

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 15, 1968

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

QUESTIONS**WIRRABARA ROAD**

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain what plans the Highways Department has for the reconstruction and sealing of the Wirrabara Forest Main Road No. 153?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

WHEAT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In this morning's newspaper Dr. A. R. Callaghan is reported as saying that the increase in the amount of wheat being produced in Australia should be curbed. Dr. Callaghan forecasts that 10 per cent more wheat will be reaped this year than was reaped in any previous year. Can the Minister say what steps may be taken to reduce the acreage of wheat sown, so that wheat yields will be more realistically related to the laws of supply and demand?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member's question is one that has been troubling people for centuries, so I do not suppose he expects me to solve it in the time available this afternoon. As honourable members well know, Dr. Callaghan is a very knowledgeable gentleman, not only on the subject of wheat but on agriculture generally. He has represented Australia overseas on the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Like the honourable member, I was interested to read what Dr. Callaghan had to say. The one thing missing from his remarks was the solution to the problem that the honourable member has raised: how we can get farmers voluntarily to reduce the acreage sown by 10 per cent. I point out that the average would be 10 per cent: it would be very much greater than 10 per cent in some States.

The stabilization scheme offers the wheat industry, as distinct from other primary industries, a guarantee. I think the Commonwealth Government has decided on 200,000,000 bushels this year for the guaranteed price, which figure is 50,000,000 bushels greater

than the previous figure. We are not at the moment sure of the initial payment, but the home consumption price will be greater. This tends to invite farmers to go in for wheat production, especially when they see that every other commodity that could take the place of wheat is faced with rather difficult circumstances on export markets. I do not think the answer to this problem is readily available. However, I will certainly take out the crystal ball tonight and have a good look at the question.

SPEECHES

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to place a time limit on the speeches of members in both this Council and the House of Assembly?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We don't need it here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think the Leader's interjection is most pertinent to this question, for in my opinion it is not necessary to impose any such limit in this honourable Council. Also, I believe the matter is covered by the Standing Orders that govern this Council, in that it is in your discretion, Mr. President, to rule upon unnecessary prolixity, and no doubt you would exercise your prerogative in this matter, if necessary.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

STATE BANK ACT AMENDMENT BILL
Second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal purpose is to give effect to the decision of the Government, as announced in the Budget proposals, to require the State Bank of South Australia to make a contribution to the revenue of the State out of its annual profits. The amount of this contribution will be generally in line with the amount it would pay in Commonwealth income tax if it were not exempt through being an authority of the State. The opportunity is being taken also to bring up to date certain other sections of the Act mainly by making necessary conversions to decimal currency, and by repealing certain provisions which have ceased to be useful or effective and most of which are now obsolete.

The functions of the State Bank, as most members will know, may be broadly classified in three categories. First, it operates a general banking business covering the whole normal field of trading bank activities, and though it is traditionally more orientated toward rural finance it nevertheless conducts a wide range of industrial and commercial as well as personal accounts. Secondly, it operates an extensive business in long-term housing loans, lending as principal a large volume of funds made available out of the Home Builders Account constituted under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. Thirdly, it carries on, as agent for the State, a variety of lending functions under the Loans to Producers Act, the Advances to Settlers Act, the Loans for Fencing and Water Piping Act, the Advances for Homes Act and the Student Hostels (Advances) Act, etc.

For this last group the funds are provided by the Crown, all income belongs to the Crown and all expenses are met by the Crown. Accordingly, the Crown receives all profits from those activities and bears all losses, but, fortunately, all of these activities operate on a fully self-supporting basis with small profits. The first two activities of the bank, that is, the general banking and the long-term housing loans, are conducted by the bank as principal and accordingly any profits are retained by it for its own purposes, and they must also cover the bank's own losses. Fortunately, the bank has for many years been able to operate profitably to the mutual benefit of its customers, the State generally, and the bank itself. The bank's profits last year were \$822,380.

Of course, all private banks with whom the State Bank is in active competition pay Commonwealth income tax, which is currently at the rate of 45 per cent. It is the practice in many States and other countries to require trading concerns owned by the Crown to contribute to public funds in much the same proportion as a private concern would be required to do. The Commonwealth requires the Reserve Bank of Australia and the Commonwealth Banking Corporation, which includes both trading and savings banks, to make large contributions out of their profits to Consolidated Revenue. A number of other States which have Government insurance offices require those offices to contribute out of their profits amounts in lieu of taxation. The previous Government proposed in a Bill providing for the setting up of a Government insurance office a comparable requirement. It has appeared to the Government reasonable and proper to seek to make

this provision, and that an appropriate proportion to be diverted to revenue is 45 per cent, which is the current rate of income tax upon companies generally. This will not be a severe imposition upon the bank for it will only be payable if there are profits, and 55 per cent of its profits will remain with the bank for further expansion of its business.

I shall now deal with the various clauses in the Bill. Clauses 2 (a), 3, 6 and 7 merely effect conversions of amounts of money from sterling into decimal currency. Clause 2 (b) makes a drafting correction which had been overlooked in 1958. Clause 4 repeals the existing section 34 dealing with the disposal of the bank's profits and replaces it with a new section which requires the bank to make the requisite contribution to Consolidated Revenue and provides, in a more simplified manner than at present, for the holding and use of existing reserves and the balance of future profits after the contribution to Consolidated Revenue has been made. The manner by which the bank's profits will be determined will require the approval of the Auditor-General. Instead of continuing the existing disposition of the retained surpluses of the bank in the two separate funds known as the Bank Reserve Fund and the Redemption Fund, the new section, on the recommendation of the bank board, has been drafted with the object of consolidating these two funds in the Bank Reserve Fund. This has been recommended mainly because the Redemption Fund was originally designed to repay debentures raised by the bank from the public and the bank has not found it necessary or practicable to secure its capital in this way.

Clause 5 repeals section 37a of the principal Act. This section had been enacted in 1941 to deal with certain losses that had been incurred in connection with certain transactions that had been entered into in the past in accordance with Government policy. This section has served its purpose and is no longer required. Clause 8 repeals Part VIA of the principal Act which was enacted in 1935 and which was originally designed to make loans to primary producers out of funds specially provided by the Treasurer for the purpose. Since the enactment of this Part the bank has greatly expanded its activities and now provides for this type of business out of its normal funds in the course of its ordinary business. No advances have been secured from the Treasurer for these purposes for many years and most of the earlier advances have been repaid.

At June 30 last the outstanding amount was only \$12,084.00 and the bank held reserves on account of this particular business to an amount equivalent to \$118,396.00. On the recommendation of the bank, Part VIA is accordingly repealed and by clause 9 provision is also made for the bank to repay the Treasurer the outstanding amount and to treat any subsisting advances to primary producers made under the Part to be repealed as if they were advances made by the bank in the ordinary course of its business. Provision has also been made by clause 9 for the reserves remaining after repayment in full of the outstanding advances made under Part VIA to form part of the Bank Reserve Fund.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1807.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): I rise to support the appropriations, which virtually tie up with the Treasury policy of this State. As we do not deal with the individual items of the Estimates in this Council, I feel I am in order in generalizing about the financial position and making, possibly, a few suggestions about the lines we should endeavour to follow. First, I strongly support correcting at the earliest opportunity the imbalance between the Loan and Revenue Estimates. I am aware that the Treasurer has that in the forefront of his policy, but there are other points to which we, as members of this Council, should draw attention to assist him wherever possible. I suggest to the Treasurer that we endeavour to do our utmost for the time being, until we have recovered from last year's State-wide drought, to limit tax increases and prefer instead every possible saving by eliminating wastage, inefficiency, and overlapping of redundant departments. Above all, if it is necessary to increase taxes a little, we should simplify the means of collecting them.

One minor policy matter comes immediately to my mind. From day to day every honourable member finds his mail box full of literature which, in the main, has been posted through the Postmaster-General's Department and carries a large postage surcharge, although for the 59 members of this Parliament the expense involved is relatively minor compared with that for the whole Public Service.

However, dozens of similar economies that should have been made in the past can well now be effected. For instance, booklets, pamphlets and other documents are printed and published on paper of the highest quality, of such a quality that in the business world only the wealthiest firms and shareholders would countenance.

It leaves much to be desired when we consider the state of the wastepaper basket by lunch time every day in the mailing room of members of Parliament. I suggest that honourable members seriously examine departmental publications that in many cases are too long and voluminous for the average member to have any chance of perusing and giving fair consideration.

Let us look at the other side of the picture, that of obtaining finance (apart from local finance), and here I want to suggest to honourable members and to everybody interested in the public life of this State that we should lead through strength. The strength of the smaller States lies in the Senate of the Commonwealth Parliament. I cannot help recalling the many occasions in recent months of attacks made by members of the Australian Labor Party on the Government through the Senate, thereby using the power of the Senate to persuade the Government, if possible, to act in a different manner. How different from the attitude of the members of the Opposition in this Parliament with regard to this distinguished Legislative Council.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What chance have we of persuading anybody in here?

The Hon. SIR NORMAN JUDE: Honourable members opposite often waste time trying to do so. I point out that what I want to see (and I have said this many times both outside and inside Parliament) is pressure brought to bear by all Senators, especially from the smaller States, unanimously working for the good of the Commonwealth and of their own States in particular. This does not occur, and I am certain it is because of a great deal of Party parochialism on both sides. On the other hand, if Senators representing the Opposition Party begin pressing for what they know is not a purely political matter but something for the good of the States, then we will find our own Opposition doing likewise. That is why I say it is of the greatest importance to lead through strength and not through weakness, due to numerical weakness in the Commonwealth Cabinet.

We, together with the Treasurer, must watch closely the impact of special grants made by the Commonwealth Government to the various States from time to time to assist with special projects, and members of the Senate should see that such grants are fairly and reasonably distributed. I have spoken in this Council on previous occasions about developmental roads, how grossly unfair the existing system is, and how often it is abused to assist the special claims of Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Queensland, to the great disadvantage of Victoria. Western Australia is becoming one of our greatest States and its people can be very proud of it, as I would be if I lived there. I am glad that this great development of mineralogy and metallurgy has occurred to put that State on its feet; it is no longer a mendicant State. When I was there recently I made the suggestion that, having inherited, discovered, or been fortunate enough to gain great additional wealth in such a short time, it might be as well for the Parliament of that State to display some generosity by putting off for some time (or soft-peddalling) the Ord River project so that some of these vast millions of dollars could be spent on States that needed the money more.

I wish to refer to a most important attitude that should be taken by Parliamentarians today. What I am about to say is strengthened by the extraordinary amount of petty legislation being brought forward in both Houses at present. Such legislation may be necessary, but it tends to make honourable members lose sight of the priorities that are important to this State.

The No. 1 priority is water: it is not only our lifeline today but our bloodline. By it we live or die, both economically and physically. We all know the calamity that would occur if the city found itself, even for a few days, without water in the middle of a hot summer.

Let us consider the priorities with regard to water: first, conservation; secondly, proper usage, which can be largely effected by economies and by charges; thirdly, re-use of water, which is not carried out nearly enough in this State compared with the extent to which it is carried out in countries that are far more fortunate in respect of their original supplies of water; and, fourthly, desalination or "new water". Chlorination (to purify the water) filtering (to ensure the absence of foreign matter) and fluoridation are also important,

but they pale into insignificance compared with conservation, proper usage and re-use.

Our main source of supply, apart from reservoirs, is the great Murray River, but our supply from this source is tremendously affected by the requirements of other States. No member of Parliament representing an electoral district in this State, whether he be a member of the Commonwealth Parliament or of the State Parliament, should be allowed to forget for one moment that the Chowilla dam or its alternative must be promptly proceeded with in thought and then in action. Far too much time is being spent, even by experts, in considering ideas. This matter, however, is of grave importance to this State and should be dealt with promptly.

During a recent visit to another State I was made painfully aware that the hold-up in respect of the Chowilla dam was partly due to the most unusual lack of water in the city of Melbourne. Unlike this State, Victoria did not prepare sufficiently in advance for its needs for water and electricity. The Ovens River in Victoria could probably provide Melbourne with all the water required for all time, but apparently Victoria is reluctant to harness this river for political and, to some extent, economic reasons. This is not our concern: Victoria must run its own show, but we must see that, in running its own show, Victoria does not put us out of the market for the right to use the water granted to us through the River Murray Commission.

I do not like the past history of the salinity in the Murray River: there was something wrong about it somewhere. Some honourable members may know far more about this matter than I do, but it seems to me that the steps now being taken in regard to salinity could have been taken many years ago. If the Minister of Agriculture, with his greater knowledge, likes to comment on this point I shall be very pleased. We have killed off thousands upon thousands of fruit trees and other trees along the river, and this certainly cannot be allowed to continue. Water must be stored where evaporation is least. This is one of the problems associated with the Chowilla dam. We must see that our bores are maintained wherever possible at a high standard. We must see that saline water is not allowed to run back into bores that are considered to be comparatively useless, particularly those in the western metropolitan area. We must carefully consider the proper usage of water and drainage. The water in the South-East is another possible source that may prove invaluable in the

future. I do not think nearly enough research has been done on this matter up to the present.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is now in process.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I am glad to know that something is being done. The question of proper usage is important for the whole of the State. For instance, we should consider the merits of the sprinkler system *vis-à-vis* flooding, which often proves costly and wasteful, particularly in the South-East. If everyone is charged for every gallon that goes through his meter, we shall encourage proper usage of water. There should be reasonable charges, and reasonable penalties for wastage. Whilst each of these points, considered separately, is not of major significance, when the effect of all these points is added up over the whole of the metropolitan area, the total effect is considerable. The re-use of water is in its infancy at present, so I hope a responsible officer of the Engineering and Water Supply Department will be sent overseas to study this matter.

During this debate we have heard certain remarks about effluent water. Frankly, I stand to be convinced that effluent water from Bolivar cannot be used and used reasonably economically. We must realize that not all things are done economically by either Governments or private interests. Although not all things are economic, some of them are necessary, and I suggest that the saving of water in this State, even if it might not be quite economical, is necessary, especially if it permits saving millions of gallons or more a day. I think this matter should have the closest attention of the, shall we say, amateurs in Government, who will insist that the experts get their facts absolutely right.

Lastly, I refer to desalination. We do not hear much about that here, but when we get about and read all the literature available on this subject we find that it is becoming of paramount importance. Some people even now go so far as to say that water is far more important than oil, and I cannot agree with them more. All I am suggesting is that we keep right up to the mark on this matter of desalination and not let it slip away into the background because other things, such as Chowilla, claim our attention for the moment. Surely the things I have mentioned are the appropriate priorities, although there are, as I have suggested, the other minor matters such as greater purity, filtration and fluoridation.

I turn now to railways. It is my humble opinion that the second priority after water in this State today (not tomorrow, or yesterday, but today) is a standard line of railway between Adelaide and the Sydney-Perth line. This is of paramount importance to this State, no matter whether it be a question of export or internal trade. The wealthy State of Victoria can afford to smile. It has its broad gauge to its north-eastern border and its standard line to Sydney. It can interchange its bogies in Melbourne, and it has a State-wide railway on its broad gauge. Its business to Adelaide is not affected.

I cannot understand why the organizers in our railway unions are making such a fuss about the closing of some minor line which is of no particular importance today. Such closing may inconvenience the workers on the railway line or a few people who still use the facility because it happens to run very near their front door or their small factory. I cannot understand why the powerful unions associated with firms such as General Motors-Holden's Proprietary Limited or Chrysler Australia Limited do not tell these organizers and their own unionists that this question of standard gauge line to the North is so important to all the workers of the State—far and away more important than these little minor matters that we are being asked to consider from time to time. I can only wonder: are the men being properly informed, or is it a blank suggestion that some sideline closure is against them?

These people should (and I believe they would) push for development, rather than stagnation, if they were told the facts about the hook-up. That is not to mention the line between Port Pirie and Whyalla, although I fully realize that this is a Commonwealth extension. I realize also that the Commonwealth does not have the vast overhead charges of a terminal railhead. However, that is beside the point. We must get our priorities right, and the priority of this virtually North-South railway is of the greatest importance.

I realize that tourism is very important also to South Australia, but can one compare the importance of a new line to Alice Springs or even (as I always wished) the completion of the standardization from Marree to Alice Springs, or the road from Eucla across to the west, or a sealed road to Alice Springs, with the things to which I have drawn the notice of honourable members earlier? I say these things should have only a secondary priority.

I now wish to say a few words about the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. I thought the Minister gave a very good exposition of this subject, and I thought it more than countered the mild criticisms of our Labor friends. He pointed out that they were the strongest proponents of more committees, more planners and more controls than we had ever envisaged before. Then this master plan arrives. Originally, under the Playford Government it was to cost \$400,000, but it was let slide up to about \$1,000,000 with the indefinable and hidden costs added in. Let us all face up to this point: everyone screamed for this long-term plan, both for public and political reasons, so we should now stop passing the buck and just using it as a political football.

Of course, it cannot be done in 20 years, or even 18 years (which apparently is now the plan) unless we get vast sums from the world bank. I remind honourable members that there are other States in Australia as well. I have thought that the Minister, in the first flush of enthusiasm, so to speak, has been over-optimistic. However, I would sooner have his enthusiasm than a great deal of wet blanket pessimism when it comes to the future of the State. We must consider the psychology of these plans. If we have a small one which affects only a few people in one area (a few who will be hit or who will raise a hue and cry, while a few go-getters will rub their hands and see an opportunity for gain), the local politician rises indignantly while keeping his finger on the pulse to see which way the cat jumps. But what of the big plan? It affects a proportion of people in many districts, so all members rush in and appear to condemn it. Few praise its many merits, and apparently all the experts of the past few years are cast aside as mere dreamers. Quite rightly, the Government tabled the plan, as the Playford Government tabled the metropolitan area plan of the Town Planning Committee. Would honourable members like me to quote what the Labor Party, both in Opposition and as the Government, had to say *ad nauseam* about nothing being done, things being a waste of money, etc. It is a wonder that they did not strangle the M.A.T.S. plan at birth, but no, they were going to help their newly-formed planning organizations, not the committee or the experts, but they talked of planning ahead quite ruthlessly.

The overall plan naturally affects most people, so what do members opposite say? They say, "To hell with the plan." I suggest

that no very long-term plan will ever be carried out in its original shape, but it is now possible to see where we can make a start and where it can lead. But what of finance? The Minister has from time to time indicated that so many millions of dollars will be available over a certain period (I will not quote actual figures, but they are available). As far as the State is concerned, he can only estimate how many motor vehicle licences, driving licences and repayments of loans there will be, as well as possible additional taxation, although he would be better to keep off the latter, if he wants to see the plan going at all.

In the Commonwealth sphere there is no guarantee of the same financial pattern. Indeed, the Commonwealth Bureau of Highways may report differently altogether. I remind honourable members that it does not report to Parliament although, quite frankly, it was supposed to. The Government was scared that it might raise the ante, having regard to the then overall 30-odd per cent involved in the transportation of goods and people. It must be insisted that the Commonwealth Bureau should report to Parliament, not to the Government. I understand it has recruited 30-odd experts to its staff, experts who could well be used by the individual States in their highways or country roads authorities. Yet that bureau reports only to the Government. I venture to warn the Minister that I have far more fear that that bureau, if it makes a striking report of any type, will suggest it is essential that the great cities of Sydney and Melbourne have more money allotted to them for what might be regarded as their very serious needs, if they are to deal with their traffic problems before it becomes impossible to deal with them.

In closing, I would prefer to see the Treasurer emphasizing that he will insist on greater efficiency in all departments and attempt to reduce various departments where they are shown to be wasteful (and I point out that I did not say "uneconomical"). I would also like to see that every attempt is made to reconcile long-term spending with the Loan Estimates, and vice versa, which, I believe, the Treasurer is setting out to do. Finally, he should seek continuously to get the support of all this State's members of the Commonwealth Parliament to see that South Australia is enabled to control its own financial destiny to a far greater extent than at present. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I, too, support the Bill, which authorizes the

allocation of \$220,962,000 for the commitments contained in it. Previous speakers have touched on many facets of the Bill, but I intend to touch only on those that most directly affect my portion of the State. It was gratifying to see that, by way of increased revenue from expected profits from both the State lottery and the Totalizator Agency Board operations, it is hoped to achieve an increase of \$330,000 to subsidize hospitals. This should result in a great fillip to country hospital facilities.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department has been allocated \$12,717,000 for the year, which would appear to be inadequate. I say that with some conflict of mind because I appreciate deeply the Government's intention to commence building the Polda to Kimba main early next year. On the other hand, I consider that the allocation of \$175,000 is pretty niggardly. That scheme is very cheap when one considers that 1,200 square miles of some of the best wheat land in the State can be given the stability of a water supply for only \$2,200,000. It was hoped that the scheme would be completed in three years, but at this rate of expenditure we can expect completion in about 1981. I know that that is not intended and that it is hoped to have Commonwealth assistance to speed the completion of this project. However, by drawing attention to its urgency at every opportunity I hope to achieve something towards the early completion of this much awaited main. Not only will this bring an end to the hardship and expense incurred by both the farmers and the State, but it has the added benefit of involving a supply of Electricity Trust of South Australia power to this area.

While on the subject of primary production, I point out that one of the greatest pains inflicted on the primary producer today is the never-ending and conflicting advice and criticism ladled out by self-styled experts. Economists and columnists, whether or not they know anything of farming, try to make a bob for themselves by publishing articles regarding what a farmer should do to produce more for less. Generally, an amalgamation of plant and an enlargement of properties is advised, yet during our last Parliament legislation restricting leases to 4,000 acres was passed. These restrictions and anomalous rentals are impeding production and development in many areas of the State. The Government has promised to examine both these impositions, and I advise them to put away their binoculars and

give both acreage limitations and the ridiculous rentals full and promised consideration.

The development of what for years was considered waste land can be economically achieved if the developer is given some encouragement, but it is no encouragement to find that, after several years of what has been described as a qualifying period to prove one's ability and intentions, a miscellaneous lease when transferred to a better tenure can carry an increased rental from less than \$100 to, in some cases, over \$1,200 a year.

Bank managers have told many applicants for assistance that, if their rental was less, they could perhaps assist them. However, although many of these people were given the green light to go ahead and develop a miscellaneous lease, with the promise that if they proved their ability and resourcefulness as developers they would be granted a better tenure, they are now faced with the fact that their own efforts have been assessed to their detriment and they are now paying a rental based on fictitious prices being paid for land and are finding themselves in such a position that they are not prepared in most cases to proceed further with development.

I know the Land Board has certain formulae for arriving at these inflated rentals, and therefore an absolute change of policy is urgently needed. I stress to the Government that now is the time to give some indication that it will change this policy. We have always had those with us, too, who predict that next year our products will be unsaleable. We can read at least two articles a month by various experts who say that, because the drought has broken, there will be a world glut. Now and again, these people are right but what they do not write into their articles is what to do about such a problem. Do we stop production, and find that next year there is a drought anyway and a great demand for the product which was condemned a few months before or do we continue our progress?

I was particularly interested to read some figures put forward by a gentleman purporting to represent the primary producer. He made a point of telling the general population to what extent they were subsidizing the primary producer. Why a primary producer representative would want to come out with these statements I cannot quite understand.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Is this a member of Parliament?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I said he was a gentleman; I do not wish to qualify that. I can understand that, if somebody else had made these statements, he would not want to contradict them if he believed them true. I did not believe them true and made some investigations, and I believe I can effectively dispute them. The gentleman in question claimed that every man, woman and child paid \$5 a year to subsidize the dairy industry, and that dairy farmers received an average subsidy of \$1,800 each.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who was it who said that?

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Someone quite close to town.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Yes. I was able to ascertain that the subsidies to the dairy industry payable under Commonwealth legislation are \$27,000,000 for milk production for butter and cheese, and \$800,000 for exported milk products, making a total of \$27,800,000. Statistics available show a total of 77,077 properties with dairy cows in

Australia. If we exclude those properties with fewer than four cows, we have a figure of 59,857. Using the latter figure, we find that the subsidy payment to each dairy farmer is \$464 and, although this is more than we like to see (no industry wishes to be subsidized but sometimes it becomes necessary in order to keep it going), it certainly is considerably less than the \$1,800 calculated by the gentleman I am quoting. Also, the cost to the Australian population is not \$5 a head, as was quoted—at least, not according to my calculations. The population figure for Australia at December, 1966, was 11,651,340, and the total dairy industry subsidy was \$27,800,000, making it a personal contribution of \$2.40, and not \$5 as stated.

The same gentleman had this to say about the wheat stabilization plan. Using, for some reason of his own, a figure of \$100,000,000, he claims that farmers will receive a subsidy of about \$2,000 each. In actual fact, if we take 1967 and the two preceding years, the wheat industry figures are these:

Year	No. of growers	Payments to Wheat Stabilization Fund from Consolidated Revenue \$	Average subsidy to growers \$
1964-65	54,465	18,069,135	312
1965-66	51,103	16,154,366	316
1966-67	54,985	15,508,065	282

The Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) has stated that the new plan will require a guarantee of \$68,000,000 over the five-year period of the scheme, which itself covers only 200,000,000 bushels at a guaranteed price of \$1.45 a bushel, and what the actual Government contribution to the scheme will be depends entirely on what markets can be found overseas. It is clear that some elements are ever ready to attempt to drive a wedge between the producer and the consumer. I hope that I have clarified the position concerning subsidies. It would be appropriate to say, "All that glitters is not gold" and "many things that appear black are only painted that way".

Before closing, I point out to the Minister of Roads and Transport that I was not happy with the replies I received concerning northern roads. I believe more funds will have to be allocated to the Highways Department for spending on those roads. The Minister's reply

regarding the hiring of Highways Department equipment in outback areas was most unsatisfactory. Despite the fact that much of this work could be done by contractors, I still believe that in many instances it would be impracticable to bring a contractor the distance necessary to perform a small job. The same work could be carried out by using Highways Department equipment to the benefit of outback people generally. I refer to some of the smaller maintenance jobs on aerodromes, etc., and although in his reply the Minister pointed out that the department had no desire to enter into the contract field, I do not believe that this would be entering that field. People in local government areas have often hired earthmoving equipment to perform small jobs. A similar facility could be extended to people engaged in the pastoral industry at some gain, I think, both to public relations and to the Highways Fund. I do not wish to debate

this matter further, and I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 9. Page 1739.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): The principal Act to be amended by this Bill was first introduced in 1940. At that time the Mining (Petroleum) Act, as it was then designated, was looked upon as a model Act by other States, and it was an Act that at the time led the way to the search for oil. That Act was amended to some extent in 1963, and many amendments were made to it in 1967, including a change in name from the Mining (Petroleum) Act to the Petroleum Act, which is the principal Act now operating in this State.

The amendments before the Council deal mostly with administrative matters rather than amending the operative parts of the principal Act. I desire to comment on one or two of the proposed amendments, and I hope the Minister of Mines will provide answers before the debate is closed, perhaps at the same time answering any criticism that may be levelled at the Bill. Some of the amendments clarify matters in the interpretation section of the Act. I thought that clause 3 of the Bill as it affected section 4 (1) of the principal Act had been tidied up by an amendment in 1967. This deals with the word "helium" and certainly the intention of the Government in 1967 was to clarify that section. Subsection (1) included a proviso that would normally have been inserted in the Act separately; it contained the word "helium" and, although I thought that the 1967 amendment deleted the word, apparently this was not the case.

One aspect of the Bill causes me concern, and I point out that I have given particular attention to this amending legislation because of the large number of amendments made in 1967. I refer to section 7 of the principal Act dealing with the mode of applying for licences both for exploration and for production. Part II of the principal Act covered the issuing of licences as applying to exploration, production, and pipelines. Section 7 deals mainly with applications for exploration licences. I agree that sufficient power exists in subsection (4) to enable the Minister to obtain further information, but only in relation to those matters contained in section 7 (4). The effect of the amending legislation is to delete the words shown in clause 4 thus

leaving the form of the application to the discretion of the Minister. That is where I think complications could arise. Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act, which lays down the information that an applicant for a licence must submit. Section 7 of the principal Act requires, amongst other things, information about the applicant's financial position and about his ability to give effect to the provisions of the legislation. Where the Minister of Mines is not satisfied he can seek further information. Section 7 (4) of the principal Act provides:

The applicant shall, with his application, furnish evidence as to his financial position and technical qualifications, and as to his ability to comply with this Act and the terms and conditions of the licence for which application is made. The applicant shall forthwith, upon request by the Minister, furnish further evidence relating to such matters, and if such further evidence is not furnished to the satisfaction of the Minister within three months after the request therefor the application shall, unless the Minister otherwise determines, be deemed void.

This gives the Minister the power to require any other information he desires in relation to the applicant: it is not all-embracing, despite what the Minister said in his brief second reading explanation. In relation to clause 4, the Minister said:

Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act. This amendment eliminates the obligation for an application for a licence to be in a prescribed form. The power to obtain all information that may be required by the Minister already exists in subsection (4) of that section, and it is considered that a more flexible form of application to suit varying circumstances is desirable.

I suggest that the provision is not all-embracing, although the Minister may think at present that it is. The whole of Part II of the principal Act deals with issuing licences and with the obligations placed upon the applicant himself not only in respect of the exploration for oil or gas but also in respect of the production of oil or gas. There could be a multiplicity of applicants for the same area or different areas. It is still possible to get the smart boy who is not averse to putting it over, if this is possible. I do not know whether the Minister has had any experience of this kind of person, but I certainly had such experience.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: None has been successful.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: None of them was successful, and I expect that none of them will be successful, but one must be right on the ball all the time. Some applicants may not be aware of their obligations when lodging

their applications and, if there is no prescribed application form, much time may be wasted through correspondence going back and forth. Perhaps an opportunity may be missed. Can the Minister of Mines say what the future procedure will be? The application is made to the Director of Mines (this has always been the procedure) and it is then referred to the Minister. Does an applicant write to the Director of Mines stating his desire to apply for a licence for oil exploration covering X square miles? Should he state his financial position and enclose two copies of the map of the area? Does the applicant say, "In what form should I submit my application? What information does the Minister desire, and how can I go about this?"

The correspondence sent in by the applicant will naturally become an official application and will be filed, but what will follow this step? Much information will not be contained in the initial application. I assume the Minister will then write to the applicant saying that he desires the application to take a certain form. The applicant then attempts to comply with the Minister's request. Honourable members must realize the time that will be taken by all this correspondence. The words "as prescribed" still appear in section 6 of the principal Act. Surely the applicant for a licence would have to specify parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude? Such matters are more adequately dealt with through a prescribed form. The desired information would then be furnished by the applicant himself. The clause dealing with an application for a pipeline licence involves this difficulty, for this provision is deleted, and again it is left to the discretion of the Minister. The same thing applies with regard to reporting accidents.

Clause 8 amends section 32 (2) of the principal Act. This clause relates to the renewal of a petroleum production licence. It is entirely divorced from section 7 which, as I have pointed out, deals with an application for an exploration licence. It is now proposed to delete the words "the manner and form prescribed" and to insert "a manner and form approved by the Minister".

A company that is operating under an exploration licence might find oil or gas of commercial value and want to go into production. I believe that already an application has been made by Delhi-Santos to the Minister for a production licence in respect of the Gidgealpa field, and I assume that that application was made under the amending legislation of 1967 on a form prescribed. However,

some other company or individual might be fortunate enough to find an oil field of commercial value. Does that company or individual first write down to the Director and say, "I hereby apply for a production licence as this field is of commercial value and I now desire to produce oil"? Will this be sufficient, or will the Minister then have to write back and ask for details? Surely it would be better if there were a prescribed form that would set out all the information the Minister would desire. I do not know the purport of the amending legislation in this respect. I cannot see that this would effect any significant saving. Certainly, I cannot see that it would save the time of departmental officers. In fact, I think it would have the opposite effect, for it would involve correspondence between the Minister, the department and the applicant.

The Minister in his second reading explanation touched on these matters only very briefly, and when he is replying I should like him to furnish information in relation to these two points I have raised. I think the other amendments are administrative ones and that they tidy up the legislation. Subject to those comments, I support the second reading.

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

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 10. Page 1809.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I support the Bill. I am sure that all of us realize the very great need for more veterinary surgeons throughout the State. All primary-producing organizations have brought all possible pressure to bear on both the State Government and the Commonwealth Government to increase student allocations and scholarships, and I am sure that the Government in return has made every possible effort to acquire veterinary surgeons from other countries.

We have been very fortunate, perhaps, up to now that we have amongst our stockowners and producers a number of men who are very capable in the art of animal husbandry. Some of these gentlemen have gone to some expense and spent a great deal of time studying the various veterinary books published from time to time. Some of those books are good, whereas others are not. I think animal husbandry in South Australia is what it is

today largely because of those men who have been prepared to make their services available to the producing community. I could mention one man in particular that I know well and I know there are others throughout the State. Mr. Crosby at Cleve would be one man who qualifies for some recognition. He has made much time available to the animal industry on Eyre Peninsula but, to my knowledge, has never charged anyone for his services. Indeed, he has travelled many thousands of miles, sometimes at short notice and sometimes for long distances. At times he has travelled late at night to perform emergency acts to assist primary producers to save their animals.

One of the disturbing features of our present set-up is that our South Australian universities provide no facilities to train veterinary students. Because a man has to leave South Australia for six years to study either in Sydney or in Brisbane it has had a deterring effect on the numbers of young men prepared to take such a step. Perhaps the universities and the Education Department say that the limited number of applicants for veterinary training has never warranted such a course being instituted here. They say that if 25 or 30 persons desired to enter such a course something could be done about it. On the other hand, in my opinion, if the universities had such facilities available they would have no difficulty in getting their 25 or 30 applicants. The fact remains, regardless of whether what I say is correct, that we are still short of veterinary surgeons in South Australia. Indeed, we are so short that recently, when I wanted a blood test performed on one of my bulls that I wanted to send to Western Australia, I would have had to pay \$300 to have it done by a private practitioner. Fortunately, however, the Agriculture Department was able to help me out. I make the point that veterinary surgeons are hard to find, especially when one gets away from the metropolitan area, and it is most desirable that we build up our pool of them.

For that reason, I wish to comment on clause 3 (d), which provides, in effect, that any foreign graduate, although he may have the necessary qualifications, must reside in Australia for not less than two years before he can practise. I believe this cuts right across the object of inducing foreign graduates to Australia to practise as veterinary surgeons. A man holding the necessary qualifications in Germany is not likely to come to South Australia if he knows that he may have to spend two years as, say, a railway porter before

being allowed to apply to practise in this country. Undoubtedly, we need more veterinary surgeons, and we should do all in our power to induce them to come here from outside Australia, at least until our teaching facilities are able to cope with the necessary intake of young people wishing to graduate as veterinary surgeons. The Minister will no doubt have something to say on this matter, but I intend to move an amendment to this clause, providing that the period be reduced from two years to six months. That would be ample time for our authorities to ascertain the qualifications of any man who planned to practise as a veterinary surgeon here.

It could, perhaps, be said that language would be a barrier, but I doubt this very much. If a man has the necessary qualifications, the fact that he speaks in German would not affect a sick cow, anyway. I support the Bill with the reservation that in Committee I will move the amendment I have referred to.

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

FLUORIDATION

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

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

which the Hon. V. G. Springett had moved to amend by striking out all words after "that" second occurring with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the following words "while the procedure adopted by the Government for 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".

(Continued from October 10. Page 1815.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): The Government's decision to place fluoride in our water supply without express Parliamentary approval has in my mind raised several very important issues. It is unfortunate that when the Hon. Mr. Geddes moved his motion there was a misunderstanding of the intention of that motion and, according to a press report, it seemed to be interpreted that the motion was against the addition of fluoride to our water. However, as I understand the situation, that is not the case at all. His motion

related to the method by which the addition of fluoride was to be achieved, namely, that it was done by an Executive act and not by consultation with Parliament. Therefore, what I shall say is on the basis that Mr. Geddes objected to this being done without the express authority of Parliament.

That involves what is a very old question and a very old principle: the use of Executive power as against the power of the Legislature, or ahead of the power of the Legislature. This question has led to very considerable discussion and writings by many important people over many years. In 1950 a book called *Law and Orders* was published by Professor C. K. Allen, the Professor of Jurisprudence at the Oxford University, in which he sets out this matter under three chapters: first, Parliament and the Executive; secondly, the Judiciary and the Executive; and, thirdly, the public and the Executive. I do not wish to quote from that book, except to bring it to the notice of anyone interested in the subject.

In my opinion perhaps the best book that has been written on this subject is an older one published in about 1929, which was written by the Rt. Hon. Lord Hewart, then Lord Chief Justice of England, and it is called *The New Despotism*. At page 14 he says:

That there is in existence, and in certain quarters in the ascendant, a genuine belief that Parliamentary institutions and the Rule of Law have been tried and found wanting, and that the time has come for the departmental despot, who shall be at once scientific and benevolent, but above all a law to himself, needs no demonstration. There is an agreeable story, not too old, of a distinguished Anglo-Indian civilian, who, returning home on leave after a prolonged absence, passed the Houses of Parliament on his way from Victoria to Charing Cross. "What place is that?" he asked. "That, sir," was the answer, "is Parliament—the Houses of Parliament." "Really," he exclaimed, though his exclamation was in fact slightly different, "does that rubbish still go on?" Everybody knows the frame of mind, and everybody has met some of the teachers in that school.

But another aspect of the matter is illustrated by a wellknown conversation which took place, not so many years ago, between a distinguished Treasury official and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It happened that matters had not gone quite smoothly in the House of Commons that evening. The departmental specialist was not, for once, able to say to his chief, after the rising of the House, with that air which as nearly approaches a tone of triumph as official decorum permits, "Well, sir, we have got our clauses". What he did say was that he wondered whether all this palaver was really necessary. After all, what was the good

of the House of Commons? And how perfectly useless was the House of Lords! Why should the work of the expert be always at the mercy of the ignorant amateur? Why should people be allowed to try to govern themselves when it was manifestly so much better for them to be governed by those who knew how to govern?

"Seriously," he asked, "could not this country be governed by the Civil Service?" "Undoubtedly it could," replied the Chancellor of the Exchequer, "undoubtedly it could. And I am quite sure that you and your colleagues would govern the country remarkably well. But let me tell you this, my young friend: at the end of six months of it, there would not be enough lamp-posts in Whitehall to go round."

A little later he continues:

But when once the fact is appreciated that democracy is really the name of a form of government, the essence of which is that every citizen in the State shares the responsibility for the good government of the State, and when it is further understood that, in the opinion of many competent observers, by no means confined to this side of the Atlantic alone, the great achievement and the enduring pride of our history and institutions are precisely to have exhibited to the world, in an unexampled way, the art and practice of real self-government, as well in peace as in war, the true dimensions of the present issue, and the true nature of the assault which is being resisted, become reasonably clear. Much toil, and not a little blood, have been spent in bringing slowly into being a policy wherein the people make their laws, and independent judges administer them. If that edifice is to be overthrown, let the overthrow be accomplished openly. Never let it be said that liberty and justice, having with difficulty been won, were suffered to be abstracted or impaired in a fit of absence of mind. . . . It is manifestly easy to point a superficial contrast between what was done or attempted in the days of our least wise kings, and what is being done or attempted today. In those days the method was to defy Parliament—and it failed. In these days the method is to cajole, to coerce, and to use Parliament—and it is strangely successful. The old despotism, which was defeated, offered Parliament a challenge. The new despotism, which is not yet defeated, gives Parliament an anaesthetic.

The strategy is different, but the goal is the same. It is to subordinate Parliament, to evade the courts, and to render the will, or the caprice, of the Executive unfettered and supreme. The old King, as Rudyard Kipling sings in *The Old Issue*, sometimes reappears under a new name:

All we have of freedom, all we use or know—

This our fathers bought for us long and long ago.

I have read that because I think that is an important contribution to our thought on this matter; it is a contribution made by the Lord Chief Justice of England, of whom we can take some notice on matters of this kind.

South Australia has a Constitution Act; it is a short Act of 75 sections, divided into four Parts. The first Part is headed "Preliminary"; the second Part is headed "The Legislature"; the third Part is headed "The Executive"; and the fourth Part is headed "The Judiciary". That Act does not attempt to set out the powers and responsibilities of each of those heads or functions of Government: all it does is to set out the method by which the people occupying positions under those heads are appointed. It sets out the method by which the Legislature and its members are appointed and what the Legislature consists of—the two Houses of Parliament. It sets out the Executive and the number of people constituting the Cabinet, which is the Executive; it sets out the qualifications for appointment to the Judiciary.

It is important to note that this division of responsibility in a democracy, as we know it, was recognized many years ago. If we look at Halsbury's *Laws of England*, which everybody knows is to be treated with respect, we find this stated:

The sovereign power, or government of the country, comprises the Legislature, or body which makes the laws; the Executive, or authority which carries the laws into effect so far as they relate to the public services; and the Judiciary, which enforces the due observance of the law.

Under our system, each of these heads of Government has its own important part to play. As I understand it, whenever democracy has failed or has not operated correctly, it is because one of these functions has taken over the responsibility of another. In some cases, the Executive has done away with Parliament altogether; the Executive has governed the country and raised and spent money without the approval of Parliament. The Executive then becomes all-supreme and we have a dictatorship. But a worse situation arises when the Executive does away with the Judiciary and determines whether a man shall retain his freedom or whether he shall lose it and be taken into custody. When we get that kind of dictatorship we are in real trouble.

It is interesting to note that the only real protection we have against this at present is the existence of a bicameral system of Government where one House is appointed on a different basis from the other House and by a different set of electors, because by this means the Judiciary is protected from any interference by the Executive or by Parliament. That is a right that all that I have said this afternoon has emphasized. It is a right that

we have won for ourselves over the years, so it is important that we keep the functions of the various heads of Government separate and that we realize what each has to do. There can be no doubt that the power of the Executive has increased tremendously in recent years. This has happened through force of circumstances. Today, Government is a more complicated exercise. It covers a whole field of functions that were not the responsibility of Governments in years gone by. In particular, in the social sphere we legislate on many matters that it was not thought came within the ambit of Parliamentary jurisdiction years ago. Because of the vastly increased volume of legislation that is necessary and the larger area over which Governments preside these days, and because of our high standard of living, it has come about that it is not physically possible for Parliament to deal with every matter affecting the people. Consequently, subordinate legislative bodies are necessary, and thus Executive power has increased. Some people consider that this is perhaps not an undesirable thing; as Professor Allen said:

Some people say that the form of Government does not matter. This general view was epitomized long ago in the cynical couplet:

For forms of Government let fools contest,
Whatever is best administered is best.

That alludes to the fact that many people think that democracy is a slow and in some ways an unsatisfactory way of getting where we want to go. For my part, I accept the dictum of Sir Winston Churchill on this matter when he said that he was quite satisfied that democracy was the worst form of Government until he looked at all the others; whilst it was by no means perfect, when brought alongside other kinds of administration it stood out on its own. I have said in recent years the work done by the Executive has increased tremendously, and it has acted in numerous instances without express Parliamentary approval.

I suppose in times of war, and in the sphere of the Commonwealth Parliament where the Government is charged with the safety of the country, Executive power has been used almost to the utmost. I think it is true to say that, when a declaration was made at the commencement of the Second World War that Australia was at war, that declaration was made without Parliamentary approval; indeed, I do not see how it could have been otherwise. Whilst I do not wish to enter into controversial matters this afternoon, I think the F111 was probably bought without Parliamentary approval. Each State operates in a more

limited sphere, dealing with less money; consequently, the power of the Executive does not range over such a wide area. However, as I recollect the situation, the city of Elizabeth, which was created through the instrumentality of the Housing Trust, a semi-government body, was planned, designed, commenced, and implemented without the express approval of Parliament.

I think that the chlorination of water supplies announced in 1949 (and I am indebted to the Chief Secretary for giving me this information) was put into effect in 1953 without the express approval of Parliament. As far as I can ascertain, (and I have not had time to make an exhaustive examination of the matter) compulsory X-rays for the prevention of tuberculosis were also introduced without a reference to Parliament. I do not wish to enter into an argument this afternoon, but I believe that whilst the Australian Labor Party was in power in this State it introduced four weeks' annual leave for certain Government employees without the express approval of Parliament; in fact, that Government did it against the express will of the Parliament, which I think was an abuse of power.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: And the present Government is, unfortunately, reaping the whirlwind!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Having examined the matter from all points of view—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Does the honourable member believe that introducing fluoridation by proclamation makes it right? That is how I interpret his remarks.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: No. What I am saying is that the area in which the Executive acts is increasing because of the more complicated nature of government and the increasing number of matters dealt with today. However, I reserve the right to say that the question of whether any issue is right must be determined on the facts in each case.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: If Parliament carried a resolution opposing the fluoridation of water supplies then the Government would not proceed with a Bill.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Parliament is the supreme legislative body. This was stated by one authority as follows:

The theory of our Constitution is that Parliament is the supreme legislative body, and all legislation except its own is subordinate.

I accept that situation, and I think this Government would be ill-advised to proceed with fluoridation of water supplies if, in fact, there was any serious expression of view that it

should not do so. I should accept the will of Parliament, and that is the point I make concerning the four weeks' annual leave granted by the previous Government. At that time Parliament expressed a view against such a proposal, and I think its view should have prevailed. I think we are getting into serious trouble and doing a disservice to democratic institutions if we ride roughshod over Parliament. I regret that the Government has decided to fluoridate the water supply without the express authority of Parliament. The amount of money is small in relation to expenditure that a Government may make without the express approval of Parliament; therefore I do not think we can justify turning down the proposal because of the amount of money involved.

On the question whether fluoridation is a good or bad thing from the point of view of the dental health of the community, the bulk of the evidence, as far as I can see, appears to indicate that it is advantageous. However, I am a little worried whether enough consideration has been given to the person who is not physically well. From the point of view of the ordinary person in the community whose bodily functions are satisfactory, I do not think any harm will result, but I wonder what effect fluoridation could have on a person who had a serious liver complaint and who could be subject to inflammation of that organ? What will be the effect on the person who has lost a kidney and relies entirely on the proper functioning of the remaining kidney? What will be the effect on a person suffering from asthma, which could possibly flare up from some unexplained cause? I do not know whether all these matters have been investigated, but I have done considerable reading on this subject and I am unable to find where any medical man (and apparently specialists in all fields have examined the matter) has expressed apprehension on this proposal.

The Hon. V. G. Springett: There is no difference in the overall incidence of such illnesses in areas with naturally fluoridated waters compared with unfluoridated areas.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That fortifies my point. Before expressing my view I think I should say I am entirely disinterested, having a complete set of dentures, and so have no personal involvement. Having thought of all these things, whilst I think that perhaps the Government may have been better advised to seek Parliamentary approval, nevertheless I do not think that what the Government has done

is sufficient to warrant my voting against the methods by which this decision has been made. I sincerely hope that the introduction of fluoride to our water supplies will prove the boon we hope for the people of this State. I believe that the Hon. Mr. Geddes was correct in raising the issue and I do not think he need have any qualms, because it is the responsibility of Parliamentarians, particularly members of this Chamber, to see that such matters are properly ventilated. What

the honourable member has done has emphasized the importance of Parliament and attracted people's attention to the important functions of this Chamber in particular.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.20 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 16, at 2.15 p.m.