

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, November 3, 1970

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

QUESTIONS

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently I directed a question to the Chief Secretary concerning the impact of the common fee principle on the operations of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The institute supplies a service in pathology to Government hospitals and those doctors and patients in the whole State who wish to use it. It is estimated that it will earn \$750,000 this year as revenue from its work for private doctors and patients. It has embarked upon a policy of centralization of services using a computer and expensive automated equipment because of the economies and the control of accuracy of work which is possible through such a policy. This is the only economical way of handling coming work-loads, using a computer and large automated analysers efficiently. The present "most common fee" principle destroys the incentives for economies and to keep fees low. This is because work is free for the patient when the fees equal the sum of the combined Commonwealth and fund benefits. Thus, the way is open for large commercial enterprises to enter the field of laboratory automation. Exploitation of pathology for profit is possible because costs fall progressively as volumes of work increase, so that there cannot be a "most common fee" that can be related to costs. The principle is therefore not strictly applicable to automated pathology. The institute is most concerned about the following matters:

1. Lowering of standards of work if many uncontrolled laboratories enter the field.
2. Disruption of the institute's centralized services with loss of most of the institute's revenue.
3. Attraction of key staff away from the institute by financial inducement from large commercial enterprises so that an adequate service cannot be given to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and other Government hospitals.
4. Exploitation of the health scheme with enormous profits at taxpayers' and medical insurance payers' expense.

5. A huge upsurge in the volume of pathology undertaken through "multiphasic health screening" of the so-called normal population, and through the "preventicare" system.

6. "Preventicare" is operating in Sydney, Melbourne, Canberra and Brisbane, and an approach has been made for its introduction into Adelaide. However, the pathology services are better organized in South Australia, and I believe the operative firm does not have the capital to establish the system here against the combined opposition of the institute and the firm of private pathologists. Nor do I think that it can operate sufficiently economically or that it has sufficient merit yet to compete successfully.

Nevertheless, the institute is very vulnerable, and large commercial enterprises can very easily cripple its whole organization, setting up an alternative to make large profits, and leaving the institute to undertake the unprofitable sections of pathology.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking another question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I thank the Chief Secretary for his rather lengthy reply concerning the situation of the institute, and I am sure that any honourable member who peruses the reply in *Hansard* will be concerned with matters it raises. As no doubt the Government has also considered the reply, can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to take action to overcome the obvious difficulties that have arisen?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The seriousness of this position had not been brought to my notice until the Leader asked his question. I did not receive a reply until last Thursday or Friday, and this matter was discussed yesterday in Cabinet. I am having a conference with both the Director of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science (Dr. Bonnin) and the Director-General of Medical Services to examine the position to ensure that we can protect our institute, which I am told, and believe, is equal to anything in Australia.

SOCIOLOGICAL REPORT

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Development and Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to the activities of the sociological committee set up at the beginning of this year

(or it may have been late last year) to advise the Government on social aspects of the ground water problems of the Northern Adelaide Plains. This committee met 17 times, mostly in the office of the Land Settlement Committee (as you would well know, Mr. President), and three times it visited the area around Virginia so that members could see the situation at first hand. I believe the committee met for the first time on about February 24 and its last meeting was on about September 1. Will the Chief Secretary ask his colleague whether the committee has submitted its report and, if it has, when it will be made available to honourable members?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that last week he was most concerned that a member who had asked a question should be given the reply. For his information, the Hon. Mr. Hart asked a question about this committee some time ago and, this afternoon, I will give the reply to him, as he was the member who asked the question.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary a reply from the Minister of Development and Mines to my recent question about the report of the sociological committee?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The sociological committee is investigating the possible long-range effects of water restrictions on the market garden community of the Northern Adelaide Plains. It has issued two interim reports to the Minister of Development and Mines, each of which discusses alternative administrative and technical policies. No purpose would be served in releasing the reports at this stage.

STUDENTS' MEETING

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Can the Chief Secretary, as Leader of the Government in this Chamber, say whether the meeting of secondary school students, held on Sunday in the Lady Symon Hall of the University of Adelaide, was conducted with the knowledge and approval of the Council of the University?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know anything about this matter, but I will refer the question to one of my colleagues in an attempt to obtain this information.

MEAT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: It has been brought to my notice that many of the meat producers of South Australia (and this would

apply to meat producers throughout the Commonwealth) are most concerned about the inroads being made into the meat trade by synthetics or imported meat. The Minister may not be aware of it, but there is a processed meat being sold labelled "Product of Uruguay". This is sold in the various States throughout the Commonwealth. Will the Minister take up this matter with other State Ministers of Agriculture and with the Commonwealth Minister to see what can be done to prohibit the sale of imported meat within Australia, where we are finding it difficult to sell meat at an equitable price? I could give many examples. For instance, I know that a 50 lb. wether today that would be fit for any table in the world nets the producer between \$2 and \$3. It is a serious situation where meat is being imported into South Australia from outside by companies operating within Australia. Will the Minister take up this problem with his fellow Ministers of Agriculture?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will do that. I will take it up with the Minister for Primary Industry, because this is a Commonwealth, not a State, matter. I can assure the honourable member, however, that the other States are just as concerned as South Australia is about the importation into Australia not only of meat but also of dairy produce, wine and brandy. If it is the policy of the present Commonwealth Government to do these things, it will have to account for its actions. It is causing great concern to the meat industry, particularly when we consider that we in South Australia now have a record number of sheep—19,000,000; and cattle numbers have risen by 50 per cent in the last few years. That of itself is reason enough why we should be patronizing our own industry here in South Australia rather than importing produce from other countries. I will take up this matter with the Minister for Primary Industry. I assure the honourable member that this is not the first occasion on which a matter of this nature has been brought to the Minister's notice. I brought to the notice of the Agricultural Council earlier this year the matters of imported brandy and imported cheese.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Can the Minister say whether the Commonwealth or the State Governments are aware of the health regulations that apply in Uruguay, from which this meat is being imported? Do the regulations comply rigidly with our requirements regarding blue tongue and the various other diseases which we are attempting to keep out of Australia? Stringent inspections should be

made of meat entering Australia for this reason. I believe that even tinned meat can carry the blue tongue germ, which is not uncommon in South America. Will health regulations similar to those that the Americans are laying down regarding the export of our meat products to the United States of America be applied to this imported meat?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I am unable to answer the question, I shall obtain a report as soon as possible from the Commonwealth authorities on what they lay down in this regard.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Over the past few weeks several questions have been asked of the Minister regarding the export of meat from this country, and from this State particularly, to America. In a reply to an earlier question the Minister said:

We in South Australia must be concerned at all times about the problems that face the export of meat, to America particularly, which is such a lucrative market, but, at the same time, I assure honourable members that our abattoirs fulfil their obligations admirably.

Since we still have not got a licence to export meat to America, can the Minister explain what he meant by those last words; in other words, what are the obligations that have been so admirably fulfilled by our abattoirs?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think I can qualify that statement by the answer that I will now give. Questions that have been asked by honourable members in this Council and in another place regarding the withdrawal of licences from Australian abattoirs for the export of mutton to America indicate that some members, at least, are not clear on what has actually happened and, with the indulgence of this House, I wish to clarify the situation. The facts are that on or about May 18 of this year the United States Department of Agriculture advised that all registered meat export establishments in Australia would lose their right to export mutton (I emphasize the word "mutton") to America.

Later, the Canadian authorities followed suit. I believe that the reason given for this action by the United States authorities was that the very high standards of hygiene demanded by them were not being met by Australian slaughtering establishments. Subsequently, some abattoirs (in the main, small through-put works constructed comparatively

recently) applied and had their licences reissued. Applications by others were rejected.

I want to make it perfectly clear that, for the Gepps Cross abattoirs, the embargo applies only to mutton, and the export of beef and lamb to the United States and Canada is not affected. The latest information I have is that the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board intends to ask for an inspection of its establishment within the next week or so with a view to reinstatement of its licence to export mutton to the United States.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I thank the Minister for that reply, but can he inform me about the position of the Noarlunga and Murray Bridge meatworks?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No, but I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

HIGHWAYS FUNDS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On October 22, I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, whether, in view of the fact that the Commonwealth was supplying \$9,450,000 this current year for expenditure by the Highways Department on declared urban arterial roads that form part of the roads and routes shown in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report, the Government had advised the Commonwealth Government that the M.A.T.S. plan had been withdrawn and, if it had not, whether the Government felt morally bound to do so. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague reports:

This Government does not consider that it has any obligation to inform the Commonwealth Government at this time regarding its proposals for better public transport facilities following its decision to re-examine some of the proposals of the M.A.T.S. plan.

KANGAROOS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: A statement attributed to Mr. H. G. Brooks, Vice-President of the Stockowners Association of South Australia, in last Saturday's *Advertiser* under the heading "Roos 'outnumber station sheep'" asserts that many stations in the North and North-West carry more kangaroos than sheep. The association asked that fresh permits be issued to get a balance between the two types of animal. Apparently a deputation recently waited upon the Minister and asked that the

permits be issued by the Pastoral Board instead of by the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation. The article states:

The Minister considered this to be a most practical suggestion and said he would raise it in the House of Assembly.

First, can the Minister say whether the statement attributed to him is factual and whether he thought it was practical to transfer the work of issuing these permits from the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation to the Pastoral Board? Secondly, can he say whether he really said that he would raise the matter in the House of Assembly? Thirdly, will he comment on the contention of the Stockowners Association that it had not had a reply from the Minister and that he was dodging the issue?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am delighted that the honourable member has raised this matter, because it brings out one point very specifically: we must not believe all we read in the newspapers. When the deputation from the Stockowners Association came to see me about kangaroos, I suggested that it would be a good idea if the members of the Pastoral Board could act as advisers to the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation to bring it more up to date. Because members of the Pastoral Board travel in the pastoral areas for most of the year, they would have a very good appreciation of the situation. Strangely enough, the deputation agreed that I had made a good suggestion. It went a stage further and suggested that the matter be placed in the hands of the Pastoral Board, but I did not agree to its suggestion. I said that, because I believed that the department was doing a very good job, I did not intend to interfere with the existing situation. I repeat that I did say it would be in the interests of everyone concerned if members of the Pastoral Board could act as advisers to the department. I have written to Mr. Brooks this morning pointing out what I have just said to the honourable member. My explanation should enable him to understand the matter and realize that I did not intend to dodge the issue; I pointed this out in my letter to Mr. Brooks.

VIRGINIA BASIN

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary obtained from the Minister of Development and Mines a reply to my question of October 13 about installing meters in the Virginia water basin?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My colleague reports:

Water quotas come into effect on November 1, 1970, and the quota allotted to each grower covers a period of 20 months to June 30, 1972. As of November 1, 1970, it is expected that about 750 meters will have been installed. There may be between 150 and 170 growers who have resisted installation and at that stage will be unmetered. Steps are in hand to prosecute where necessary, and it is hoped that this may be effective. Growers whose bores are unmetered will have their quotas reduced monthly until such time as a meter is installed, so that they will gain no advantage from the delay.

FISHING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about bag limits for fish in the Port Pirie area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: In discussions with the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation (Mr. Olsen), he has expressed the view that bag limits for whiting in certain areas, if applied to unlicensed ("amateur") fishermen, would be in the interests of fisheries management provided, however, that the taking of fish smaller than the legal size were prohibited. Under the bag-limit system previously in operation, unlicensed ("amateur") fishermen were permitted in certain areas to take a daily number (bag) of whiting and in that "bag" they were permitted to include undersize fish. The effect of this was that dishonest licensed and unlicensed fishermen, when questioned by inspectors, always claimed any undersize whiting in their boats had been taken in the bag-limit area and, therefore, prosecutions were difficult to obtain. The effect on the fishery of this weakness in the law was detrimental to the fishery and bag limits were accordingly abolished by proclamation in October, 1968. It is interesting to note that the Select Committee on the Fishing Industry recommended the prohibition of the taking of undersize fish by anglers fishing from boats. I am prepared to discuss this question further with the Director.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture has not replied to the question I asked and, in making my request again, I quote from *Hansard* of October 27:

Does the Minister of Agriculture intend to reintroduce bag limits for fish in the Port Pirie area and will those limits be for fishermen who fish from boats only or will they be for fishermen who fish from boats and net from beaches in the area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will have another look at the question and obtain a further report for the honourable member.

CARP

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of October 21 regarding carp in the Murray River?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: European carp were introduced into Victoria some years ago, and before they were declared a noxious fish they had become established in some 1,500 dams and lakes. Victoria instituted a programme of eradication by poison, costing, it is believed, over \$100,000. However, it is likely that, when Lake Hawthorn was drained into the Murray River in 1968 to release saline water, European carp escaped into the Murray. The Murray system is so vast that it would be impossible to eradicate the species.

FROST DAMAGE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture to explain to those members of the Council not knowledgeable in matters agricultural what he meant by the "milky dough" stage of crop growth. I believe that the Minister has given considerable thought to this matter and that he has been good enough to obtain an explanation. Will he give that explanation to the Council?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Director of Agriculture reports:

The tissues of the cereal grain are formed during a period of approximately a fortnight following flowering and fertilization. The starch granules which make up the bulk of the endosperm of the mature grain are then gradually deposited within this tissue. During this period of starch deposition, moisture is gradually lost from the grain, and the grain passes through the "milky" and the "dough" stages of endosperm development before reaching maturity. The "milky dough" stage represents the transition point at which the endosperm finally loses its liquid consistency. The report of the recent disastrous frost in the Murray Mallee and Upper South-East indicated that crops were susceptible to damage from flowering right up to this stage. Usually frost damage is confined to crops that are in the flowering stage.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Recently I asked a question of the Minister of Lands concerning the availability of funds for assistance to primary producers in South Australia. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The three funds, as stated by the honourable member, are:

	Balance at 30.9.70 \$
Deposits—Farmers Assistance Fund*	609,824
Deposits—Primary Producers Debts Adjustment Fund ..	804,636
Deposits—Marginal Lands— Improvements Account ..	267,872

1. * The amount held in the Farmers Assistance Fund includes \$244,881 representing repayments of assistance granted from Commonwealth funds in connection with the 1967 drought. This money is repayable to the Commonwealth in accordance with conditions laid down in 1967 and cannot be used in the present situation. The amount currently available in this fund for assistance under section 5 (1) and (2) of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967, is \$364,943. The rate of interest chargeable on advances made under this Act will be 6½ per cent a year in accordance with the provision in section 5 (2) (a) that any advance will bear interest at the rate charged by the State Bank of South Australia in respect of overdraft loans made to primary producers.

2. The Primary Producers Debts Adjustment Fund is reserved for use in the adjustment of debts of primary producers as provided in section 21 of the Primary Producers Assistance Act, 1943, and the Primary Producers Debts Act, 1935-1943. The rate of interest chargeable on any loan made under the latter Act shall not exceed 2½ per cent a year.

3. The Marginal Lands—Improvements Account is not subject to any statutory restriction in its use, but has been used to provide grants to primary producers on marginal properties and minor related assistance. An amount of \$150,000 was transferred from this account to the credit of the Farmers Assistance Fund in 1967 in accordance with section 3 (b) of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967.

IRON ORE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Some time ago I asked a question of the Chief Secretary concerning the holding of special mining leases on the low-grade iron ore deposits in the Warramboos area. I asked him who held those leases, when they expired, and what their terms were. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The special mining lease over the Warramboos low-grade iron ore deposits is held in the name of W. B. Nelson on behalf of the Marcona Corporation.

The lease is granted for a two-year period expiring March 4, 1972, subject to a programme of exploration and feasibility studies.

MOTOR VEHICLE INSURANCE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Recently I asked the Chief Secretary a question relating to comprehensive motor vehicle insurance and the justification for the increase in rates. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: An investigation of the position concerning increased comprehensive insurance premiums to operate on or after November 1 has disclosed that insurance companies' loss ratio, which is the ratio of the value of claims paid to premiums received, has increased substantially and is well beyond the level considered desirable by the industry. Increased premiums proposed appear warranted. Increases have been designed to cover the spread of insurance costs and are substantially below new rates for the Eastern States. It is difficult to ascertain what the total value of increased premiums will be, but it is unlikely to exceed the increased cost of claims for 1971.

ZAMBIA

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the presentation by the Commonwealth Government to Zambia of a complete biscuit making factory. I asked him what percentage of grain bought by Zambia came from Australia. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Information that I have obtained from the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry indicates that almost all of Zambia's grain imports are believed to come from Australia. In the season 1969-70, of 70,803 tons of wheat imported by Zambia, 70,592 tons was exported from Australia. In the previous season, 95,982 tons of a total import of 96,438 tons was Australian wheat. The 98 tons of oats imported last year from Australia is understood to be the major portion of Zambia's oats imports.

ROAD SAFETY COUNCIL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Lands replies from the Minister of Roads and Transport to the questions I asked during the debate on the Appropriation Bill concerning funds being made available to the Road Safety Council this year?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I regret that these details were not available during the debate on the Appropriation Bill, but I have

now been supplied with the following information by my colleague, who has informed me that the figures quoted by the honourable member are correct, as the following table shows:

1969-70	
	\$
Salaries	15,006
Grant	13,000
Special road safety campaigns	6,255
	<hr/>
	\$34,261
	<hr/>
1970-71	
	\$
Salaries	17,863
Contingencies	14,500
Special road safety campaigns	—
	<hr/>
	\$32,363
	<hr/>

These figures indicate that the provision this year is \$1,898 less than last year. However, it is pointed out that \$6,255 was provided as a grant for special Christmas and Easter seasonal road safety campaigns. If the sums provided for salaries and contingencies are compared for each year, it will be found that \$4,357 more is provided this year.

In the report of the Road Safety Council for the quarter ended September 30, 1970, the Chairman stated that an increase of \$12,000 was being provided this year. This is explained by the fact that \$13,000 was provided last year as a grant under the Minister's "Miscellaneous" line, whereas this year, under the Minister's department, \$9,583 is provided for salaries (after charging \$8,280 for two field officers against the Commonwealth Grant), and \$14,500 is provided for contingencies, making a total of \$24,083. The net increase is actually \$11,083. Last year's salaries of \$15,006 were charged to the Commonwealth grant, which this year is being increased to \$19,000, against which \$8,280 for two field officers will be debited, leaving the balance of \$10,720 available for other purposes. The whole question of finance for the Road Safety Council is complicated by the fact that, in previous years, it was given a grant, whereas the council is now a branch of the Minister's department.

APPLE EXPORTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Next Thursday the apple-growing co-operatives in the Adelaide

Hills will be considering the practicability of resuming shipments to Britain under a scheme that has been approved recently by the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry and the Apple and Pear Board. This scheme will require a large amount of finance, and applegrowers will have to find about \$3.50 a box to be able to sustain the scheme. It is hoped that about 500,000 boxes (perhaps it may not be as many) will be exported, and this will be a difficult burden to carry. This number of boxes will mean that applegrowers will have to grow the crop and sustain the cost of harvesting, packing and transporting it to Port Adelaide. The sum involved will be at least \$1,500,000, for which there will be no prospect of repayment until the pools are finalized, and this is most unlikely before November. The whole practicability of exporting these apples rests on finance being available to the industry at a very reasonable rate of interest. It is most important that, before Thursday, if possible, applegrowers receive some indication whether it will be practicable for this finance to be obtained through the State Bank. Will the Minister of Agriculture consider the practicability of financing such an export at risk under the scheme supported by the Apple and Pear Board?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have had some \$64 questions in my time, but this is a gem! What the honourable member is asking me to do in two days is carry out an exercise of tremendous magnitude to try to get him some guarantee from the State Bank. I have no doubt that this matter has been looked at carefully by the apple and pear producers of this State, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Department of Primary Industry, who have launched this scheme in co-operation with the department. Surely this matter should have been resolved at that time rather than at this late stage. If the apple and pear growers of South Australia are vitally concerned with this project, it is a wonder they have not come to see me before now. I do not see how it is practicable at this late stage in a matter of not two days but one day (because tomorrow would be the only opportunity I would have to go into this important matter) to do anything. That would be absolutely impossible.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a further explanation in view of the Minister's reply.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I think the Council will recall my asking the Minister

last week whether he could disclose any details of the Apple and Pear Board scheme, and he refused to do so; so the Minister should be aware that this matter could not have been raised earlier than now. Also, the Minister would be—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Did the honourable member say that I refused to give information?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: The Minister did so.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Oh, come off it!

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: He said it was rather a confidence, which could not be breached. Secondly, the Minister may not be aware that this finance has always in the past been provided by the State Bank, and this is more a continuance of prevailing arrangements that have largely lapsed because of the small exports of the last two years. It is not a matter that would require much negotiation. The Minister may care to review his statement in view of that further explanation.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am pleased to say I am a little clearer about the situation now that the honourable member has given me this further information, but I point out to him (and I have already made this statement once before in this Chamber) that I have never intended to try to withhold information from the Council and, if what transpires in the Agricultural Council is not resolved and it is requested, in those circumstances, that it not be discussed, I am sure the honourable member will appreciate the attitude adopted not only by me but also by previous Ministers of Agriculture.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: You are changing around now.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No, I am not.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Don't disclose your ignorance.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member is the ignorant one.

The PRESIDENT: Order! Interjections are out of order, and the Minister will make his reply without personal reference.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Thank you, Mr. President. As regards the loan from the State Bank, I think that bank is quite capable of handling it. Further, it is a matter for the Treasury rather than for the Agriculture Department.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTRY)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 2183.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): This Bill contains only one operative clause. The Chief Secretary's second reading explanation was very short, so perhaps in his reply he will give the Council a little more information about the appointment of an extra Minister. There is no doubt that the present Ministry is too small for the amount of work involved.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In what way do you mean?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: In the development of the State. I believe it is small in numbers. During my experience in Parliament, I have seen colleagues of mine, both of the Australian Labor Party and of the Liberal and Country Party, who have obviously shown the strain of overwork during their terms of office as Ministers. The present Government has been in office for only a short while (perhaps that period could be called the honeymoon period), and it is enjoying the results of the work done by its predecessors. It has yet to bear full responsibility for those things that have not been done but for which it will be responsible in the future. It is perfectly obvious to members of Parliament that, as a Government's term of office proceeds, the Ministers become increasingly overworked and show signs of their worries and heavy responsibilities.

I should like the Chief Secretary to explain whether there will be a genuine reallocation and dividing up of existing portfolios or whether the new portfolio will merely be a new one created with a fancy name without serving any real purpose. I believe that some of the portfolios should be divided to equalize the work. For example, I should like to see the portfolios of Roads and Transport, on the one hand, and Local Government, on the other hand, separated. Although at first glance these portfolios may appear to complement one another, I believe that there are many instances where their interests are completely apart; in fact, they may be diametrically opposed. I also hope that the expense of creating another Ministerial office will be kept to a minimum. The expense of splitting existing portfolios, in respect of which secretaries already exist, should be considerably less than that of creating completely new portfolios and departments.

Clause 2 (a) increases the number of Ministers from nine to 10 and clause 2 (b) increases from six to seven the maximum number of Ministers in the House of Assembly. I presume that the Government intends to appoint the new Minister from that House. Of course, even if this Bill is passed in its present form, the Government can still appoint an extra Minister from this Council. I do hope that due recognition will be given to the very great service that the Hon. Mr. Banfield has given to this Parliament. I have worked in close association with him on the Public Works Committee, and I know something of his community work in helping the under-privileged. Consequently, I believe he has special talents that could benefit the State. Although the present Government is not noted for any great love for this Council, I hope that will not affect its judgment in connection with the new appointment. I support the Bill.

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

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 2188.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): When looking at this Bill one realizes that most of the first 45 clauses deal with amendments to the Industrial Code as it exists at present. The remaining two clauses deal with the virtual re-enactment of the Early Closing Act. I do not intend to speak on most of the first 45 clauses because I believe that other honourable members should possibly lead on those clauses, which relate mainly to the appointment of Deputy Presidents to the Industrial Court and one or two other matters, on which I may ask questions during the Committee stage. Honourable members will recall some of the comments that were made during the passage through this Council of the Referendum (Metropolitan Area Shop Trading Hours) Bill.

I should like to repeat what I said during the debate on that Bill, namely, that every honourable member had some sympathy for the Government in approaching an extremely difficult problem. I think every honourable member would have some sympathy with any Government faced with the problem of non-uniformity of shop trading hours within the metropolitan area as defined in this Bill. It is not an easy problem to solve. There may be some arguments in favour of not moving

into uniformity, but there will always be difficulties if shopkeepers on one side of a street can open for whatever hours they wish and shopkeepers on the other side of the street must close at a certain time. I therefore have some sympathy in this respect for the Government in approaching this problem, but I have no sympathy at all for the method the Government used in approaching the problem.

During the debate on the Referendum Bill I said it would possibly be quite impossible to interpret the result of a referendum where the Government put up, purely for political purposes, a single loaded question. I would say that the Government could adopt practically any approach and say that it was the will of the people in the referendum. It could adopt the approach that has been adopted in this Bill (5.30 p.m. closing on weekdays and allowing Saturday morning trading) and say that that was the will of the people as expressed in the referendum. One could also just as logically argue that it was the will of the people not to interfere with the present situation. So, I place very little value on the result of the referendum and I think I stressed this point during the passage of the Referendum Bill through this Council. During the debate on that Bill I am reported on page 894 of *Hansard* as saying:

Many problems could be posed, and at this stage I will pose just one. Supposing the vote throughout the area as defined in the Bill is almost a 50-50 one but that 80 per cent of the people in Elizabeth and Tea Tree Gully and 80 per cent of the people in the Mawson District want no change; in other words, they vote the only way they can for no change, namely, 9 o'clock closing on Friday night. What conclusion will the Government draw from this sort of vote? That is only one of the problems that can come from a loaded question such as this.

The Minister of Lands virtually said in reply that the Government would interpret the result of the referendum as it wished to interpret it. That is exactly what has been done. I have always advocated that we should have legislation governing the method of conducting referendums in South Australia similar to that existing in the Commonwealth Constitution to prevent any Government from using a loaded question for political purposes. If the format were followed that the Government must introduce a Bill which must pass both Houses and which must go to the people for ratification before going to the Governor for signature, this would allow people at a referendum at least to cast an intelligent vote. As I have said before, the result of this referendum is incap-

able of intelligent interpretation. I said that this was made clear—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes, politically.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Perhaps if the Chief Secretary will wait just a moment I shall illustrate the question he has raised regarding how this matter was introduced in the first place purely for a political consideration. The Government was made aware of this during the debate in the Council. At that stage, the Government remained completely inflexible: it would not take the advice of the Council of or honourable members who suggested that this procedure was quite wrong; it remained inflexible, and now has reached the situation where, for a change, it has only itself to blame.

I believe that the Government wanted 9 o'clock closing on Friday nights, but it was not game to say so. This is borne out by the comment of the Minister of Works who, as soon as the Government decided to proceed with a referendum, stated that 70 per cent of the people would vote for it. I also wish to add that, in my opinion, the demands of a modern society for shopping hours will have to be met with some increase in or rationalization of them. If this is not done, we will simply be burying our heads in the sand. It is perfectly obvious that our way of life is changing very rapidly, and will continue to change in the future.

Today, if one moves through districts such as Mawson, Playford, Tea Tree Gully and Modbury, one will find that many young people are buying their own houses, and that very often the wife is working. We must admit that, as time goes by, there will be more and more working wives in our community. These people are now demanding longer shopping hours, and will continue to demand them and, eventually, will have their demands met.

During the referendum, two pressure groups advocated a certain viewpoint, and I do not blame them for doing that. However, I wonder who, during the referendum, was speaking for the people. It appears that this whole question can now be answered only with a political answer. I want the Council to mark my words now: the demand for some extension or rationalization of shopping hours will continue. No Government will be able to resist this pressure. Any Government that resists this pressure will be burying its head in the sand. One has only to move overseas to see how other countries have tackled this problem and to see a rationalization of shopping hours, where sometimes the shops do not

open on Monday mornings but remain open, say, until 10 o'clock on Wednesday nights. The Minister of Agriculture at one stage made an interjection concerning political matters. I have studied the Minister's second reading explanation extensively. He said:

I made clear the Government's proposal that there should be uniform shopping hours within the enlarged metropolitan area and indicated that a further Bill would be introduced immediately after the referendum to give effect to the decision of the people as expressed in the referendum.

One may well ask, "Why the delay?" One may also ask, "Why the special meeting in the high grass of Klemzig to decide exactly what the Government would do?" The Government had to receive its instructions on what to do regarding the dilemma in which it found itself. In the second reading explanation, the Minister also said (and I think that this is possibly the most humorous section of the whole second reading explanation):

I might say that it was unfortunate that attempts were made to turn what I thought was a social question, which was to be put to the people on a non-Party basis, into a political issue.

This never was a social question. The Labor Party has admitted that it is not a social question, otherwise there would have been a totally different vote in another place. It was a political question from the day the Government conceived the idea, and it was a political question from beginning to end until the meeting in the hidden house at Klemzig with the cockatoo.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: We didn't see you there!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, but the press photographers with their telephoto lenses were present. The sequence of events was good enough for *Punch* or the *Bulletin*. So the Government finally decided this vital issue and, as much as I disagree with the Government's decision, I do not believe that I should interfere to defeat this legislation. Therefore, I intend voting for the second reading.

If, instead of having their heads counted, members of Parliament had voted in a secret ballot or with the advantage of a secret ballot I am certain we would have had a very different Bill before us today. I know it would be quite useless for me to make any appeal to the Government at this stage to reconsider this matter. Therefore, I accept the decision it has made. However, there are some clauses that I believe should be amended in Committee. To my mind, applying this legislation from

January 1 is unjust and unwarranted. I agree that the Government's intention with regard to the business activities of butchers and bakers was clearly stated in its policy speech given in April this year. It was quite clear then that the Government intended applying to the businesses of butchering and baking a 5½-day week and a 5-day week respectively. However, no indication whatsoever was given to the owners of other shops that the axe would fall on their operations. A newspaper of August 6 carries the following report of a statement by the Premier:

The only statement the Government has made concerning alterations to trading hours relates to butchering and baking. In both of these trades, the specific proposals that we had for ordinary trading hours were set out in detail in the policy speech and outlined at the time of the State election, namely, that there would be a 5½-day week for butchering over the whole State and a 5-day week for baking. This was the only way we could see of achieving a satisfactory rationalization of both these industries. As for the rest, we believe the present position should be held.

That was a statement by the Premier only a few short weeks ago. Therefore, I believe that in all justice the axe should not fall on these shops on January 1. No doubt when this assurance was given people continued to expand their business in these areas and to invest money, and no doubt also the people working in these areas believed that the statement by the Premier was an accurate one. In those circumstances, I consider that the operation of this Act should be delayed, in order to ensure some fair play.

Any established small business, with the axe falling on January 1, will have to reorganize its activities. In all probability the owners of those businesses have equipment on hire-purchase, and that equipment will have to be sold. I believe that between now and January 1 is too short a period to allow time for these businesses to be reorganized. In some cases, people will have to worry about the tenure of their shops. I believe that injustice will be created to these people and that there will be many people in those areas who will feel the full economic blast. Shop assistants and others working in these industries have hire-purchase and home-purchase commitments. If the operation of this legislation is not delayed for some time so as to give some period for readjustment, considerable hardship will ensue for many people. I could give many other examples of the need to consider some delay in the operation of this legislation. If other honourable members wish to look at this

question I am certain that they can expand on the thoughts I have put forward in this regard.

I intend placing on file amendments to delay the operation of this legislation. It has been suggested to me by certain people (and it has been well argued, too) that the Council should amend the Bill to ensure that no action is taken before the next election. I sincerely believe that if the Council adopted that attitude the Government could rightly charge it with doing so purely for political purposes. However, I do not believe that, with the axe falling on January 1, people will have a reasonable opportunity to adjust themselves. I hope the Government will concede that this is a valid point and not something put forward merely with the idea of seeking to embarrass the Government or of amending something for political purposes.

I turn now to page 20 of the Bill dealing with new section 227. This new section deals with the constitution or abolition of shopping districts. I support a change in the procedure in this regard, for the old procedure of petition and counter-petition was cumbersome and unwieldly and some revision was necessary. At the same time, I am not exactly enthralled by the new procedures suggested in this new section. The first three subsections deal with the fact that a council may apply to the Minister to constitute or abolish a shopping district. Subsection (4), dealing with how this is to be arranged, is as follows:

The council must attempt to ascertain the views of shopkeepers, shop assistants and other interested persons upon the subject of the application and the application must be accompanied by a statement of those views.

I do not think I have seen a clause that is more vague than that.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: That is a flexible clause!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is, but who will interpret its meaning? After the application has been received by the Minister of Labour and Industry he may then direct the council to conduct such further inquiry or to conduct a poll as he thinks necessary or expedient to ascertain the views of the electors resident within the portion of the area defined by the application. No boundaries are stated and there is no mention of a council ward or an electoral district. It seems to be just lines drawn on a map. Who will prepare the roll and then certify it? Who will vote? Will it be a voluntary or compulsory vote? Nothing is indicated, except that the council may be directed by the Minister about what it shall do.

Having gone through all this the Minister will then make up his mind to do what he wishes to do, anyway.

I have always agreed that the system of petition and counter-petition should be changed, but this new method is just as ridiculous, if not more so. The new procedure does not make any sense, and I suggest to the Government that it should reconsider new section 227 so that it can be reframed on the lines that councils outside the metropolitan area defined in the Bill should be able (without all this ballyhoo) to decide whether a shopping district should be created or abolished. Having made that decision the council applies to the Minister who, before following the recommendation of the council, can call for a referendum of electors within that shopping district. Having decided to call for a referendum it is the Government's responsibility to prepare the roll and conduct that referendum. If the council recommendation is approved by the referendum or the poll of the area the Minister should be bound to follow the wish of the majority of those who voted. This is a far more logical approach than the procedure recommended in the Bill.

I draw members' attention to the list of exempted goods in the fourth schedule. From memory, I believe that this is exactly the same as the list that came before the House of Assembly last session, but that Bill did not get through that House. So many anomalies and stupidities are associated with this list that a brilliant satirist could have a wonderful time and make his living by referring to them. However, I shall leave that matter to other speakers who will draw the Council's attention to those anomalies. At this stage I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ADULT FRANCHISE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 2192.)

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I should reply to what has been said by some honourable members. The Leader, in his speech, made it clear that he wanted the franchise for the Legislative Council to remain within the family. I listened with much interest to his remarks. Today, during a debate on another Bill, he said that what had been done was fit for *Punch* and perhaps the *Bulletin*.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I said that in respect of what was done in another place.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I suggest to the Leader that some of his remarks about this Bill are also fit to be included in *Punch* and the *Bulletin*, because there was so much bull in those remarks that a person would not be able to turn round without slipping. The Leader cannot have it both ways. Opposition members have claimed that this Council, although it was constituted about 120 years ago, is up to date. Yet the Leader has said many times that we have to up-date legislation and alter our laws because we are living in a changed world. People think differently today from what they did 120 years ago, and I ask the Leader to be more realistic so that when he judges the merits of legislation introduced 120 years ago he will appreciate that the same circumstances do not apply today. No honourable member could say that they apply today.

The whole situation rests on the fact that many members of this Chamber do not want any alteration to the existing Constitution, because they know that any alteration will be detrimental to the chances of retaining their place in this Chamber. Let us not kid ourselves about this. Honourable members will not vote for something that they know will mean that they will not be here after the next election. Members are so well protected now that they may serve a term of six years, come hell or high water, and they do not want that status to be interfered with: it is six years, and that is it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What about the Senate? Have you read the report by the Labor Senators on this matter?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I wish the Leader would let me make my speech. He has made his and I did not interject, although many times I would like to have done so but did not want to impress on the Leader that he was making airy-fairy statements all the time. Let us look at some of the statements that the Leader has made. First of all, he claims that, because the Labor Party wants to introduce compulsory voting for this Chamber, it is being very naive. We can say of the people who will not face up to Parliamentary responsibility today (and they claim to be a part of the Parliament of South Australia) that, if they are not prepared to give the people of this State a say in who should represent them in this Council, they could be very naive, too; they cannot have it just one way.

The Hon. C. R. Story: What do you mean by "they could be naive"?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: You are naive; you cannot just stipulate that because the Labor Party wants compulsory voting it is being naive. I say that honourable members who do not wish to give the people of this State the opportunity to vote for the persons they want to represent them here are being naive, too. We cannot force the issue by trying to throw the onus on the Labor Party because the onus is fairly and squarely on every member of this Chamber to decide whether he represents the people of this State or whether he represents a very small minority of them. I have felt strongly on this issue ever since I have been in this Parliament; I make no secret of it.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: You could not have been at the meeting at Salisbury last night.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I quote something else that the Leader said:

The Government's moves in this matter are designed to destroy the historic role of the Legislative Council.

It is certainly historic if nothing else because, if we go back 120 years, we find it was definitely a historic event when measures were then written into our Constitution that were never written into the Constitution of the British Parliament, the Parliament from which we took our cue. That is true, and that is why that Parliament has been able to whittle down the powers of the House of Lords. This is the situation in which we find ourselves.

The Hon. C. R. Story: But Britain has no written Constitution.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: We find that for some reason or other (no doubt, it is a political move) it is claimed that this Council is not political. That angers me because, if we talked about politics in this Chamber, one might say that this Bill had an even chance of getting through; but I will bet my bottom dollar now that this Bill will not see the light of day; it will be voted against overwhelmingly.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I hope so.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Then why waste your time discussing the Bill?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am pointing out the situation in this Chamber. The whole object in this Chamber over the years has been not to become too public: we must not emphasize what this Chamber does; we must play it down all the time because many people outside do not know that this Chamber even exists! If we ask them what the Legislative Council is or who their Legislative Council members are, they do not have a clue.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You would get a strange answer if you asked them what "M.L.C." stood for.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: They would probably answer "Methodist Ladies College". That is the whole purpose of this Chamber. However, that does not apply to the members of the Labor Party—and we are members of the Labor Party just as the remainder of the members are members of the Liberal and Country League.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: They take their orders from that organization.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: They are not members of the Liberal and Country Party, as it is sometimes claimed they are: they are members of the Liberal and Country League, although they like to be known as members of the Liberal and Country Party because the Country Party is starting to gain some ground in the country areas, where the people are saying, "Let us go for the Country Party." So the L.C.L. members cottoned on to the idea and said, "We had better call ourselves the L.C.P. so that we can counter this move." Sometimes they think of themselves as members of the L.C.L. and at other times as members of the L.C.P. If the cap fits, wear it—today L.C.L., tomorrow L.C.P.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Being Melbourne Cup day, too, it is a bob each way.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Then the Leader said:

I am sure that the people would demand that this Council should be as independent as possible from the Party-political pressures existing in another place.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is the provision of 16 members to four!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This is really laughable because honourable members are elected to this Chamber on the L.C.L. ticket and naturally they cannot claim to be other than members of the L.C.L. They cannot be independent and members of the L.C.L. at the same time, can they? They cannot have it both ways. When one is in a political Party, naturally one tends to follow the Party line.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You have to follow it in your Party.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I quite agree with the honourable member: members must follow the Party line. I remember a former Premier of this State, Sir Thomas Playford, saying this to me on one occasion. I asked him, "How do you get on with the Upper House?" He said, "They are a pretty difficult lot to contend with up there. I have been

invited to two of their Party meetings in my time as Premier of South Australia. On the first occasion I answered 'No'; on the second occasion I answered 'Yes'". They were the only two occasions that he, the Premier of the State for a record term of office, was called before the committee of the Council, and he was subjected to certain cross-examination and what have you. That was the answer he gave on those two occasions.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: He was taking you on, I think.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He influenced the Council because it voted for him.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Throughout his speech, the Leader talked about the independence of this Council and what a great job it was doing in the interests and welfare of the people of this State. He almost had me crying because it was so pathetic to think that people could be so gullible as to swallow this sort of stuff—because that is what it is. It is absolute political hypocrisy (if I may use those words) to claim that this Council is an independent House, a House of Review, and all that sort of nonsense, when it is not. Nobody can convince me otherwise. Honourable members can put this sort of twaddle to the electors and say, "We are the saviours of the rotten legislation introduced by the Labor Party." That is the sort of tactic going on on the other side of this Chamber, and that is absolutely ridiculous.

I believe that the people of this State should have the opportunity to elect a Government. If the Government (to put it in the words of the Leader) is so naive that it wants to introduce legislation to satisfy the whims of the Party bosses, as the Leader often calls them, then no doubt the people of this State should have the opportunity to throw it out at the next election. That is the whole system of democratic Government, in my book, but it cannot be done in this Chamber. For instance, a person must be at least 30 years of age before he can sit in this Chamber: he cannot come in when he is 21—he must be at least 30. Sir Arthur Rymill said that the 18-year-olds who go to war and serve overseas should have the right to vote for members of this Chamber. What about these young fellows coming back from Vietnam: are they eligible to vote for members of this Chamber?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The answer is "Yes".

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: At present the answer is "No". If a person had served in the Second World War, which was a declared

war, the answer would be "Yes". However, if a person had served in an undeclared war, the answer would be "No". Let us consider the position of the former Attorney-General of this State, Mr. Millhouse, who was a member of the household of the Millhouse family. He has been a member of the House of Assembly for many years, yet for some time he was not entitled to vote in Legislative Council elections.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: This causes you some concern?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Yes. Here we have a person elected by the people of the State to represent them in the House of Assembly, yet for some time he was not entitled to vote in Legislative Council elections. I do not think the honourable member realizes the full implications of this ridiculous situation. Why should Mr. Millhouse not have had a vote in Legislative Council elections? As a member of the Millhouse household, he did not own any property. Furthermore, he was not a returned serviceman and he was living with his family. Therefore, because of the provisions that had prevailed for so long, he was not allowed to vote in Legislative Council elections.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: He might have been a candidate to represent Central No. 2 District.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Honourable members cannot have it both ways. They should come down to earth and realize that, if they want to represent the people of the State, they should give all adult people the opportunity of voting for them. Honourable members do not admit that, if this Bill is passed, they may lose their seats. That is why we will see a bloc vote against this Bill.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I think there are a couple of enlightened ones amongst members opposite.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said that he wanted only a select few to be eligible to vote in Legislative Council elections. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and I have crossed swords on this matter in country newspapers for many years. During the debate on this Bill the honourable member said:

This makes it increasingly important that the Constitution should be framed in the best interests of the people.

I could not agree more. He continued:

Although the Constitution was drawn up in the last century, it does not mean that it is out of date: it is a modern Constitution in one of the most modern States in the world.

How can we describe something as being modern if it was introduced 120 years ago?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Labor Party's platform was framed in 1921.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Some points in the Constitution are probably applicable in today's modern world, but many of the provisions favoured by Opposition members were drawn up 120 years ago and are completely out-dated.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Our Constitution has been described as being the best in the world.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member continued:

The Constitution is such that the Legislative Council does not govern the State; it does not initiate policy; it cannot form a Government within this Chamber. It was so designed to review legislation, and I believe the record of Parliament in South Australia upholds the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution.

I then interjected as follows:

Do you honestly believe that?

The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan replied:

The honourable member will have his opportunity to speak later, if he so desires.

Obviously, the honourable member did not know what to say in reply to my interjection. Later, the Hon. Mr. Potter explained exactly how far-reaching the powers of this Council are. This Council has powers that are equal to those of the House of Assembly.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: No; it has not.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This Council has the power to throw out any Bill.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: The Minister should try to initiate a money Bill here!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This Council can initiate legislation. In addition, it can receive a Bill from the Lower House and, without even looking at it, throw it out. If the Council does not have powers equal to those of the House of Assembly, what does it have? If it did not have equal powers, it would not be able to take such action. If this Council is a House of Review, as honourable members claim, the ideal situation would be that the Council should have no right to throw out legislation that had been initiated by the Government, which had been elected by the people of the State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Would you say that we should not have thrown out the succession duties Bill?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall spell it out clearly. This Council should have no right, if it claims it is a House of Review, to

throw out any legislation that has been initiated by the Government, which has been elected by the people of the State.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why not?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am making my statements on the assumption that this Council claims to be a House of Review. As a matter of fact, this Council has more power than the House of Assembly has, because this place has the final say as to whether legislation passes or does not pass.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The people have the final say.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No. After legislation reaches this Council from the House of Assembly, it can be amended here. The amended Bill is then returned to the House of Assembly. It is only natural that at times the House of Assembly will not accept the Council's amendments, because the House of Assembly initiated the legislation in accordance with the policy on which the Government was elected. If the Council does not get its way it digs in its toes at conferences and says to the House of Assembly, "If you do not agree to our amendments we will throw out the Bill." Surely that means that this Council has more power than the elected Government of this State. No-one can deny that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is complete rubbish, and you know it.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is not.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They won't admit it.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: How explicit must I be? Honourable members will not face the facts. I shall go through the matter more slowly. I feel like a schoolteacher who is talking to a class of small children. Legislation on a policy matter may come from the House of Assembly to this Council, which may amend it. If the amendment is not agreed to by the House of Assembly, a conference is called between the two Houses. I hope honourable members are following me. If the Council digs its toes in and insists on the amendment, to which the House of Assembly does not agree, what happens? It is a deadlock, and the Bill is thrown out.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: There's a final court of appeal: the people of South Australia.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Council either accepts or rejects the Bill. It is not the people of South Australia who have the final say, because the people do not elect members to this Council. That is the whole crux of the matter. The Leader cannot have it both ways.

He is saying that we can reject any legislation we see fit to reject and go to the small number of the people who elect members to the Council. We do not go to the people; let us get that clear. If we go to the people, we should accept this Bill. I challenge the Leader to do that. He talks so much about going to the people to decide. This Bill is the only means of leaving it to the people to make the decision.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That's your decision.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I challenge the Leader to back his words. He has said that the people will decide. If the Leader wants the people to decide, he should accept the Bill; that is when the people will decide. The Leader is not game to do that, because he will lose his seat; that is why he will vote against the Bill. Let us not kid ourselves.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Government has the right to go to the people on this issue.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Government has the right to go to the people at any time. However, Council members are elected by a small number of the people.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And only once every six years.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It is not that I want to delay the passage of the Bill, which will not be passed anyway because honourable members are scared to accept voting by all the people of the State for Council elections. It is very interesting to note that Victoria and Western Australia have recently passed legislation of this nature to allow people in those States to decide who are to represent them in their Upper Chambers. The Upper House in New South Wales, as the Hon. Mr. Hill said some time ago, is elected by both Houses of Parliament. That State has a different set-up, but I read in an interstate newspaper a fortnight ago that the New South Wales Government is now contemplating following in the footsteps of Victoria and Western Australia.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Not seriously.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It has been discussed.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It has been discussed for 30 years.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: At least it is being discussed now.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: They still remember the referendum they held on this issue some years ago.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: One can line up arguments on this matter. Let us talk about

a bicameral system of government. The Liberal Party in Queensland has made no attempt to reinstate it. I am not saying that Queensland is wrong in doing what it is doing; it can do what it likes; it is its own affair. I am interested in affairs in South Australia but I am also interested in the fact that the Labor Party cannot be blamed for introducing a measure of this nature to satisfy its own whims, if one likes to call it that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It certainly is.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The only reason the Leader will not agree to this legislation is to satisfy his own whims, because he is scared to go to the people of the State to be elected. I remind the Leader of his couple of attempts to be elected to the House of Assembly. He did not do so well, and that is why he came into the Council.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Why did you come into the Council? Because you got sacked?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have heard some funny statements in my time but that one takes the cake. I support the Bill and its principle. If we are to have government for the people we should have government by the people. The only way we can have it is by allowing everyone to have a ballot-paper for Legislative Council elections. If we deny anyone in the State who is eligible to vote for the House of Assembly, the House of Representatives, or the Senate, the right to vote for the Council (we claim that the Council is a part of the Parliament of South Australia), we are a party to a system which might have been applicable 120 years ago but which is certainly not applicable in this modern day and age. I suggest to honourable members that they think very carefully about this Bill, because they cannot claim to have any right to deny the people of South Australia a vote for the Council. We have heard much talk about the family (which is a catch word); it may sound good.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It worries you a little.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It does not worry me. Such catch words do not mean a thing. I think the Leader is very disappointed that he did not get a write-up in the press about the family vote. I have mentioned how the family vote can operate. Members of a family can vote for the Lower House. However, those people cannot vote for members in this Chamber. What a disgusting circumstance

that is! I think it is high time that the people realized the protection this Council has enjoyed for the last 120 years.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: We want protection from this Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Leader wants all the protection he can get or he will lose his seat. I do not blame him for voting against the measure.

About the only L.C.L. honourable members who would hold their seats would be the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, the Hon. Mr. Hill, the Hon. Mr. Potter and the Hon. Mrs. Cooper. Would not members opposite be foolish to vote for something knowing full well that in a few years time they would be picking cherries or digging up the front garden?

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): We have been treated to a very interesting diatribe in the last few minutes. I do not know whether it struck other honourable members in the same way, but I wondered why the Minister left the delightful area he previously represented to seek greener pastures.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: To show that he could win under either system.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think the Minister has explained it well this afternoon.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The honourable member could not get into the House of Assembly when he tried.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: One thing I think would be even more attractive to the Minister, and that is the fact that not only did he come into the delightful Central No. 1 District, in which the Labor Party majority is very high, but by some mysterious means he was able to edge out another honourable member. I believe that that was a jolly nice way to have a bed of roses made for him. So I do not think he should be worried unduly about Opposition members, whom he has accused of being worried about their political futures. It would be much easier for many honourable members to sink their principles or throw them to the wind and do what is the popular thing at any time. In the years I have spent in this place, the honourable members that I have been associated with have been people of a calibre who have not thrown their principles to the wind on any one point and, if I judge the position correctly this time, they will not do so now just because it might be the popular thing to do.

It is terribly easy to be popular, but in this place (and I have been here since 1954) one needs a fair amount of moral fibre when it

comes to dealing with certain situations. I have not found members of this Council lacking in their responsibilities, and I take some exception to what has been suggested as the reason honourable members are speaking in opposition to this gimmick that has been put up by the Labor Party for its own political benefit.

What is being advocated by the Minister is something that one might call compulsory democracy, and, of course, it is in complete keeping with Socialism. Provided a Party can get a book of rules and put everyone in the same mould and then screw a lid down, it can control people and control pretty well anything else. That is precisely the object of this legislation and other forms of control. That is why I say I believe that this is nothing but compulsory democracy. In the other House the Opposition went to some pains to try to get the Government to bend just a little on such things as voluntary voting, separate rolls, and different elections days, but each one of those suggestions was rejected out of hand. The Labor Party in that House has the numbers, so its attitude is that it has the power and control. There is no minority thought down there. The Government would not accede to even the simplest amendments put forward by the Opposition in the other place, even though the Government stood to win (according to some speeches that I have read somewhere) half a loaf.

This is completely in conformity with what is Socialism and what we will get if we give complete and utter power into the hands of this Government. I believe that the Government, having failed in the first step, has made a slight change in its priorities. If we look at the *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders* of the Australian Labor Party (South Australian Branch) as amended to June, 1968, which costs 50c—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did you pay your 50c?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. I understand that one cannot get it free, otherwise I would have tried.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Give us another 50c and we will give you the latest one.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This one will be all right for my purpose.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I don't think this platform has changed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, it has not.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: We stick to our principles, the same as you stick to yours.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Under "Constitutional and Electoral", clause 1 (b) states:

That a second Parliamentary Chamber in South Australia is unnecessary and wasteful of public funds.

It goes on to say:

The immediate aim should be: the Legislative Council should be abolished after a favourable vote of citizens at an election at which abolition is an issue.

This was mentioned in the policy speech, so presumably we ought to be abolished. However, the Government's attitude is that it cannot accomplish that at the moment so it will have another go later. The rules go on to say:

Meanwhile, the Council should be reformed by (a) altering its powers to conform with those of the United Kingdom's House of Lords.

How nice it would be if we had the Hon. Lord Banfield and the Hon. Lord Shard!

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I think it would suit me, too.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I would not mind being the Hon. Lord Orange Grower from the River. The rules continue:

(b) Providing adult franchise in the voting for this House; and (c) boundaries for the Legislative Council allocated on the basis of one vote one value.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Of course, you can't do that: the people would get a fair go!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They are the steps of progression.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are not denying that that was in our policy speech that was endorsed at the last election?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think the Hon. Mr. Banfield said that the policy as enunciated by the Premier at that time was abolition. This Bill would be working towards that end.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is the first step.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is right.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The issue has to go to the people.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It does not.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is in the Constitution.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It would be necessary for a referendum to be held beforehand. However, it would not stop the Government from trying to get a double dissolution in order to get to that referendum. Therefore, I think what we are talking about is splitting hairs, rather.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: They can't have it both ways.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: At present, we are on the first leg of the quinnella. I have always believed that when one dishes it out one ought

to stay to receive. I think honourable members know what I mean. I have a few things I should like to dish out with reference to what was said a few moments ago. The claim that the franchise for this Chamber is confined to a tiny minority of people may be accepted by people who are ignorant of the facts. I should think that at present the position would be that about 88 per cent of the people are entitled to vote.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I think 85 per cent is about the best I could find.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I could agree, but that is hardly a tiny minority. This Government claims that it can obtain a true consensus of opinion of the people concerning shopping hours with a "No" vote of the size that it was, but thousands and thousands of people did not vote and thousands of people cast an informal vote.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: At least they had the opportunity to do it.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They have had the opportunity to enrol and vote for the Legislative Council for a long time, for at least 114 years.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Not the 85 per cent.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, but if we had real democracy and a voluntary voting basis for the House of Assembly I believe that the same position would obtain, except when people are stirred by issues and they deal with members through the ballot box. That means a voluntary explosive effort to show their disdain. However, in a situation where 25 per cent of the people are dragged to a poll against their will—people who do not want to be informed, who are to some extent imbued with false loyalties, and who are given bed-time stories about what will happen to their jobs if they do not vote in a certain way—then we are not getting an informed vote.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: They put people into Parliament who are afraid of voluntary voting: they have said this in their speeches.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was suggested, by way of a challenge to the Leader, that the present method of voting is completely archaic because it was introduced about 120 years ago. If one considers the history of this matter one finds there have been many changes in the Constitution to enable more people to be enrolled, the most recent being in 1969, when spouses were given this opportunity. I have had several letters from constituents, who have complained that their admirable wives cannot vote but a sinner with about five acres is able

to vote. This situation shows that these people have not kept in touch, because these women have been eligible to vote since 1969.

I wonder how many of their husbands have told them that they are eligible to enrol. Another aspect raised by the Minister about ex-servicemen was also tidied up in 1969. Returned servicemen from the Second World War, the Korean war, and members of the Merchant Navy have now been included in the provisions of the Act. The matter of those fighting in the undeclared war in Vietnam is in the hands of the Government to proclaim, so that more people could be enrolled. The provision is there and it is a matter of proclamation. Therefore, the Government is not giving the people who are entitled to vote the opportunity to do so unless it makes this proclamation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not the people who are entitled: the people who could be entitled.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am speaking of people who are eligible because of their presence in that theatre of service. Apparently, all avenues have not yet been explored by the Government in its cry for more democracy. I have not altered my ideas on this matter. At a time like this many things are happening that seem, to many of us, fairly indecisive and a bit frightening and worrying. Other Bills are to be introduced that deal with an alteration to the Constitution and with the Electoral Act. We hear of tremendous reforms: I consider that the privileges and pleasures that we have should be digested slowly. A person will not get indigestion from something he likes, but when he gorges it becomes nasty.

So many things have been suggested for this State in the charming 70's (or whatever they are called), but I should like changes to happen more slowly. Young people are being granted more privileges, but I have not noticed it suggested that they should be more responsible citizens. Many things disturb those of us who think about what is happening. It has been suggested that in the Council we often see a bloc vote, but many members are wondering in which direction we are going at present. If we retain the basis of the present system until we see something better, this State, and most certainly the future of this State, will be much better served. I like change but I like to take it quietly. Matters should be considered seriously when the time is opportune and after things have been sorted and sifted more. However, I will

not expedite the first step that will lead on to the five steps of a one-House system in Australia.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): First, let me make my position clear. I have principles: I stick to them and I rarely run away. I have advocated compulsory voting and full adult franchise for the Council since I have been a member. I sincerely believe in the abolition of this Council, and I have never said otherwise. I do not have to shift my ground: I stick to what I believe in, because I think it is right. Also, I think that most people believe that these principles are correct. When we went to the people at the last election we stated in our policy speech that this Bill would be introduced. If it is endorsed, I believe this Council should not have the right to say "No", even if it is a House of Review.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What if a Government proposed to extend its term of office to 10 years: would the Council have the right to defeat a Bill proposing that?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If it was in the policy speech and the people endorsed it, the Council would not have the right to do so. I do not think that any Government of this State that wanted to extend its term of office to 10 years would win but, if the people said "Yes", the Council would not have the right to go against that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Without a second House, it could happen, could it not?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not in the Leader's mind but maybe it could. I have sat patiently and listened to what honourable members have said and I should like to make my speech now. I have listened to the speeches made on this Bill with some perplexity at times, wondering what was going on. I have heard honourable members opposite who, I think, were seeing the light and realizing that the people wanted compulsory voting and full adult franchise. Some of the suggested amendments are, in effect, merely a repetition of what is already in the Constitution. Some honourable members say, "Yes; you can have full adult franchise but there must be separate rolls and different polling days; and you cannot abolish the Legislative Council without a referendum of the people." But the need for a referendum of the people is already contained in the Constitution. I do not know the purpose of that amendment. Perhaps it is for the purpose of easing the consciences of some honourable members or it may be in order to make things more difficult—I do not know.

Some honourable members opposing the Bill are speaking with a voice of fear. I heard the Hon. Mr. Story just now say that, because the Government is in power, it wants this and it wants that. I reverse that and say that those honourable members who speak along those lines in a voice of fear and with a sense of power are speaking with fear because they have the power and are afraid of losing it: the Council has more powers than the House of Assembly has. As the Minister of Agriculture has said, whether or not honourable members agree with him, the Council has the last say on whether or not a Bill goes through. That is the power that certain honourable members want to hold on to; they do not want full adult franchise or have to obey the will of the people. I have seen it happen in my time in this Chamber that, when the final crunch comes, it is not the House of Assembly that submits: on three or four occasions the majority of this Council has submitted rather than throw out a Bill and face the people. Is that true or not? I believe that sooner or later—

The Hon. C. R. Story: I do not agree with your suggestion of the motive.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Oh; you talked about power and people who wanted it.

The Hon. C. R. Story: You just said that the reason—

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Never mind what I just said; I said the truth and don't try to sidetrack me, because you will not.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It is no good talking to you if you won't listen.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member is the greatest sidetracker I know. He is not getting away with this one. Some honourable members talk with fear because they are afraid of losing the power they have.

The Hon. C. R. Story: How pathetic!

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is true and, when it comes to the final crunch at some time in the future (at one time I did not think I would live to see the day when the crunch would come in this Council, but I think it is coming; I sincerely believe it is coming—not because of what will happen to this Bill now but I can see it happening in the foreseeable future when we go to the people on whether the franchise for this Chamber should be conducted on the same lines as the Senate elections) I think the people will favour full adult franchise for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: How can we review legislation without the power to reject?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am not saying that we cannot review it; I am saying we have no right to reject specific points that have been plainly and clearly made in a policy speech and endorsed by the people.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: When you refer to the Senate, are you suggesting proportional representation?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I would be the last to advocate proportional representation. I am a Party man. It is my belief that many of the world's troubles stem from proportional representation.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: You were speaking of the Senate.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Senate has compulsory enrolment and a compulsory vote with proportional representation.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Except in the Northern Territory and the Australian Capital Territory.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. The only fair and reasonable system in this State is full adult franchise with all voting on the same day and on the same roll, with everybody having equal opportunity. This has been an enlightening debate. The change of heart in some quarters is encouraging. What will happen to the Bill? I have different views from those of the Minister of Agriculture: I think it will pass the second reading. I shall look with interest to see what the Opposition does—at one time voting with us and at another time voting the other way. I do not want to anticipate the result, but it will be most interesting. I thank honourable members for the attention they have given the Bill.

The PRESIDENT: As this Bill is an amendment to the Constitution Act and the Constitution of the Legislative Council, it is necessary that the second reading be carried by an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the Council. I have counted the Council and, there being present an absolute majority of members, I put the question, that this Bill be now read a second time.

The Council divided on the second reading:

Ayes (6)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey, C. M. Hill, A. F. Kneebone, F. J. Potter, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Noes (13)—The Hon. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, E. K. Russack, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

PINNAROO RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2124.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): This Bill relates to a problem that has plagued landowners and ratepayers in the Lameroo and Pinnaroo areas. My interest in it stems from my concern for local government in those areas. I fully realize that other honourable members are more conversant with other aspects of the area and the people there. The question of these breakwind reserves was often raised with me when I was directly concerned with local government. I am pleased to see that the problem has at last been tackled, although I must say that I think the method of solving the problem is not the best, unless the Minister ensures that in due course local government in the area is given almost absolute control over these particular breakwind reserves.

In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the history of the matter went back to 1903, when the Pinnaroo Railway Act was passed. The provisions of that Act allowed for the survey of additional Crown lands for allotment. Because of the dangers of sand drift, etc., that were expected as a result of the construction of the railway and other development in the area, the legislation provided that the Surveyor-General had power to reserve such portions of the four hundreds concerned as he deemed advisable to be perpetually reserved as breakwinds for the prevention of drift sand and soil. Because the perpetual reservation of the areas raised problems, further legislation was passed.

Because history has proved that the legislation did not satisfactorily indicate under whose actual control the reserves were to be, another Bill is now before this Council. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that the control of these areas would be vested in the Minister of Lands. He said:

The areas could then be dealt with in various ways. They could, for example, be dedicated as:

1. National Parks under the control of the National Parks Commission;
2. Reserves under the control of a district council;
3. Reserves under the control of the Minister.

Further problems that have been encountered in the area concern the making of roads, the opening of new roads, and the closing of old roads. In addition, problems arise because some of the reserves are actually being cropped by landowners. In other cases the natural vegetation and scrub land are being damaged.

Again, problems arise as a result of power lines passing over reserves.

For years local government in the Pinnaroo and Lameroo areas has been endeavouring to have these problems solved. For years it has been endeavouring to find out who really does control the breakwind reserves. In addition, local government has been endeavouring to satisfy those ratepayers who have reserve lands alongside their properties. Again, it has been endeavouring to solve the problems that arise when natural vegetation is wantonly destroyed, but it has never been able to get very far. For the last 18 months departmental officers have been in the area making inquiries and trying to solve the whole problem. What worries me is that this is typically a local government problem that can best be solved in the local government area by the local people. In referring to the areas, the Minister said that they could be dedicated as:

1. National Parks under the control of the National Parks Commission;

2. Reserves under the control of a district council;

3. Reserves under the control of the Minister.

When I read that part of the Minister's explanation I realized that local government in the area would not be given the amount of control it ought to be given. People concerned with local government in the area fear that, if this Bill is passed in its present form, they will still be plagued with much red tape and much time wasting through having to deal with the Lands Department in the city. However, if the control of these reserves could be given to local government, it would sort out the problems. That would be a far more satisfactory method of overcoming the difficulties.

Wherever I go throughout the State I hear adverse comments and criticism in connection with the Lands Department. It is not a question of criticizing the department's officers. I do not hear criticisms of individuals within the department; indeed, I hear quite kindly remarks about them. However, a massive system seems to have grown up in this State over a long time in which the Lands Department has become interwoven with the whole area of development throughout the State.

I think it is time that a very high-level inquiry, possibly even a Royal Commission, was instituted by the Government to investigate the question of whether or not the Lands Department should continue to expand further, as it will under the Bill, or whether the time has come for its activities to be curtailed. I am not suggesting retrenchments, as officers

could be transferred to other departments as vacancies occur with the passing of time. An investigation could disclose whether the department's staff could be reduced.

It is my belief that the staff could be reduced by about one-half or one-third of its present number. I think an inquiry should be undertaken to question the need for so much control when individuals who are leaseholders want changes in their leases. Is there a need for so many approvals and for the alleged unreasonable or reasonable delays when a leaseholder must go through some process that affects his lease?

In the whole question of leasehold and freehold, a high-level inquiry should be held to see whether there is a need for so much leasehold land in South Australia or whether it would be better in the State's interest to freehold much more of the existing leasehold land, and on what basis this should be done. I believe there should be far more freeholding; by this means the Lands Department could be reduced.

Regarding local government, I give an instance in point. Local government is concerned with the delays and problems that arise when dealing with the Lands Department. In the upper river towns, particularly Berri and Barmera, I am convinced that, because of the system that affects progress and development there, they have been restricted over the years, and will continue to be restricted.

Only last weekend I was talking to a leading resident of Coober Pedy, and I have been interested in that town's progress from the point of view of the Highways Department and of the need to seal the main street. It would appear that the delay with the Lands Department is still continuing, because the street has to be surveyed and laid out by the department. I stress again that I am not critical of the department's staff, but the whole system involved with our leaseholding and with the Lands Department should be made the subject of a top-level inquiry.

Therefore, I seek the Minister's assurance that he will give every consideration to this matter. He should give the maximum possible control to the district councils of Lameroo and Pinnaroo, the two councils concerned, because they can treat at the local level with the ratepayers involved in the problem occasioned by breakwind reserves. Those councils and the individuals in those areas can sort out their problems, which have been there for about a decade and which are still unresolved.

If the Minister retains control, as is stated in the Bill, that might be satisfactory. However, if those individuals and councils have to continue with red tape, with forms and with time being taken up in negotiations with what they consider to be a bureaucratic control in the city, they will remain discontented. My sympathies are with them in this matter. Therefore, I ask the Minister, when replying, seriously to consider giving an assurance that, first, he appreciates the problems of the

local people and, secondly, that he will continue to give the maximum possible control to local government in the control of these reserves in the future. If he does this, I will be prepared to support the second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.7 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 4, at 2.15 p.m.