

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, June 24, 1969

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

QUESTIONS

PARLIAMENT HOUSE PARKING

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Last week I directed a question to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, regarding the future use of the site now occupied by the Government Printing Office. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have obtained a reply from the Minister of Works. The committee established by the Premier to determine the feasibility of the use of Elder Park as a festival theatre site recommended that, on the demolition of the Government printing works, a plaza be constructed between the rear of Parliament House and the proposed festival theatre. It was indicated in the committee's report that vehicle parking facilities for about 360 vehicles could be provided beneath the plaza and that adequate space could be reserved for Parliamentary vehicles.

MENTAL ILLNESS

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Following last week's conference of the Ministers of Health of this country, can the Minister of Health say whether consideration has been given to the problem of payment by mentally sick people for their treatment in hospital? Is any consideration being given to their receiving the same medical benefits as apply to other forms of sickness?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In 1967, when the present Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Health, the State Ministers of Health adopted a charter in relation to the mentally ill. Many parts of that charter have been implemented, and I think we can all take a great deal of pride in the improvement that has been made in this field. Part of that charter concerns the question of hospital benefits to those receiving treatment in psychiatric institutions. The Commonwealth Government has increased the benefits in various fields. Certain categories of patients in psychiatric hospitals are now receiving social service benefits. The present situation is not what the full recommendations of the charter in 1967 envisaged but at the recent conference of the State Health Ministers the

charter was re-endorsed. It is the general impression of the State Ministers of Health that many strides have been taken but that further improvement in this field is necessary to reach the situation where psychiatric illnesses and physical illnesses are treated in exactly the same way. The charter has been re-approved and we hope that in time the remaining areas will be brought into the field of assistance from the Commonwealth through hospital or social service benefits.

BUS OPERATORS

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask my questions of the Minister of Roads and Transport. First, is a private bus operator charged a fee for the licence issued by the Municipal Tramways Trust before he can operate a bus service? If there is a fee, what is the amount? Secondly, does the M.T.T. charge for the roadworthiness tests carried out by the M.T.T. on buses owned by private operators? If so, what is the amount charged? Thirdly, are any private bus operators subsidized by the M.T.T.? If so, who are the operators and to what extent is each one subsidized? Fourthly, does the Minister know of private bus operators being subsidized by private companies or businesses for the transport of passengers?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will obtain a report on that matter and bring down an answer to the questions.

GAWLER PLAINS WATER SUPPLY

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Publicity has recently been given to a projected development on the Gawler Plains for almond and vine growing on a considerable scale. The yields forecast in the promotion of this scheme are high and must call for intensive production under irrigation. Underground water in the area is already over-exploited and cannot sustain present production. In fact, it seems more than likely that many growers already established must lose heavily as water supplies dwindle.

There is no prospect of drawing water for such large-scale irrigation from public supplies and in any case the success of the irrigation of vines and almonds on these soil types is largely unknown. Can the Minister tell us just what is his view of this project, which has been stated as bearing the recommendation of the Agriculture Department?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have had several telephone calls on this matter from constituents of mine in that area, and I have taken the trouble to do as much research as I can. The information is not full but I have obtained as much as possible. It is this:

I am well aware of water supply problems in the Angle Vale area north of Adelaide, and I was, therefore, surprised to learn of the reported plans for development of a portion of that area for planting with vines and almonds. It is unfortunate that, in some of the sales promotion statements that have been published in the press, inaccuracies have occurred. My attention has been drawn to one advertisement which stated that the Agriculture Department had "certified" the soil as being eminently suitable for growing grapes and almonds, and that a 10-acre estate could return an income of up to \$6,000 a year within five years. I am informed that one inquirer was allegedly told by a salesman for the developers that the Agriculture Department had asked the company to develop the area for almonds.

I am advised that a principal of the developers did in fact contact the department, and the district horticultural adviser subsequently visited the property and discussed various aspects of cultural and water requirements for almond growing. The adviser indicated at that time that in his opinion the soil was suitable for almond growing (and I emphasize at this point that no mention was made of vines), but a warning was given that any area planted should not be more than could be adequately watered. The adviser also expressed the opinion that eight acres of almonds would not provide a very good return.

I am not aware of any other contact between the development group and the department; and certainly there have been no official communications to my knowledge. No advice was sought or given on the growing of grape vines on the estate. I believe that the maximum depth to which bores may be sunk in this area is 25ft., and at that depth the quantity of water available would be totally inadequate for the extent of vine and almond plantings apparently envisaged by the development company.

I am advised that the rainfall is probably between 17 and 18in. a year, of which only 14 to 15in. would be effective. If irrigated, vines require around 30in. of water a year, and a further 15 to 16in. of supplementary irrigation would certainly be required. This

would amount to about 340,000 gallons an acre or 170,000,000 gallons for the whole 500 acres a year. (One acre inch is equal to 22,600 gallons.) I know of no undertaking from any other department to provide additional water, from either reticulated or underground sources, for this project.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the matter very properly raised by the Hon. Mr. Kemp. I had raised this question earlier with the Minister of Works, who replied at that stage along the lines given in the statement of the Minister of Agriculture. Apparently there has been no agreement with regard to water. At present many people in that area who have blocks of land planted with fruit trees are being refused permits for water and, in some cases, are sharing bores in order to make do, but they are encountering great difficulties. Will the Minister give an assurance that before any further water permits are considered in this area the needs of existing ratepayers will be considered in preference to the needs of future developers?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I know of no law that prohibits people from planting what they like on their own property, but with water the position is different. If the honourable member is referring to water, then the question should be directed to my colleague the Minister of Mines or I will raise the matter with the Minister of Works in another place. However, I repeat: people may plant what they like on their own land and the Government has no control over such plantings. If the question relates to the availability of more reticulated water being piped to the area in question then I shall refer the question to the Minister of Works, but if it deals with bores I shall refer it to the Minister of Mines.

SALT MINING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I have been informed that the Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha of Japan has recently established new customers for salt and is consequently likely to require 1,700,000 tons of salt a year. At present the firm is carrying out feasibility surveys at

Exmouth, Western Australia, but South Australia is also in the salt market. It will be appreciated that Exmouth is 2,000 miles closer to Japan than is South Australia. However, the firm is extremely interested in the salt deposits at Port Paterson, near Port Augusta, and desires to obtain special leases to conduct a feasibility study in this area. Can the Minister say whether he has been approached by this company and, if he has, can he say what stage have negotiations reached?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The area referred to by the honourable member is at present reserved for the Crown, and anyone wishing to develop it can make a proposal to me, as Minister. Such a proposal will be looked at very carefully and a special mining lease can be issued. I will appreciate any firm proposal that comes for the development of this area or any other area in the State.

NURSES

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Considerable publicity has recently been given to the problem of back strain occurring in nurses when lifting heavy patients. It is not a new problem, but one that has been with us for many years. It has been found in some parts of the world that with proper training in the art or technique of lifting this problem can be reduced to more or less minimal proportions. Following the statement in the newspaper recently that nurses in South Australia are taught by "a physiotherapist" how to lift patients, may I ask the Minister if any consideration is being given to the many nurses (apart from those in Adelaide where "a physiotherapist" can work) who take up their training where no physiotherapists are available?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Considerable publicity was given in the *Advertiser* this morning to the seminar examining this question. From the point of view of the Public Health Department, this matter is engaging its attention, and I understand that the paper given at the seminar was presented by an officer from the Public Health Department. Two angles should be considered: first, training people in the correct way to lift so that the possibility of any injury occurring is minimized and, secondly, examining the need to provide lifting equipment in hospitals for

handling heavy patients. I assure the Hon. Mr. Springett that these matters are being examined and, where possible, training methods are being used to teach trainee nurses how to lift a patient correctly.

KULPARA SCHOOL

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question relating to the Kulpara schoolhouse?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have obtained a reply for the honourable member, which reads:

A survey has been undertaken of the proposed site for a new school residence at Kulpara. A detailed site plan is being prepared by the Public Buildings Department which will be forwarded together with a request for the erection of the residence to the South Australian Housing Trust within two to three weeks.

NATURAL GAS

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Last week I asked the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, a question relating to conversion to natural gas. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As the conversion of gas appliances in the metropolitan area for the use of natural gas is the responsibility of the South Australian Gas Company, I have obtained a report on the honourable member's question from the General Manager of that company. He reports that his company is co-operating closely with the gas utilities in Melbourne and Brisbane and that there is no doubt that the conversion operation in South Australia will be considerably assisted by the lessons to be learned from Melbourne and Brisbane.

Simulated natural gas conversions have already been carried out at Christies Beach and do not appear to have caused any serious difficulties. At Elizabeth when domestic appliances were converted for the use of simulated natural gas the number of callbacks for additional service represented only 10 per cent of the 2,350 consumers converted, which is considerably below the percentage of consumers who have required further service when conversion to natural gas was undertaken in the U.S.A. and Canada.

The actual conversion of domestic appliances will be undertaken by Stone and Webster Services Pty. Ltd., which company has had considerable experience in this work. Mr. Floyd Dunn, Job Supervisor for that company, has had 27 years' experience in natural gas conversions: he is assisted by a staff of American supervisors. The Gas

Company has also appointed a Gas Conversion Engineer to work in close co-operation with Stone and Webster Services Pty. Ltd., and a team of the Gas Company's service fitters will be specially trained as inspectors to check the efficiency of the Stone and Webster conversion crews. The General Manager of the Gas Company concluded his report as follows:

As a public utility, we fully recognize our obligation to the community but we hope our consumers will show a degree of patience and tolerance during the 12 months' conversion period. The long-term benefits of natural gas to South Australia will, we hope, be sufficient recompense. Our study of the problems of natural gas conversion in America indicated they had many teething problems but the natural gas industry is now the sixth largest industry in the United States and the American housewife has complete confidence in gas. There is plenty of documented evidence available indicating that natural gas is a safe fuel, comparing more than favourably with any other form of energy. We are fully aware of natural gas conversion problems and will do our utmost to minimize inconvenience to gas consumers.

KIMBA-POLDA MAIN

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: On June 17 I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, regarding the Kimba-Polda main. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: At the time of the investigation into the proposed water supply for the Kimba area in 1965, the Public Works Standing Committee took evidence at Kimba from the following witnesses:

- H. R. Hogan, Farmer, Kimba, representing the Stockowners' Association of South Australia.
- H. K. Mayfield, Farmer, Kimba, representing the S.A. Wheat and Woolgrowers Association.
- C. J. Rayson, Farmer, Kimba.
- I. B. Rayson, Farmer, Kimba.
- A. E. Schaefer, Farmer, Kimba.
- G. J. Burton, Farmer, Monument.
- A. H. Greenfield, Farmer, Kielpa.

All of these witnesses were strongly in favour of the proposed scheme, pointing out that there were no useful supplies of underground water in the area and good holding ground for dams was difficult to find in many parts of the district. As far as is known, there were no objections raised to the payment of rates at that time, and the only comments made by abutting landholders to the Regional Engineer since that time have been questions on when work on the scheme was going to commence. A canvass of abutting landholders has not been made, but such a canvass is being considered in connection with the work of

preparation of a submission to the Commonwealth Government for the making of a grant to the State toward the cost of a comprehensive Lock-Kimba scheme comprising the work already approved together with some additional branch mains.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: In view of the reply obtained from the Minister of Works through the Minister of Agriculture regarding the opposition to the rating for the Keith to Tailm Bend main and of the absolute necessity for expediting the Kimba-Polda main, can the Minister representing the Minister of Works say whether it would be possible to transfer some of the \$6,000,000 Commonwealth grant to the Kimba-Polda main?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will make the necessary inquiries for the honourable member.

MAIN ROAD No. 410

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question concerns the road known as Heaslip Road, main road No. 410, which intersects the main road from Salisbury to Waterloo Corner. As all honourable members will know, this road was closed at this intersection some four years ago following some regrettable fatalities there. A few months after the road was closed the Hon. Mr. Bevan (the then Minister) was good enough to show me a plan that the Highways Department had to reconstruct the corner to allow the flow of traffic to continue in safety. Since then we have had a scheme for a roundabout put up by the Salisbury council, and presumably some variation of the plan which the Hon. Mr. Bevan was good enough to show me at that time, but no further action.

Travel through that area now requires two short right-angle turns, which are practically impossible for the driver of a semi-trailer to negotiate unless he gets on the wrong side of the road and creates danger in that way. Can the Minister say whether this apparent impasse between the Highways Department and the Salisbury council can be resolved satisfactorily? I do not think anyone would seriously ask for the road to be opened in its present state, but surely the Highways Department and the Salisbury council can come to an agreement for the reconstruction of that intersection so that it can be negotiated with safety.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will find out the latest information concerning the negotiations that have been taking place over a considerable period of time between the Highways Department and the Salisbury council. I think it was actually nearer three years ago than four years that this closing occurred. To my knowledge, a great deal of harm to traffic does not exist by the present arrangement.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It has stopped the accidents, hasn't it?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It has stopped accidents. Regarding the traffic use of the corner, I think traffic is managing quite well with the present arrangement. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Dawkins that some final decision has to be made about the whole matter, and I will see what I can do to expedite that decision.

DRAINAGE RATES

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Agriculture yet received a reply from the Minister of Irrigation concerning drainage rates in the South-East?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My colleague, the Minister of Irrigation, advises me that he is not in a position to indicate the outcome of this matter at this stage. At the present time an inter-departmental committee is examining the situation and is also having discussions with representatives of landholders affected.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Marine and Harbors Department Building,
Port Adelaide,
Tailem Bend to Keith Trunk Water Main
and Associated Works.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1)

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Before dealing with the details of this Bill, which appropriates a further \$1,235,000 for 1968-69, I believe it would be useful for me to give honourable members a brief summary of the present state of Revenue Account and the probable results for 1968-69.

On September 5, 1968, against the background of accumulated deficits totalling \$8,365,000, the Government presented the 1968-69 Revenue Budget, which proposed a nominal surplus of \$21,000 for this year. However, as then indicated, it was known that new wages and salaries awards were bound to become effective during the year, and in fact two major determinations—in a national wage case and in the matter of a teachers award—were then pending. Accordingly, the realistic forecast was for a significant deficit unless the Commonwealth Government could be prevailed upon to make additional grants available or there should be some quite unexpected lift in State finances.

There have been several variations from the original estimates for individual items of receipts and payments, but overall the prospects are now for a result quite close to a balance. Briefly, the adverse impacts of additional wage and salary awards amounting in all to about \$4,000,000, and of losses in revenues of about \$1,000,000 due to late implementation of new taxes and charges, together with other net short-falls of revenues of perhaps \$750,000, seem likely to be offset by new and adjusted Commonwealth grants of \$4,500,000 or thereabouts, and by net savings in expenditures of about \$1,250,000. Honourable members would probably find it of interest if I were to give a few more details of the variations.

The major improvement has been in Commonwealth grants. In the first place, the factors used in the calculation of the annual taxation reimbursement grant have increased more than originally estimated. The increases in the State's population in the year to December 31, 1968, and in the level of average wages throughout Australia in the year to March 31, 1969, have both shown improvements greater than taken into account originally, and as a result the principal grant seems likely to be increased by rather more than \$1,000,000. Secondly, the Commonwealth Government at a conference in March, 1969, became convinced of the seriousness of State problems in meeting major wage awards and other current Budget problems, and agreed to make available an additional grant of \$12,000,000, to be shared among the States.

South Australia's share of that total is about \$1,350,000. In the third place, South Australia had lodged a detailed submission for further grants to assist in overcoming its long-term and intractable Revenue Budget problem.

The Commonwealth, on being satisfied that the State was doing all that could reasonably be expected to help itself by exercising economy and by taxation measures, recently approved a special grant of \$2,000,000. The likely favourable effect of the three variations this year is about \$4,500,000. The Government is grateful to the Commonwealth for the extra assistance, even though it is less than it sought and expected, but our long-term problems require much more than assistance in only one year and, at the forthcoming annual meeting with the Prime Minister, the Premier intends to make quite clear the need to have this special grant carried into 1969-70 and subsequently incorporated into the principal grant.

The receipts from State taxation will clearly be below estimate. In general, the implementation of new and extended charges was about one month behind original planning, and collections have accordingly been less than earlier estimated. On the volume and value of normal business, it appears that a small decline in stamp duties is likely to be offset by a small improvement in succession duties receipts.

The receipts of all the business undertakings are expected to fall below estimate. For the railway undertaking the loss of revenue is expected to be between \$400,000 and \$500,000, owing to the movement of last season's good grain harvest being slower than originally estimated. This factor also appears to be having some effect on the receipts of the harbour services, but to a lesser extent. The revenues from water and sewer rates are now expected to fall some \$400,000 below the first forecast owing to reduced usage of water and, consequently, billing for excess not reaching the levels earlier thought likely. For the forestry undertaking, the original estimate was made in the hope that the decline in sales of forest produce would be overcome quickly and that surpluses would become available for transfer to revenue upon as favourable a basis as in earlier years. The recovery is occurring more slowly than hoped and receipts are, accordingly, below estimate. Among other variations the major one is a probable fall below estimate in receipts of the Hospitals Department, owing largely to new and increased fees being brought into effect later than planned.

For payments, the present indication is that the total will be about \$2,750,000 in excess of the appropriations approved by Parliament. As the cost of various awards that came into effect

after the framing of the Budget is calculated at a figure approaching \$4,000,000, it can be seen that there are economies and savings of about \$1,250,000 in aggregate for all departments. The major excesses in expenditure that will eventually appear in the published accounts will be about \$1,400,000 for the Education Department and about \$650,000 for the Railways Department. The fact that the expenditures will exceed appropriation for these two departments is due entirely to the cost of major awards. The same reason will apply to a number of smaller excesses.

In fact, because of the very careful control of expenditures during the year, the necessity for additional funds for normal departmental purposes (other than for salary and wage awards) will be limited virtually to the Public Buildings Department and the Social Welfare Department. This careful control will produce savings in some departments sufficient to more than offset the higher wage and salary costs in those departments. I will comment on some of these matters in a little more detail when dealing with the items covered by the Bill.

Summarizing the position, it appears that, after taking account of the individual variations in receipts and payments, this year's Revenue Budget result will be close to a balance. However, as was pointed out last year, small variations in timing of receipts and payments at the end of a year, even over a few days, can affect the final result by several hundred thousand dollars. In an annual Budget of almost \$300,000,000, receipts and payments are each averaging well over \$1,000,000 a working day.

If the appropriations approved by Parliament in the principal Appropriation Act early in a financial year are not sufficient in any particular category to cover the Government's actual commitments during that year, it is then necessary for the Government to call on other sources of appropriation authority. There are three such sources, namely, a special section of the main Appropriation Act, the Governor's Appropriation Fund, and a supplementary Appropriation Bill.

In the main Appropriation Act is a special section (section 3 (2) and (3)) which gives additional appropriation to meet increased costs due to awards of wage-fixing bodies and to meet any unexpected upward movement in the costs of pumping water through the two major mains. This special authority is being called upon this year to cover the larger

part of the costs of the two major awards, that is, the total wage determination for departments generally and the teachers award affecting only the Education Department, and also to cover a number of other salary and wage determinations, though it has been possible to meet some portion of the new award costs out of the original appropriations. It has not been necessary this year to call upon the special authority to cover excess costs of water pumping.

Another source of appropriation authority is the Governor's Appropriation Fund, which, in terms of the Public Finance Act, may cover the expenditure of up to \$1,200,000 in addition to that otherwise authorized. Of the \$1,200,000, up to \$400,000 is available, if required, for new purposes—that is, for purposes not previously authorized either by inclusion in the Estimates or by other specific legislation. The appropriation in the fund is being used this year to cover some smaller excesses above departmental provisions and the costs of a number of new purposes, but it is not sufficient to provide for all the expected claims for additional appropriation. The Government has therefore decided to put before the Council a supplementary Appropriation Bill to cover the excess expenditures of five of the larger departments and sections and to relieve the fund accordingly. The proposals are for additional appropriation totalling \$1,235,000, as follows:

	\$
Chief Secretary and Minister of Health—Miscellaneous	275,000
Public Buildings Department	350,000
Education Department	250,000
Minister of Education—Miscellaneous	250,000
Social Welfare Department	110,000
	<u>\$1,235,000</u>

The details of the appropriations listed in the Bill are as follows:

Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, Miscellaneous—It was originally proposed that the Whyalla Hospital would become a Government hospital as from October, 1968. Accordingly, provision was made for a continuation of grants in the normal way for the early part of the year only and for payments thereafter to be met from appropriations under the Hospitals Department. It took longer than first expected to resolve all the matters connected with vesting in the Government, and the transfer is now set down for July 1 next. Therefore, it has been necessary to continue grants for the full year, and additional

appropriation of \$275,000 is required. The appropriation originally included under the Hospitals Department for the Whyalla Hospital will not be used but, as honourable members know, it is not possible to transfer appropriation authority from one section to another.

Public Buildings Department—For the Public Buildings Department the original appropriation was \$7,411,000. The additional cost of salary and wage awards this year has been about \$170,000, but fortunately the original allotments for these particular wage and salary purposes have been adequate to cover the further costs. However, extra funds have been found necessary to meet unavoidable commitments in the maintenance, repair and servicing of various Government buildings, principally education, police and courthouse buildings. To cover these increases it has been necessary to provide for a further \$350,000 in the Bill.

Education Department—The original appropriation for the Education Department was \$53,267,000. The additional cost of the teachers award and the total wage determination is estimated to be about \$1,450,000, and it is probable that the department's total excess above original provision for all purposes will be contained within that sum. However, whilst it has been possible to meet all salaries and wages without calling upon the full supplement available consequent upon the effect of award increases, it has been necessary during the year to make somewhat greater provision than originally set down for materials and services for primary, secondary and teacher education. The authority of special section 3 (2) of the Appropriation Act does not extend to cover the increased expenditures on contingency lines and therefore it is necessary to include provision of \$250,000 in the Bill.

Minister of Education, Miscellaneous—The payment of Commonwealth grants to the States for recurrent purposes of universities is linked to the payment of State grants and the collection of fees. Each \$1.85 of fees and State grants attracts \$1 of Commonwealth grants up to specified limits. For some years the policy in this State has been to approve annual budgets of the universities at levels that will attract the maximum Commonwealth grants available. It has also been the practice to pay recurrent grants by monthly instalments fairly evenly over the course of the academic year. Any variation in receipts from fees, either up or down from estimate, is normally matched by a compensating adjustment in State grants.

The fees actually received by the University of Adelaide in 1968, and likely to be received in 1969, are below the levels estimated when the State's 1968-69 Budget was prepared. To take account of this factor and to give an even distribution of grants, it is now desirable to provide a further \$90,000 for the Adelaide University.

The procedures now evolving under the newer Commonwealth-State arrangements for colleges of advanced education are similar in many respects to those for universities. In particular, the Government has had regard to the extent of Commonwealth financial assistance when determining the level to which it will support the annual budgets of the colleges. The assessed needs of the South Australian Institute of Technology for 1969 are greater than appeared likely when the State's 1968-69 Budget was presented, and now it is desirable to advance a further \$160,000 to the institute to give an even distribution of funds in 1969. The Commonwealth Government intends to amend its legislation to provide for higher grants to match increased State contributions on account of the institute, but it may be several months yet before the funds are received from the Commonwealth.

Social Welfare Department—For the Social Welfare Department the original appropriation was \$3,250,000. The additional cost of salary and wage awards this year will be about \$50,000, but it will be possible to cover this further cost within the original appropriations for salaries and wages. However, extra funds will be required to meet necessary costs of running the department's homes and for payment of public relief. To meet these additional commitments on the various contingency lines the Bill now includes provisions totalling \$110,000.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further \$1,235,000 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum and sets out the amount to be provided under each department or activity. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made.

Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds or bank overdraft, if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet

the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to July 1, 1968. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. Except for the amount of appropriation sought and the period covered, this Bill is the same in all respects as the supplementary Appropriation Bills passed by Parliament in recent years. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Appropriation Bill as presented for the year ending June 30, 1969, and I understand the necessity for its presentation. In the short time at my disposal, I have examined the reasons given for the necessary additional expenditure. I sympathize with the Chief Secretary when, as Minister of Health, he said that the proposal to take over the Whyalla Hospital as a State organization as from the end of last year had to be deferred because of the difficulty of arranging such a takeover of a large hospital of this kind. The cost of maintenance of that hospital would have been paid from revenue in any case, but now, because of the time of takeover, it is necessary to obtain special approval in order to make necessary funds available. It is a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and the amount of \$350,000 is involved. I will wait with interest to see whether the figures as finally produced are the same as those considered necessary, because I have a vivid recollection of the Public Buildings Department not spending, in various departments, anywhere near the amount of money made available last year. I hope that a similar position will not arise this year.

In his second reading speech, the Chief Secretary mentioned a matter that is of great interest to me, and here I refer to water supplies. I hope the people in this State realize the importance of water and the part it plays in affecting the welfare of the people and the economy of the State. Having been in office during two years of drought I know the difficulties associated with such a calamity. I hope the present Government realizes the important part played by water in the improvement of the State finances and the economy generally.

The Chief Secretary said that revenue from water and sewerage rates is now expected to fall about \$400,000 below the original forecast due to reduced usage of water with the

resultant decrease in rates for excess water. The point I make is that although revenue is down by that amount of \$400,000 because of the reduced demand for water, the Government will, in effect, save some hundreds of thousands of dollars in not having as much water from the Murray. It is all very well people saying that the improvement of the economy of the State has been achieved through industry. In my opinion that is far from the truth. The real reason for the improvement in our economy, the kernel of the matter as it were, is that we should praise the Lord for sending us rain. That, I believe, represents 90 per cent of any success in that direction. Nothing can be done without water, and it does not matter which Party is in Government; if the tide is against you, you are in trouble. I hope honourable members and the public in general realize this, because I have lived long enough and made such a study of water that I know if we have not got water we cannot succeed.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And the honourable member cannot drink it!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: No, I do not drink it at any time. I would not drink one glass of water a year. While speaking of water, I would direct the attention of the Ministers to the following matter. The Engineering and Water Supply Department now arranges for people, if they so desire, to pay water rates 12 months in advance instead of collecting those rates quarter by quarter. It may be that on the completion of payment for 12 months an account for excess water is forwarded for an amount used in a given period. In a case I have in mind a cheque was sent immediately to cover the account, but within a week the person concerned received a note asking that the amount be paid by such and such a date. The Government should examine this matter. People do not like having demands made on them to pay an account for water that has already been paid.

I raised this matter with the Engineering and Water Supply Department because I was not happy with the situation. I realize that computers do the work in that department, and possibly the quarterly payments overlap. I am no authority on running an office, but if a certain district is due for accounts for excess water to be sent out, and accounts for the quarterly payments are due to be sent out, surely it would not be a hardship for the department to send both accounts together. The instance I mentioned happened in the northern area, and I believe it happened to

more than one person. I suggest that this matter be taken up by the Chief Secretary or the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

In the instance I mentioned, when I rang the department I was told that the account had not been paid, although I happened to know that such was not the case. I suppose one payment overlapped the other, but that is not good bookkeeping. The customer is always right but when he is over-right he does not like the department telling him he is wrong.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Perhaps the department is waiting for the cheque to be cleared?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The cheque I mentioned is quite all right. The remaining matters mentioned in the Bill follow the usual procedures, and it appears that the bulk of the worry in extra costs is associated with wages. I raise no objection to the Bill being passed, and I hope it will go through without a great deal of delay and that members will not be kept here after dinner tonight.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I rise to support the passing of this Bill. It is the usual procedure that towards the end of the financial year the Supplementary Estimates have to be brought forward because, as the Chief Secretary said in his second reading speech, even though the Treasury may be buoyant it is not possible to transfer an appropriation authority from one section to another, even within the one department. I believe the Bill shows the prudent management of State finances throughout the past year, and I think all members in this place, and perhaps the taxpayers outside, will be pleased to hear from the Chief Secretary that the Budget will be approximately balanced at the end of this financial year. State finances are a problem; they concern many people, and to hear a prediction of a balanced Budget is good news indeed. The Chief Secretary has given a clear indication of the requirements of the departments mentioned and of the financial position of the State.

The PRESIDENT: Order! As one hour has elapsed since the meeting of the Council the Orders of the Day must be called on.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary) moved:

That Orders of the Day be postponed and taken into consideration after Appropriation Bill (No. 1) has been disposed of.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I wish to comment on the line "Minister of Education, Miscellaneous" and refer to the position of Commonwealth grants in relation to the University of Adelaide and the actual passage in the Chief Secretary's speech as follows:

The fees actually received by the University of Adelaide in 1968 and likely to be received in 1969 are below the levels estimated when the State's 1968-69 Budget was prepared. To take account of this factor and to give an even distribution of grants, it is now desirable to provide a further \$90,000 for the University of Adelaide.

As I said earlier, I believe that the Chief Secretary has given a precise and accurate description of the reasons for these appropriations, but on this one point I would be interested to know why the fees have fallen below the estimate, in view of the quota system that now applies in the university and the fact that the accommodation there is fully taxed. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from June 19. Page 110.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor (Sir James Harrison) on the opening of Parliament. At the outset I want to congratulate Sir James on his appointment as Her Majesty's representative in this State, and in particular on the way he read his Speech at the opening of Parliament; it was read with very great care and with very great clarity, and we all followed it easily. I think it was a little unfortunate that we should have included in the Speech a reference to the town of Kybybolite. I believe that any new Governor should be excused from the necessity to pronounce a word like that in his maiden Speech. However, I sincerely congratulate His Excellency on his excellent performance, and also on the effective way in which he is carrying out his duties.

I congratulate Sir Louis King on the knighthood conferred upon him in the Birthday Honours list. I think it was a very popular award, and I sincerely hope that he and Lady King will live long to enjoy it. I also congratulate Mr. Kearnan, Mr. Acting Justice Zelling and Mr. Reg. Sowden on the honours that were conferred upon them, all of which I heartily endorse.

On another note, I very much regret that the Hon. Mr. Wilson, who was a member of this Council for many years, should have passed away. I always regarded him as a personal friend. I thought he carried out his duties as a member of this Council in a very painstaking fashion, and he undoubtedly had the support of a very large number of electors. I personally very much and very sincerely regret his passing. Likewise, I should like to mention Senator Laught, who was not a member of this Parliament but was a South Australian Senator for many years. Senator Laught worked very keenly in the interests of South Australia, and I regret his passing, likewise that of Mr. White who was the member for Murray in another House for a short term. I regret that these people that one knew so well are not with us any longer.

I was glad to gather from His Excellency's Speech that there is an upturn in industrial activity in South Australia and that the economy is in a better position now than it was some time ago. It is very gratifying to me to know that in the first nine months of the 1968-69 year 9,774 assisted migrants came to this State as against 6,743 in the previous year. I believe that an increase in population is one of the ways in which we can develop this State, for every person who comes here requires all the things that are needed to live in a modern society. That person earns some money and he increases the volume of turnover in the community, therefore this resurgence of migrants coming to South Australia is very gratifying to me.

In that regard, I was very grateful that the Premier, as Minister of Industrial Development, took a trip overseas to investigate for himself the possibility of attracting new enterprises to South Australia. Already we have seen some results of his trip, and I believe that these will become more apparent as time goes on. I think that this kind of promotion overseas is to be desired, for there is nothing like personal contact to impress people with what this State has to offer. I look forward to developments from that trip.

While on the question of finances, I must congratulate the Treasurer on the prospect of a Budget which is balanced or which will almost be balanced. I believe that one of the disabilities under which South Australia laboured during the regime of the previous Government was that our State finances were not in order and that people did not have confidence in our ability to run our State

correctly. While that was the situation, they were hesitant about investing further money in this State.

The situation today is that the finances of the State Treasury are in order and increasing confidence is developing in the economic community. I believe that, given a continuance of the good management of State finances that we have had in the last 12 months, confidence in the Government and in our ability to manage our own affairs will grow, which will benefit the industrial development of the State. Everybody in the community is aware that to achieve this financial stability the present Government has, of necessity, to impose various kinds of taxation, which are in my opinion undesirable and certainly unpopular. However, with the present relationship between the State and Commonwealth Governments, I cannot see that there is any alternative.

I have said on the public platform, and I repeat here, that I still believe that the States are entitled to more consideration than they have been receiving from the Commonwealth Government. If we are to maintain our Federal system, with the State Governments performing their proper function and the Commonwealth Government performing its proper function, then the financial arrangements between the States and the Commonwealth must be worked out on a more satisfactory basis. That means that there must be more financial assistance from the Commonwealth to the various States.

This is to be preferred to forcing the States into unsatisfactory and unpopular methods of raising money. In my opinion, it will be necessary for us to look at the Gift Duty Act, which we passed last year, because that new Act contains certain features that require modification, even if I do not use a stronger word. I hope the Council will be given the opportunity to correct some statements that were made when we implemented the legislation last year. I also think there are some aspects of the receipts duty legislation that need to be considered, but I do not propose to go into them now except to say that we do realize that certain problems have arisen in connection with these matters and I think in due course it will be our responsibility to see that we do something about them.

While economic and industrial development has been improving, there is still apprehension amongst the primary producing section of the community about their future. They have been faced with great problems, with which I shall

deal directly. While they are finding that the income is contracting, they are reading in the papers every day of increased wages and salaries being paid to people in the industrial sector, which has caused some unrest and discontent among them. To illustrate what I mean, the other day I looked at the figures of net returns to barleygrowers for the barley sold by them over the last two years. For first-grade bulk barley, the net return to the grower for 1967-68 will be about \$1.25 a bushel. The net return for the 1968-69 season has not yet been finalized, but I am led to believe it will be about \$1.03 a bushel, which means that in those two years the return to the barleygrower for his top grade barley has been reduced by 22c a bushel, which is a reduction of 20 per cent in his income. That 20 per cent comes out of what will be his profit because, as far as the farmer is concerned, it costs him nearly as much to grow a 20-bushel crop as it does to grow a 50-bushel crop, the fertilizer costs being the same; so his profit has come down in the case of barley by about 20 per cent. That does not make him feel very happy, especially when he appreciates what has happened in the other sectors of the community.

On the other hand, I do not think that from the primary producer's point of view the picture is all on the negative side. From some figures produced to me recently, I formed the opinion that the farm income for the fiscal year 1969-70 in Australia should be equal to, or better than, that of the average of the last six years. To give some figures in support of this, I want to deal with wheat, which is a problem in every farmer's mind at present, particularly with regard to the matters associated with the quota system. For Australia it is proposed that the quota for 1969-70 be 344,000,000 bushels, compared with an average production over the last six years of 373,000,000 bushels. So, if we take the last three years—

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is 357,000,000, not 344,000,000.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am sorry; I said 344,000,000 when apparently it should have been 357,000,000. If it is 357,000,000, so much the better. If the average production over the last six years has been about 373,000,000 and the quota for this year is to be 357,000,000 it will mean that the difference between the average for the last six years and what is proposed to be allowed this year is almost negligible; but we do not realize the big crop we had last year.

For 1963-64, the total Australian production was 327,912,000 bushels; in 1964-65 it was 368,789,000; in 1965-66 it was 259,666,000; in 1966-67 it was 466,610,000; in 1967-68 it was 277,289,000; and last year it went up to the unprecedented figure of 539,645,000 bushels.

The biggest increases have occurred in New South Wales and Western Australia. I do not want to go through the figures for each year, but in New South Wales in 1963-64 the production was 122,000,000 bushels (taking it to the nearest million); in 1965-66 it went down to 39,000,000 bushels, but in 1968-69 it went up to 210,000,000 bushels. So the New South Wales production went up from 122,000,000 bushels in 1963-64 to 210,000,000 bushels in 1968-69. In Western Australia, production in 1963-64 was 52,000,000 bushels; by 1968-69 it had gone up to 112,000,000 bushels. So that the increased production has occurred mainly in New South Wales and Western Australia. It may be interesting to place on record the South Australian figures.

In 1963-64 our production was 53,971,000 bushels; in 1964-65 it was 52,817,000 bushels; in 1965-66 it was 39,976,000 bushels; in 1966-67 it was 53,816,000 bushels; in 1967-68 it was 26,899,000 bushels; and in 1968-69 it reached the colossal figure of 84,600,000 bushels. In forming an opinion about what the position of the primary producer will be, we must consider the excessive quantity of wheat that was produced in Australia, but more particularly in South Australia, last year. When this matter is ironed out, the difficulties that confront the industry as a whole will not be as serious as we first think.

I realize there are problems in respect of individual farmers. The man who lives in an area where there have been two years of drought, the man who has bought a new property that has not had a very high quota but is in a very good wheatgrowing area, and the man who for some other reason has not a fair quota—these men will experience problems. I do, however, know (and I think everyone knows) that measures are being implemented by the establishment of the Wheat Quota Committee to look into these problems. Whilst I realize there will be problems, I think they will be ironed out.

I should like to mention not only the figures for wheat production but also those for the acres sown to wheat. Here again, in New South Wales and Western Australia the picture shows what has happened. In 1963-64 a total

of 4,964,000 acres was sown in New South Wales, whilst in 1968-69 the area was 10,000,000 acres, an increase of more than 100 per cent. In Western Australia the acreage increased from 4,640,000 in 1963-64 to 7,200,000 in 1968-69; whereas the South Australian acreage sown to wheat did not change very much between 1963-64 and 1967-68. In 1963-64 it was 2,802,000 acres and in 1967-68 it was 2,864,000 acres. Last year, however, it did increase by about 900,000 acres to 3,775,000 acres. So, whilst there will be problems from the individual's viewpoint, industry-wise we will still be able to grow just about what was produced, on the average, over the last five years.

Turning to the question of wool, I think the position is that the price of wool is about 10 per cent higher at this time this year than at this time last year and, as far as I can see, the price appears to be reasonably stable. The latest figures I have been able to obtain show that the 1968-69 wool clip will return in Australia between \$76,000,000 and \$80,000,000 in excess of that for 1967-68. My authority for this statement is an article in the *Advertiser* of June 18.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: That represents many more bales of wool.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, but I am not talking about the prices right now: I am talking about the return—the amount we are earning. Notwithstanding the tremendous development that has occurred in secondary industry in South Australia, the truth is that more than half of our export earning capacity is still earned by the rural industries and the primary-producing industries of Australia. As I understand it, our ability to maintain the standard of living we enjoy in South Australia is linked directly to our ability to earn export income and to buy the things we need from oversea countries to maintain our standards.

I think it behoves us as a Government and it behoves all concerned with Government to realize that the primary sector of the community is still the sector that is earning the largest part of our export income. Therefore, we must look after it and be sensitive to the problems in front of it, not only in the interests of the primary producer but in the interests of the whole community. I have dealt with these matters at some length and given these figures because I do not think they are generally understood by all sections of the community. When we do understand them I think we will have a little more regard for the problems facing primary producers at present.

I should like to make one or two points about the difficulties being experienced with regard to the sale of our wheat overseas, because our quota problem directly arises from the fact that we are unable to sell overseas the quantity of wheat that we produce in Australia. While preparing these remarks I had the benefit of reading the transcript of an address given by Mr. Ken McDougall, President of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation and a member of the Australian Wheat Board, at the conference of the Tractor, Farm Machinery and Construction Equipment Association of Australia in Perth on May 20. He said:

In the first place I would just like to touch on the International Grains Arrangement. What is the International Grains Arrangement? It is a formation of exporting countries together with importing countries that have come together and tried to stabilize as far as possible the world wheat industries. We have five main exporters that are connected with, and are members of, the International Grains Arrangement—the United States of America, Canada, France, Argentine and Australia. At the moment there are two countries not members of the International Grains Arrangement—Russia and China.

China has never been a member of the International Wheat Agreement or the International Grains Arrangement, but Russia previously under the old International Wheat Agreement was a member and I think that in the end Russia will probably come back. Now this organization joins together and they agree on a minimum and maximum price at which wheat can be bought and sold, and the arrangement of creating that minimum varies from country to country . . . The maximum price, by the way, is 40 cents above the minimum and we haven't had to worry very much about that one yet but we are looking forward to the time.

We cannot sell to a country—any exporter that is a member of the International Grains Arrangement cannot sell to any country, whether they be a signatory to the International Grains Arrangement or not, at below the minimum. We must maintain that price and our Government is most insistent and has been right up to date that we do not offer (let alone sell) to anybody below the minimum. That is very briefly the position with regard to the International Grains Arrangement.

So, the question of the prices that can be obtained for the sale of wheat overseas is tied up with this International Grains Arrangement. It is logical that, if we break away from this arrangement, there can be only chaos for the industry. Some critics should realize the advantage that it is to us to maintain this arrangement. Mr. McDougall went on to say:

Then you get on to the question: "What is Australia doing with regard to selling Australian wheat—how is it done?" Well,

most of our wheat, a big percentage of our wheat, is sold through the traders to the various destinations; in some cases, such as the China contract, the wheat is sold direct from the Wheat Board to the direct Government concerned but the majority of our wheat is still sold by the traders. Now, you might ask why we maintain that principle. Well, the main reason is that it would be quite impossible for the Australian Wheat Board to have an organization big enough so that it could follow into all destinations of Australian wheat a staff big enough to do the final trading and we find it cheaper and better in most cases to still maintain the grain trading houses to handle the grain. They do it on a percentage and they buy from the Australian Wheat Board and they sell to their buyers whatever the destination may be.

What are we doing about markets? We on the Australian Wheat Board are very similar, we have delegations, numerous delegations selling missions overseas—we have numerous men going and numerous delegations coming to Australia which get no publicity at all, because we feel that if we gave them publicity it would only encourage our competitors to get in on the market so it is only occasionally that you hear of a delegation going overseas.

In London we have got our Australian Wheat Committee, a representative from there looks after pretty well the whole of the European markets and quite a percentage, particularly the North African markets and also the Middle East countries are all serviced from our Wheat Committee in London. In the Asiatic area we have got an office in Tokyo; our representative there visits all the markets in these areas at least twice a year and more often if necessary. Then you get closer to home, we have got a Singapore, Malaysia, India, Pakistan and Philippines representative—those markets will be serviced from one of our Board representatives, our Export Sales Manager from the Australian Wheat Board will call on these markets at least twice a year—so we keep in pretty close touch. When you get into South America, where we are selling quite a lot of wheat, we have delegations going over usually twice a year, sometimes more often if necessary to watch that market and we are very closely associated with a number of the trading houses, particularly Continental Grain, who do most of the work in South America so that market is fairly closely watched. When it comes to New Zealand, strangely enough we haven't sold a bushel of wheat to New Zealand this year. New Zealand is an exporter at the moment—first time ever.

I would like to place that on record in *Hansard* because I hear from a number of farmers at a number of meetings the question: "Why doesn't the Wheat Board really try to do something about selling our wheat?" I think the answer is that the Wheat Board is doing all it can consistent with its responsibility under the International Grain Arrangement. That arrangement must be maintained, and from the extract that I have read from the

address of Mr. Ken McDougall, President of the Australian Wheatgrowers' Federation, in a speech covering more or less all parts of the world, we see that the board is actively trying to promote sales within the terms of the arrangement, and I know that this will be done.

The question of price is important; Mr. McDougall says, and I entirely agree with him, that he was disappointed that an attempt was made in the Commonwealth Parliament to get the Australian Wheat Board to disclose the price at which the contract with China was negotiated. I think it would have been most unfortunate if that price had been made public; it would merely have advertised to all our competitors the price we were obtaining for the wheat and would have made public all the information that should be kept within the ambit of the Australian Wheat Board, at least for the time being. I am pleased that that did not happen, that the gentlemen concerned were not called before the Bar of the Senate, and that this matter is being left where I think it should be left—in the hands of the Australian Wheat Board.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Does the threat still exist?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I am not sure of that, but when selling anything it is not good to tell competitors the price of your product. I think it was an unwise move to try to have the information disclosed. I understand that if the States and the Commonwealth agree to the implementation of the quota system limiting producers to a quota of 10 per cent below deliveries for last year (I am not certain whether the percentage has been fixed or whether that is still a matter of negotiation, but I understand it is in the vicinity of 10 per cent, and I hope it will not be more than that) then the Minister for Primary Industry, the Hon. Douglas Anthony, will give an undertaking that quota wheat will be paid for on a guaranteed first payment of \$1.10 a bushel for a maximum quantity of 357,000,000 bushels. On that basis, a farmer knows what his first advance will be, and knows the amount that he can sell within his quota. I understand that if a farmer produces beyond his quota it will be his responsibility to keep the remainder on his farm until there is room in the silo for it, and in the following year he will be allowed to deliver that excess, but it will be regarded as portion of his quota for the coming year.

We have not had to face problems of this kind with wheat for many years, and it is difficult to say how long such a problem will remain. In relation to world consumption of wheat, production in Australia is a relatively small percentage of the total, and an adverse wheat season in the Northern Hemisphere could alter the situation quickly. On the other hand, I think we are wise not to have adopted the attitude of Micawber in the maybe forlorn hope that something will turn up. I think in the circumstances what has been done is wise.

The only other matter I wish to mention is the M.A.T.S. proposal. I do not want to deal directly with this because I think we shall have an opportunity to speak on this subject later. However, I think we should concentrate on the most urgent needs as far as the M.A.T.S. plan is concerned. In some areas freeways are required, especially in the metropolitan area. If we can confine ourselves to the more urgent portions of the plan at this stage we shall perhaps avoid much of the criticism being levelled at present and it will be made clear exactly what is proposed.

Turning now to transportation costs, it seems as though the policy will be for road and rail transport to increase the size of the units used. I obtained figures the other day, which I believe to be correct, as to the cost of transport in the developing areas in Western Australia. On the road from Meekatharra to Port Hedland in Western Australia, with one way loading as at present, using what is called triple-bottom road units, carrying 65 tons dead weight, the rate charged is 44.4c a ton mile. That is a reduction of 33½ per cent on the freight rate charged where the size of the truck used carries only 21 tons.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Is that rail or road transport?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: It is road transport. In addition, air transport is being used for carrying some fairly heavy freight in Western Australia. With a Lockheed C1 30E Hercules aircraft carrying 20 tons, the charge is 20c a dead weight ton mile, whereas they have now imported and are using an L500 Galaxy aircraft, which takes 170 tons dead weight, and the price with that larger aircraft is only 6c a ton mile, representing a reduction of about 70 per cent in the cost of freight.

I have also seen figures for rail freight. It has been pointed out to me that with a train with an ore carrying capacity of 50,000 tons compared with one with an ore carrying capacity of 200 to 300 tons, the reduction in

cost is as much as 97 per cent. I understand that in America at present there are trains that carry up to 50,000 tons. This means, I think, that in our planning for railways and freeways and so on we have to face the situation that the tendency will be for the load carried to be increased fairly heavily, and this will mean, I presume, that the available area on our roads will be reduced.

Also, it appears to me that with the motor car the speed will tend to increase, and to this end I think the Minister was wise in arranging a demonstration the other day of what happens to trucks when travelling at certain speeds in relation to the application of the braking power of these vehicles. The faster the vehicle travels, obviously the better its braking system must be and obviously the better the road must be. I say this because I believe there is a very big relationship between the quality of the road on which one is travelling, the quality of the vehicle which one is driving, and the speed at which one is travelling. I think these things make it necessary that we look at the M.A.T.S. proposals and indeed the whole of our road programme throughout the State, and we must look at it in a very different light from what we may have done 15 or 20 years ago.

I am still at a loss to know why the manufacturers of motor cars are building vehicles capable of faster and faster speeds. The young and inexperienced driver behind the wheel of a high-powered motor car that is capable of speeds in excess of 100 miles an hour has a lethal weapon in his hands, and quite frequently he does not realize this.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The manufacturers take a pride in advertising the speeds vehicles are capable of attaining.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: If they take a pride in that, it is something of which I would not be very proud. The time one saves in getting from a place 100 miles away when travelling between 90 miles an hour and 100 miles an hour compared with 60 miles an hour or 70 miles an hour is completely negligible, and the risks involved in the increased speed are too great for us to contemplate.

I consider that the time has come when perhaps we need to show more consideration to the maximum effective speed at which people are allowed to drive on our roads. Although I speak without actual knowledge on this matter, I think it is still true to say that far

too many of our accidents are occurring on perfectly straight roads, when the visibility is good and when there is no real reason why an accident should occur. The only reason is that, because of the good condition of the road and the ability of the vehicle to maintain a high speed, the vehicle is driven at a speed in excess of what is safe, even in these very good circumstances.

I have dealt generally with the economy, which is on the upgrade, and the work being done in industrial promotion. I have also dealt with the situation in which the primary producer finds himself because he is in one sector of the community that is not enjoying booming conditions at the moment, and I would like him to understand that as his representative in Parliament I and the Government are aware of his problems and that we will do what we can to assist him.

Finally, I have said something about the wheat situation and about what is being done in regard to the sale of the wheat, and in that regard the proposals relating to transport and the problems associated with it. I have pleasure in supporting the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): In supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's opening Speech, I wish to support the welcome and the congratulations of preceding speakers to His Excellency and Lady Harrison. I wish them a happy and rewarding time of office in South Australia. I join in the condolences extended to members of the families of those who have served in the State and Commonwealth Parliaments and have passed on in the recess, with particular recognition of the debt in which we stand for the work they have done. I cannot but make special mention of Senator Laught and the Hon. Bob Wilson, whom we came to know so well, to respect and to appreciate their true worth and integrity.

There is no member in this Chamber who has not come in contact with farming families who, despite forethought and provision, are losing their farms through having to sell to meet the taxes levied when the owner dies. It has always been a problem, but recently it appears to have snowballed and it now appears to be a very serious problem indeed, leading to families that have farmed for many years, in some instances from first settlement, leaving the agricultural industry. This is a very serious problem.

I have made some study of agriculture, and I know that undoubtedly the only really successful system of farming is that which we have in Australia in which the farmer-owner individually works and manages his own farm. Whenever this system vanishes not only is there a great diminution in the efficiency of farming and the productivity of the land but farming seems to lose its flexibility and ability to meet unfavourable seasons and markets. It takes on a boom and bust character, which soon calls for all sorts of artificial props and aids in market schemes, subsidy and what have you.

Also, there follow profound social changes, and these can be just as serious in an economy like that of the United States of America, where big business has entered farming, as in an economy where political change has taken the owner-manager off the land. We do not want to see these changes in South Australia. However, they are being forced upon us by succession duty and now gift duty, levied regardless of the ability of the business to pay these and now levied on the market value of land.

It is claimed by valuers that no other valuation can be made stable enough to be equitable. In South Australia, however, we have reached a stage where there is a scarcity value on land. The Commonwealth income tax law, also, by allowing the write-off of profit made elsewhere against development and improvement cost, has brought another strong force to bear in forcing values upward.

When the last assessment was made some years ago after a series of good years, capital returns on good farms were found to be a maximum of 2½ per cent, on average farms 1 per cent or less, and a very large proportion of our farmlands was giving no measurable capital return at all. This is a terribly dangerous situation, and it is now even more dangerous. There have been bad years since that time, and the profitability of farming on all sides has declined. These farming families being forced off the land today can meet taxation, based on book values of their land, only by selling out.

But these are not just rich people who are being taxed: agriculture is an industry, our largest and by far our most important industry, and an industry which works properly only when the owner works, cares for and husband the resources of the land.

Why must its owners be taxed out of existence because of this peculiarity of ownership and efficiency working together? No other industry is so taxed; other industries have been, and the result is that the private owner-manager has disappeared materially from manufacturing and the distributive and service industries, most of these now being in the hands of public companies. Ownership in the great majority is based on shareholding.

The value of shares for succession and gift duty purposes is based on the current earnings of the business. Just what would be the share values of any of these businesses if every 15 years—the average period, we are told, between changes of management in farming—the land, buildings, stock, plant and every tool and bit of equipment were valued and a 27 per cent capital levy exacted? This is the state of public ownership of companies.

A similar levy could be exacted at even shorter intervals when death or illness forced a change of management. In the great majority of these industries, even the largest would be taxed out of existence just as the private businessman-manager has been and as the farmer is today.

The State Government has recognized the injustice of this and some 10 years ago gave a 30 per cent remission to a son taking over a smaller farm, with less and less relief for larger units. At least this remission must be extended to gift duty also.

Importantly, the Commonwealth must also appreciate the problem that this small relief has now been overwhelmed by the increase in values and the decrease in profitability. If Australia wants a viable agriculture, relief must be given or land ownership will change to absentee ownership. It is already rapidly going that way.

We are already seeing absentee ownership of the worst kind on a very large scale in some of our districts, ownership by people who have no interest, or merely a dilettante interest, in the land, by people who have no real interest in working it efficiently and have bought with an eye to increasing values and with the intention of selling out when the time is ripe and reinvesting in shares that will escape the capital levy exacted from genuine agriculture and private business. I do not want to say any more on that; I feel very strongly about it.

His Excellency the Governor also paid tribute to the men who worked to preserve us from bush fire loss in what was earlier one of the most dangerous years we have

experienced recently. We must give thanks not only to them but also to Providence for the weather pattern which, with early rain, damped down the huge accumulation of fuel soon after it became dangerous.

The heavy February rains did some remarkable things. Some farmers harvested two crops of grain in the same year from one sowing in my district. Quite a few others have the prospect of another good crop in last year's paddock if grazing through the winter can be maintained.

But the rains have also left us with a fuel build-up in scrubland, so we enter the coming year with the danger accentuated by the immunity for which we are thankful. The Adelaide Hills, scrubland areas and reserves in the South-East are in a terribly dangerous state with a tangled mass of fuel piled feet on feet, until in some cases it is 10ft. high.

In no other State is such a state of affairs allowed. Men have been trained and organizations set up for the controlled burning of critical areas. This method has proved practical and effective in preventing uncontrollable bush fires. It safeguards wild life and flora.

South Australia is lagging badly, endangering lives and property by neglecting this side of fire control. I beg country fire authorities urgently to explore controlled burning. It is the only practical safeguard against the horror of uncontrollable fire on "blow up" days. It has proved safe in over 1,300 trials over 10 years, many in conditions of high fire danger, and not one of these fires has escaped.

With more and more people moving to live in high fire danger areas, this matter can no longer be neglected, for lives are at stake. It is urgent that we get on with the job and modify fire legislation as needed. Information and experience are available from other States for immediate application here. I beg that it no longer be neglected.

His Excellency, in reviewing the year, referred to some of the losses that our fruit-growing industries have faced in 1969. I was surprised that the apple and pear industry got such brief mention. It is often the fate of deserving people to be overlooked, but I wish to put before the Government and other agricultural industries an analysis of this year, to see just what can be done if growers face a seemingly hopeless position with resolution and in unison, with reasonable faith in their fellow men.

I am proud to be a part of the apple-growing industry this year. We started the year with the prospect of a fairly good crop. A heavy crop, probably slightly lighter than that for the preceding year, was predictable upon the showing of flowering buds. Even before blossoming, however, the season proved difficult, and only by hard work and persistence were protective sprays applied in time.

The blossoming was very nice, but so were the thrip plagues! Plague after plague followed in quick succession. They were costly to combat and in many cases what should have been a moderately heavy crop thinned out to a light crop. Before blossoming was over, hail came along. Not once but in some cases three times the trees were peppered with hail, not heavy enough to destroy the fruit but heavy enough to mark it permanently and downgrade it. In the whole of the Adelaide Hills only one or two isolated orchards escaped this visitation.

Then followed rain almost week by week, well into November. Growers had to apply spray after spray to keep saleable their fruit, which week by week showed more extensive hail-markings. Hope for an export sufficient to regulate the local market had to be abandoned. An export of close to 500,000 cases, on a first estimate, fell step by step until eventually only a handful of apples was sent away. A heat wave in early February was followed by drenching storms, which brought sunscald and the worst year for late scab since pre-war years.

The apple-grower faced up to one of the most expensive years he had ever known, with a huge surplus of unsaleable fruit and a large quantity of fruit from light crop trees that would not keep on a market trained over many years to find and exploit any weakness of growers and to bring prices down to ruinous levels.

What has been the outcome of this? First, systematically, through the fruit co-operatives and associations, every avenue for the sale of fruit for manufacture has been sought and exploited. Mountains of apples have been moved into factories, both here and in other States, and are still moving. Secondly, the best of the fruit has been put forward to local markets at reasonable prices.

A higher volume of sales has been flowing than ever before, thanks to advertising, promotion and good fruit. We are not yet perhaps completely out of the wood. Thanks to the

drenching rain late in the year, some fruit is not keeping as well as it should, but that fruit is now clearing rapidly.

This has all been done without statutory aid and regulations. Growers have voluntarily put over one-third of their harvest into manufacture, for much of which payment will not be made until November. The payment, when received, will not pay for much more than the bare spray bills and picking. But, thanks to this concerted action, which has not cost the State or the Commonwealth a cent, although there will be tight belts in the Adelaide Hills, there has not been the disaster of glut in spite of losing both oversea exports and exports to other States.

I am glad to live in the Adelaide Hills in a community that proudly stands on its own feet and faces up to successive blows that would have brought any other industry to its knees. There are in the Southern District, however, two groups of farmers who stand in urgent need of aid, and these are among war settlers.

There is also quite a large section of the Murray Mallee, south and west of Loxton and Waikerie, where the September rains came too late last year or, rather, were missed entirely. In this area, only now is there a sign of the drought breaking, the drought that has lasted for more than three years. In this area things are as bad as in western Queensland and northern New South Wales, of whose distress we have heard so much.

Little has been said, however, about this area within our own State. The resettlement blocks are in trouble not through lack of rain but through fault and over-optimism regarding the estimated productivity of the land when these blocks were laid out.

I have remarked before that the productivity of our high rainfall farming leaves much to be desired. With a limited area tied to grazing only, these men have had little chance of breaking out of their hopeless position since wool prices nosedived. On Kangaroo Island the position is quite hopeless, with problems of ewe infertility and high freight costs in the case of Parndana settlers. This infertility was brought on by the strain of subclover that those settlers were directed—not advised—to plant by the Government.

In the South-East, poor years, poor prices and too small blocks are great enough burdens. The last straw is the drainage and betterment rates now loaded on to them.

Under present legislation these rates must rise steeply over the years. I know that the Minister of Lands has promised to look into the matter, so the subject is *sub judice* to some extent. It is high time, however, that this whole matter of South-East drainage was looked at again.

I do not think there is any shadow of doubt that, over the greater part of the area, once drains have lowered the water table to depths sufficient to hold the winter rainfall, they will only in exceptional circumstances ever run again. Undoubtedly we have reached the stage where many drains should be bulldozed in rather than maintained. Only in exceptional instances is there now need for the costly, long bridges that settlers are being rated to replace eventually and, in the meantime, to maintain.

There are few instances where the water that moved down the drains this year could not have been cleared through cheap, narrow culverts. So, not only are maintenance and replacement charges not warranted but they are charges that should not be levied on the land; they should be levied on the traffic using the roads. It is important to realize that the maintenance of bridges is really and truly a cost that should be saddled on the users of the roads, to which these settlers are making their full and fair contribution through registration fees, licence fees, fuel tax and duties—in all the ways that every car owner and tractor owner is taxed today.

There is very important news for the State in the announcement of the preliminary work on the new dam at Clarendon. The curtain has not been lifted very far, but I assume that this is possibly to fulfil a dual purpose for Adelaide's water supply. First, it is to store for use any Onkaparinga water that is surplus to present storages, which at present is running away. Another purpose relates to the new main from Murray Bridge to Hahndorf—to pump water when a surplus is passing down the Murray River and possibly to save pumping costs when the lower river carries water too saline for general use.

Because of the enlargement of Mount Bold it must be quite a long time before sufficient water will accumulate to build a storage of the dimensions planned. I appreciate that this idea may not be much more than a second thought on the part of the authorities at this stage. However, the plan (that we should look more and more to deep storages in the hills where water can be stored economically, which storages can be filled when the Murray

River is carrying water of good quality) has certainly been in our engineers' minds for a considerable time.

What I fear is that such thought will delay facing up to the very difficult problem of water quality in the Murray Mouth lakes and the Lower Murray to Blanchetown. We must face up to this problem at once. A quantity of 770,000 acre ft., more than half the allocation of water for which we will be due if it is available after the Dartmouth dam is finished, is lost through evaporation from the lakes and lower river each year. Possibly a flow sufficient to keep the water fresh down to the pump inlets at Murray Bridge and Taillem Bend can be maintained but, without costly capital works, that is all.

The future of the lakes, with their 4ft. of evaporation, must be uncertain and must become more and more precarious as further dam construction and irrigation planned in New South Wales and Victoria draw upon the surplus running to waste that we now rely on to keep these lakes fresh. Each year more and more capital is being spent from Goolwa around the lake shores to Meningie and Narrung and along the Murray River itself. Dairying, lucerne meal and vegetable growing are now big industries in these areas. They cannot remain in existence if they do not get water of good quality every year. It is urgent that the future for them be laid down clearly. Will they be safeguarded by having a clean water supply provided or will they be allowed to languish as the lakes become more saline? I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main purpose, which is given effect in clause 2 (a), (b) and (c), is to empower the Governor, if any judge of the Supreme Court is absent on leave or is for any other reason unable fully to discharge his duties, to appoint an acting judge in his place until he returns to the full execution of his duties or to appoint an acting judge for such period as the Governor thinks fit. The clause also makes

provision for the Governor to continue the appointment of an acting judge for such period as he deems proper if, for any reason that the Governor thinks proper, an acting judge should continue in office after the time when his appointment would normally have terminated.

In recent months the work of the Supreme Court has become increasingly congested. At present one judge is absent on sick leave and two judges are unable fully to discharge their duties on the bench by reason of being engaged on other duties. Another judge is due to retire in October. An acting judge has been appointed in place of the judge who is absent on sick leave, but even if that judge were shortly to resume his full duties it would be some time before the other two judges were released from their extra judicial duties to resume their full duties on the bench. In consequence, the court will for some time be seriously understaffed and the Government feels that there would be urgent need to continue the appointment of the acting judge until the congestion of the court list is relieved. I am sure honourable members will see the need for this Bill to be passed by this House as a matter of urgency in order that the present unsatisfactory situation with regard to the court lists may be remedied with the least possible delay.

Clause 3 amends section 12 of the principal Act by expressly providing for the payment of salary to a person who acts in the place of the Chief Justice or a puisne judge. This had not been previously provided for in the principal Act and the opportunity is taken to rectify the omission.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. Knowing some of the difficulties associated with the Supreme Court as at present affecting judges, I think it is necessary. A difficulty can arise when a judge, whose place the acting judge is taking, returns to duty. The acting judge may have several outstanding cases, and it is essential that he completes those cases himself. All honourable members are aware that one judge of the Supreme Court is carrying out duties associated with Parliament. Nobody would begrudge taking a judge off the Supreme Court bench for this work, even though many people may need to take their cases to the court for hearing and ensure that they are dealt with as quickly as possible. However, if a judge is taken from the court for other work, neither the judge nor the acting judge taking his place should be penalized or inconvenienced. I believe the arrangement has

to be agreed to by the Governor who, after all, accepts the recommendation of Executive Council. I do not think Executive Council would submit a proposal dealing with judges unless it was necessary and in the best interests of the State. I therefore support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Amendment of principal Act, Section 11—Acting Judges."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I would like to explain that I am fully in accord with this Bill, but I would ask the Minister one or two questions about draftsmanship. Section 11 (1) of the Act as at present drawn provides that the Governor:

May appoint a fit and proper person to act in the stead of that judge until he returns to the execution of his duties.

The object of the amendment is clearly to provide that an acting judge may continue to be retained in office if the permanent judge, although having returned to his duties, cannot fully carry out those duties. That is only sensible and logical. However, the proviso to section 11 (3) reads:

Provided that no acting judge shall be continued in that office under this subsection for longer than three months.

Subsection (4) of that same section, inserted by amendment in 1955, provides however that the Governor may continue the appointment of an acting judge pending the hearing of some cases in which he is engaged, notwithstanding that the term of three months has expired.

This Bill does not amend the proviso that an acting judge shall not continue in that office for longer than three months; it retains that portion, but inserts a further proviso to subsection (4) by adding the words:

or that he should continue in office after that time for any other reason that the Governor deems proper.

It seems curiously roundabout verbiage. The proviso to subsection (3) states that the appointment shall be for only three months, and subsection (4) is now being amended to allow a longer period if it is deemed proper.

I am interested in why this form of amendment has been placed before members of this Council, because it would have seemed proper, more logical, and acceptable if the Governor were merely given power to extend the appointment of an acting judge from time to time "for any reason he may deem proper", to use the words of the Draftsman. I think the

Minister probably understands my point. I think the draftsmanship is roundabout rather than direct, and I wonder why this has been done.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): It will take me a few moments to sort out the points raised by the honourable member. It seems that he puts the proposition that the Draftsman was confronted with two alternatives, one appearing to the honourable member to be more logical than the other, but the one adopted was the more logical of the two. It seems to me that the intent of the Bill is clear as it stands at this stage. I think in matters such as this we are bound to consider intent rather than become too involved with detail, as has been raised by the honourable member.

Nevertheless, I think the honourable member is entitled to be informed further on the points he has raised dealing with the appointment of an acting judge. In a matter of weeks we shall be confronted with the position of having to dispense with the services of one acting judge if this amendment is not carried.

It is by no means a case of wanting to retain the services of the acting judge simply for the sake of retention. However, the position exists at the moment where, as I mentioned in my second reading explanation, the lists are extremely full and the business of the court simply cannot be carried out with the efficiency which is customary in court procedure here in South Australia and which has been traditional in our court system. Therefore, it is imperative that we make this change.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I think I have the answer to my query now.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I should like to hear the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill's interpretation of what he was trying to get at earlier, but to save him that trouble or any embarrassment I do finally point out to him that the power to make or to continue an acting appointment lies in cases where a judge is not able fully—I stress the word "fully"—to discharge the duties of his office. I hope this explanation satisfies fully the honourable member's query.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think I can give a better explanation now, with great respect, because I have now had the time to study this Bill which, as honourable members know, has only just been put before us. Section 11 (3) states:

The appointment of an acting judge shall not be determined by the death or resignation of the judge, in whose stead he has been appointed . . .

It goes on to say that no acting judge shall be continued in that office under that subsection for longer than three months. In other words, he cannot be continued as an acting judge for longer than three months in the case of death or resignation of the judge in whose stead he has been appointed, but by implication he can be continued for any time while a judge is not in action. As the Minister has explained, this amendment provides for the position where a judge partially resumes his duties but does not fully resume his duties.

I think this is a very good amendment, because it gives the Government a little latitude to see that the bench is sufficiently complete to deal with all the requirements asked of it.

There is no doubt that, under the sort of pressures we find today (especially where judges are called on from time to time to perform other than their actual judicial duties, such as sitting on commissions of various sorts), it is desirable that there should be some latitude granted in seeing that we have a bench sufficient in numbers to enable their duties promptly and properly to be carried out. Therefore, I support the measure.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.44 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 22, at 2.15 p.m.