

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 7, 1971

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

QUESTIONS

PAY-ROLL TAX

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of yesterday about pay-roll tax?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Regulations covering the collection of pay-roll tax are expected to be tabled in the South Australian Parliament during the week commencing October 19, 1971. Taxpayers will shortly receive by post return forms and circulars explaining the provisions of the South Australian Pay-Roll Tax Act and extending the time within which they should lodge their returns for the month of September, 1971, for 14 further days; that is, no penalties will be incurred if the returns are furnished by October 21, 1971. Persons who on August 31, 1971, were registered employers under the Commonwealth Pay-Roll Tax Act will be deemed to be registered under the State Pay-Roll Tax Act, and will not be required to complete a registration form unless specially requested to do so. The precise arrangements to be made with employers who may have paid pay-roll tax to the Commonwealth Deputy Commissioner of Taxation on account of periods after September 1, 1971, can be established only after reference to him, but there will be appropriate measures taken, if need be, by this Government to avoid any requirement of double taxation.

WHEAT QUOTAS

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: In the *Farmer and Grazier* of September 30 the Chairman of the Wheat Delivery Quota Advisory Committee, Mr. E. C. Roocke, said that notices would be sent to growers informing them of their quotas for the coming season. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what South Australia's quota is for the coming season and can he say whether it represents an increase or a decrease on last year's quota?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: South Australia's quota this year is 40,000,000 bushels, an increase of 4,000,000 bushels over last year's quota.

WEIGHING STATIONS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question arises out of confusion in the minds of some of my constituents regarding the correct procedure to be adopted at truck weighing stations. Honourable members will be aware that signs stating "All trucks stop" are placed 100 yards from weighing stations and, if these signs were obeyed literally, all trucks whether unladen, lightly laden or heavily laden would have to pull off the road and be weighed. I understand some people are under the impression that only those trucks which are actually waved in by the attendants at the weighing stations have to be weighed, and that other trucks which are obviously lightly laden need not be weighed. Will the Minister ascertain from his colleague what is the correct position in this regard?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will convey the honourable member's question to my colleague, and bring him back a reply as soon as it is available.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My further question also relates to truck weighing stations, and in particular to the one near the Cross Keys Hotel on the Port Wakefield Road. It is really a follow-up of the inquiry made by the Hon. Mr. Hart some time ago into a situation about which he and I were rather concerned. The roadway there is no wider than usual, and it is not possible, when trucks are turning off to that weighing station, for traffic to by-pass those big vehicles on the road. This not infrequently constitutes a very dangerous situation. Can the Minister say whether any further progress has been made in either widening the road or shifting the location of the weighing station in view of the danger that occurs there?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to take that request, too, to my colleague and bring back a reply.

HOSPITAL SECURITY

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on September 14 regarding security at the Glenside Hospital?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: A detailed report covering the escape of Bernardo Zabinski, a patient in the hospital for criminal mental defectives, Eastwood, has been provided by the Superintendent of Glenside Hospital. In summary, the patient Zabinski, who had been charged with attempted murder but who had not been tried, was admitted to the hospital for criminal mental defectives on January 8, 1958. During the 13-year period of detention in the hospital for criminal mental defectives, the patient remained reasonably co-operative, and there was no history of any aggressive conduct on his part. Zabinski had never been a disciplinary problem within the ward and in that sense was trusted. At 8 a.m. on September 9, 1971, the date of the patient's escape, Zabinski, in company with three other trusted patients, assisted a male nurse at the hospital in placing laundry bags outside the main gate of the ward. The patient escaped the notice of the male nurse while the nurse had his head turned away to see whether there were more laundry bags to take out from the ward area.

Normally, two male nurses supervise two to four patients in the handling of this laundry. On this particular day, the telephone rang and one male nurse answered it, leaving the second male nurse in charge with the four patients. A prompt search of the surrounding hospital grounds was instituted, but the patient escaped detection. On the day in question, it was raining heavily, which explains why few people were out in the open area surrounding the ward and why the patient's movements were not noticed by other patients or staff members. It is considered by hospital authorities that the escape was not premeditated and that the patient acted impulsively.

The male nurse concerned, whose attention was distracted at the time of the patient's escape, has been charged with being negligent in his duties and he has suffered the severest disciplinary action that the Superintendent of the hospital is empowered to take: a reprimand and a fine. The security within the internal area of the ward for criminal mental defectives is high, and there have been no escapes directly from this ward over the past seven to eight years. Breakdown of security on this occasion was caused by the human element.

POLDA-KIMBA MAIN

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am sure honourable members are aware of my concern regarding an early completion of construction of the Polda-Kimba main and of my disappointment at the recent rejection by the Commonwealth Government's Water Resources Committee of any financial assistance for this scheme. It took the South Australian Engineering and Water Supply Department about six years to compile the necessary evidence for submission. Yesterday, in conversation with Senator Jessop, I learned that the Minister for National Development had told him that the submission by the South Australian Government did not comply with the requirements of the criteria laid down by the Water Resources Committee. First, will the Minister ascertain from his colleague why the necessary guidelines for such a submission were not studied by our department in the first place? Secondly, will the department ascertain as quickly as possible the necessary criteria and supply any further evidence that may be required?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be pleased to do that.

POISON 1080

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Some of my constituents in the Glencoe area have become concerned about the use of the poison 1080 in forestry reserves and on adjoining roadsides. Can 1080 be detected in the remains of native animals and birds and will the Minister have a full investigation made into the use of this poison on the forestry reserves (which are, I think, declared sanctuaries) to see whether the poison 1080 is reducing the number of animals and birds?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I will take the honourable member's request to my colleague, the Minister of Environment and Conservation, and get a reply.

TRANSPORT CONTROL BOARD

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I notice in the Transport Control Board's annual report, dated

August 16, 1971, that the three-year term of the board expires on or about December 10 of this year. The Government has indicated that some changes are to be made in the Transport Department. One example is the proposed appointment of a Director-General of Transport. Is it proposed to retain the Transport Control Board as the licensing authority for country buses for a further three-year term under the Road and Railway Transport Act, 1930-71, or is some other licensing authority envisaged after December of this year?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I know that my colleague is looking into this matter. I will convey the honourable member's question to him and bring back a reply as soon as it is available.

DARTMOUTH DAM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I noticed recently that there is to be a further study into the Dartmouth dam in view of the fact that the estimated cost has increased by more than the 10 per cent allowance for contingencies provided under the agreement, and that there is to be embodied a study into the possibility of using the dam for a hydro-electric scheme. As I understand it, very little water has ever been saved in the Snowy Mountains because of the heavy drain on the waters for hydro-electric purposes. As the Dartmouth dam, if my memory serves me correctly, would receive an intake of only about 500,000 acre feet a year, such a scheme would perhaps work to the detriment of the main purpose of the dam, which is to give an assured water supply to South Australia. Will the Minister find out whether the facts I have given are correct, and whether this State's Commissioner and the South Australian Government favour using the dam for a hydro-electric scheme?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply when it is available. It has always been my impression that water now used for hydro-electric purposes in the Snowy Mountains scheme is pumped back into Lake Eucumbene. That is the way I have always interpreted it.

SPEED LIMITS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked on September 30 regarding speed limits on country roads?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have received the following reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport:

It is the Government's intention to introduce as soon as possible (and probably during the current session of this Parliament) appropriate legislation relating to the speeds of commercial vehicles. If this legislation is passed in the form proposed by the Government, it will solve the problem raised by the honourable member.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, supplementary to that asked by the Leader concerning maximum speeds for commercial vehicles.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The problems raised with the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, with me, and, I am sure, with other members, by drivers of heavy commercial vehicles concerning the maximum speed limit existing at present have become more difficult because of the operation of the points demerit scheme. Proposals to increase the maximum speeds of commercial vehicles have been under consideration from some considerable time. Honourable members from both Parties attended speed limit tests conducted north of Parafield in, I think, 1969. Will the Minister investigate this matter on behalf of the drivers of heavy vehicles who have been prosecuted and who have lost points under the points demerit scheme for their offences, so that these offences can be given special consideration in the appeal rights of drivers against the loss of points under the scheme in view of the answer just given to the Leader on this matter, indicating that it is the subject of legislation coming forward during this session?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I do not want to answer the question for my colleague, but I think we would be creating a pretty important precedent if we were to say that when someone has been charged with breaking a law we should look at the situation because subsequently the law might be amended. However, that is only my personal opinion, and I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

UPPER MURRAY FORESTER

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to the question I asked on October 5 regarding the work of the forester in the Upper Murray area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Conservator of Forests has informed me that some progress has been made in carrying out rehabilitation work of the natural forest areas along the Murray River under the control of the department. At Murtho Forest Reserve, some trial plots have been established following the recent high river, to study the conditions necessary for optimum regeneration of both river red gum and river box. In order to assist in maintaining this regeneration at a maximum, notice to cancel all grazing leases has been given. In addition, some 200 to 300 acres have been fenced to prevent grazing and so obtain regeneration, principally of native pine. Vermin destruction is to be undertaken. A considerable amount of survey work has been carried out on Crown lands in the district in order to define areas which may be suitable for retention as forest reserve and subsequent management as red gum and river box forest. No trial plantings of poplars have yet been made on Woods and Forests Department land, but this will be done in the near future. However, several species of poplar, including *Populus deltoides*, have been raised in considerable numbers at our Riverland nursery at Berri, for distribution in the Upper Murray district.

HOSPITAL FEES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I know that the Minister is fully aware of the problem to which I refer. For years many hospitals have suffered considerable financial stringency as a result of the long delay in collecting fees following the treatment of accident cases. Can the Government offer any measures to mitigate this problem?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I appreciate the problem, because large sums of money are owing to hospitals throughout the State for cases of this kind. The Government has looked at the question, but the Attorney-General was of the opinion that when the three-tier court system was functioning properly hospitals would get their money much more

quickly. I might say, with due respect to members of the profession within this Chamber and outside, that the kernel of the problem, so I am informed, is that solicitors acting for various people are not always keen to effect settlements because their clients' best interests could be affected. However, we are closely watching the position and, if it does not improve very soon, the matter can be raised again with a view to bringing about quicker settlements in the future.

WATER REPELLENT SANDS

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: I believe that over the last 12 to 14 years the Agriculture Department has done much work in connection with water repellent sands, which cause problems in many parts of the State and result in costs to primary producers of millions of dollars. Mainly as a result of a shortage of funds, the Agriculture Department slackened off its programme in this connection about five or six years ago. The Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization was doing similar work. The primary producers affected have fallen between two stools, because everybody's business is nobody's business. When I was Minister of Agriculture I called a conference between Dr. Hallstrom, then the chief officer of the C.S.I.R.O. in South Australia, and the Director of Agriculture; it was agreed that the Agriculture Department would do as much as possible, with the officers and transport available, and that the C.S.I.R.O. would ask for a special grant to see that the work was speeded up. To my knowledge, very little progress has since been made in finding a solution. Will the Minister ascertain the present position and, if necessary, take up the matter (through the Director of Agriculture) with the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science, who is responsible for the C.S.I.R.O., to see whether a greater proportion of the finance available to that body can be devoted to this matter, which is so important to South Australian primary producers?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall be happy to do that for the honourable member.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

Hackham East Primary School,
Western Suburbs Water Supply Augmentation.

MINING BILL

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

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT ABOLITION BILL

Read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary):
I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The powers of the South Australian Housing Trust with respect to the provision of factories have been reviewed, and one result of that review is the decision to repeal that section of the principal Act which gives the trust power to build factories on trust land outside the metropolitan area. This Act is not the proper home for such a provision, as the Act should obviously deal only with the powers, functions and duties of the Industries Development Committee. In 1961 the powers given to the trust under the section proposed to be repealed were substantially repeated in an amendment to the Housing Improvement Act, without the restriction relating to building only on land outside the metropolitan area. Section 25 of the principal Act is therefore virtually redundant and is repealed in this Bill.

In order to clarify the whole situation, it is provided in this Bill that it is one of the functions of the Industries Development Committee to investigate any matters referred to it by any body such as the Minister and to make reports and recommendations thereon. The Chairman of the committee has signified that, as long as the committee's role in the whole matter relating to the provision of factories by the trust is clearly defined, there is no objection to repealing the redundant section. I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 10 of the principal Act by providing that it is one of the committee's functions to investigate and report and make recommendations on matters referred to it under any Act. Clause

3 repeals section 25 and the heading thereto, which deal with the provision of factories by the trust in country areas.

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

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary):
I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In recent years some doubts have been cast on the power of the South Australian Housing Trust to purchase factories. Of the three Acts that govern the activities of the Housing Trust, both the Housing Improvement Act and the Industries Development Act give power to the trust to build factories (restricted in the case of the latter Act to building on trust land outside the metropolitan area), but make no express provision for the purchase of factories. The South Australian Housing Trust Act provides the general powers of the trust and makes no reference to factories at all.

The Housing Improvement Act does give the trust power to buy land for any purpose other than housing if it is necessary or desirable so to do for the development of a particular locality, and it is under this power that the trust has in the past purchased several factories. However, in view of the doubts expressed and the criticisms levelled, the Government proposes to put the matter beyond question, as it appears obvious that the trust must have as clear a power to purchase factories as it has to build factories. So that the trust may operate as a developer to the best advantage and benefit of the community as a whole, it is further proposed not to restrict the power to build and purchase factories to land outside the metropolitan area. In many cases it is obviously desirable to provide factory employment in or close to those areas being developed or redeveloped by the trust. Safeguards will be the consent of the Governor and the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee in respect of any proposed erection or purchase of a factory. The Housing Improvement Act is the proper home for provisions dealing expressly with factories, if for no other reason than that it is under this Act that the trust obtains funds for the building of factories.

The Bill also seeks to remedy an inconsistency that exists regarding additions made by the trust to factories. At present, the trust has no express power to make additions to a factory and so is not obliged to obtain the consent of

the Governor or the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee before making such alterations, however major they may be. The Bill seeks to remedy this situation. I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 16 of the principal Act by inserting words that give the trust power to make additions to factories subject to the existing requirements regarding the consent of the Governor and the recommendation of the Industries Development Committee. Paragraph (c) provides the trust with the power to purchase factories and land used in connection therewith.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal Act constitutes the trust and sets out its general powers with respect to the carrying into effect of that Act. As the Housing Trust is also given substantial powers as the housing authority under and by virtue of the Housing Improvement Act, it is desirable to add to the principal Act a covering power so that the trust may act under any other Act without question and to the full extent permitted under such other Act. I will now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 20 of the principal Act, by giving the trust power to exercise any power conferred on it by or under any other Act.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1961.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I rise to comment briefly on the Bill, realizing that I have no power to alter any of the lines in the Estimates. The total receipts for the 1971-72 financial year, including taxation received from several new sources, are estimated to be \$446,622,000, while the total expenditure for the same period is expected to be \$454,000,000, leaving a deficit of \$7,500,000 for the financial year. It is on that deficit that I wish to comment.

It seems to me inappropriate that, although it is receiving extra interest-free grants from the Commonwealth Government and obtaining

increased revenue from taxation, thereby having more money to spend than it has had before, this State should be budgeting for a deficit of \$7,500,000. It is hoped that the Treasurer knows his business and that he can create new employment which will, in turn, return real financial benefit to South Australia.

Honourable members who have spoken have gone into some detail regarding the Bill. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has spelt out exactly what the Government intends to do. He said in a few concise words that State taxation would increase by \$30,000,000, while South Australia's charges for services would increase by \$21,000,000. As South Australia is to receive an extra \$24,000,000 in reimbursements from the Commonwealth Government, this means that this year's total revenue has increased by about \$79,000,000 over last year's revenue.

There are many provisions in the Bill which, it is hoped, will gain extra income for the State. However, little provision has been made to assist the rural industry. At a time when the industry is at an all-time low, it is not much consolation for those engaged in it to be told, as the Hon. Mr. Banfield has told them, that South Australia has the cheapest freight rates in the Commonwealth, because those freight rates are still too high. It is obvious that grand attempts will be made to entice tourists to South Australia. Indeed, the Hon. Mr. Banfield referred to this and outlined some ways by which tourists could be attracted here. Not so long ago, we were told that the rural industry was not of great consequence because the mineral boom would take over and bring income to South Australia. However, that idea seems to have lost favour, and now tourism is being concentrated upon. I do not have much faith in the mineral boom; nor do I have much faith that tourism will provide the income that South Australia needs.

However, I must not condemn the whole Bill, because I realize that it must be a mammoth task for the Treasurer to allot the available finances in a manner that is likely to please many people. Of course, some will be delighted with their allocations. I should think the Minister of Environment and Conservation would be pleased with the increased allocation for his department. The provision for the Minister of Agriculture again outlines the Government's attitude to primary production. The Agriculture Department, which should have received as much assistance as possible, has been treated poorly. The economics of the industry are such that any advice that can be given

to it or any research that can be carried out in relation to it should be forthcoming. However, I am pleased to see that many of the projects in the area I represent have been reasonably well served. At least, they are continuing and the allocation to them this year is, in most instances, higher than it was last year. However, we must take into consideration that the State has \$75,000,000 more to allocate than it had last year.

The bulk grain facilities at Port Lincoln, including an extension of the existing pier, are to commence this year. They will be of great benefit to Eyre Peninsula wheatgrowers. Likewise, improvements to the port of Thevenard are to continue, and a further \$690,000 has been allocated for this work. That must afford some further relief and provide an economic return for the people in the Far West. Work at the Port Augusta and Port Pirie Hospitals is proceeding and, I think, is abreast of schedule. The Port Augusta Hospital, which was in a very run down state, has received another \$1,110,000 this year as part of the \$4,000,000 scheme necessary to complete that project. The Port Pirie Hospital has been allocated \$400,000, which must be of great assistance.

Fishing havens are to have \$140,000 spent on them and on the ancillary facilities that go with them. This is an increase of \$85,000, which is greatly appreciated by the fishermen, who are finding it harder and harder to cope. Fishing has not been nearly as lucrative in the last two years as it was previously. I turn now to the Kimba main. The scheme is estimated to cost \$2,867,000. About half of that money has been spent, and the main is half completed. This year the State Government is to allocate another \$859,000. As I have previously said, I am just as concerned as is the State Government (and perhaps even more so) that this scheme shall be completed as quickly as possible. During the discussions I have had with Commonwealth members in relation to the Commonwealth Government's rejecting an application for financial assistance, I have been asked, "Why belabour the Commonwealth Government? Why not see whether you cannot get more money from the State Government?"

That is well-founded advice. I cannot quite understand why it is necessary to prolong this scheme in this way. If we can provide tourist facilities on the off chance that we shall get international visitors, who will bring money with them and perhaps spend part of it, we can spend money to maintain the district of Kimba and the county of Buxton. In fact, over the

last five years some \$300,000 has been spent by the Government to provide water for the area. We appreciate the fact that the Government has come to the party, but we can never quite understand why more money cannot be spent on the Kimba main to stop this unnecessary expenditure.

Again, this year, \$120,000 has already been approved for water cartage. The district has never been in a poorer state for water at this time of the year than now. As the crops have been reasonable and the feed has been good, there has been no run-off. I am sure no honourable member who knows the area will say that the people have not made every attempt to provide the necessary facilities. In my office I have a map of the area, which shows the county of Buxton being rather like the Coober Pedy opal field, so many diggings for dams having been made in that area.

With the \$120,000 approved for this year, \$425,000 will have been spent by the Government to bring water to the area. On top of that, honourable members can imagine what an expense it is to the primary producers in that area who have to queue, sometimes for hours, waiting for more water from the tanks provided in the railway area where the water is dumped. The cost of a heavy vehicle and the wages of a man just sitting there waiting to cart water must be considered, too. I appeal to the Government to consider spending as much money as it can to complete at least the trunk main as soon as possible.

I have here extracts from various speeches made by Ministers over the years. One, which was made in 1963 by the then Minister of Works, is as follows:

In the past 20 years Eyre Peninsula has become one of the most important producing areas of the State and water is essential to its future.

That was said at Kimba, and I believe it was true. There is not an area in the State that could continue if the reticulated water scheme was to be stopped. There is no foundation for saying that the economy would not support a reticulated scheme. The fact that the district has been able to survive without a reticulation scheme must surely prove that the economics are right for the provision of such a scheme. Another extract I have here is from the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune*, in 1923, which states:

Kimba. Water carting is still the item on the programme here. We read long letters in the papers of how things will be better for us in about three years or so, when the Tod and Poldia schemes are reticulated. That is something to look forward to, but let us hope it rains before then.

Of course, it has rained a few times in the intervening 50 years, but the position has not been corrected. I make a final plea to the Government members of this Council to do all they can to endeavour to have State money allotted to this essential scheme.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I have listened with interest to the comments of members opposite on the Budget. Of course, we have heard it all before. It is the old, old story of "Spend more, tax less, and balance the Budget". We have heard that every time. I suppose it is the Opposition's prerogative to criticize the Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It was constructive criticism.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I did not think it was. In fact, I thought honourable members were most extravagant in the terms they used. I listened with interest to the Hon. Mr. Banfield's comments on some of the things honourable members opposite had said. I thought he answered them very effectively indeed, and I would not want to gild the lily in this respect. I noticed that honourable members listened with interest, too, to what he had to say, and at times they even seemed to want to join in and help him.

I agree with some of the things that the Hon. Mr. Whyte said a few moments ago. I agree that the rural industries need assistance. I also say that the rural reconstruction scheme, the conditions of which are laid down by the Commonwealth Government, does not go far enough. As I said recently, the various State Ministers are getting together at the end of this month to discuss their experiences in the administration of this scheme, and I am sure that, resulting from those discussions, an approach will be made to the Commonwealth for further assistance in this regard. The Hon. Mr. Whyte said that we had been told that the metals boom was such that metals would take over from rural industry. I do not know who told him that, but that is in line with many statements that are made here. We are always hearing members say, "We have been told", and thereby people outside infer that the Government has said this. I do not remember hearing this statement made by this Government. In fact, a person would need a crystal ball to enable him to make such a statement.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: It is a completely irresponsible statement.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: I did not refer to the Government at all.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Government has never made a statement like that. Then something was said about turning to tourism. I say that previous Governments have missed the boat on tourism in South Australia, and if this Government is showing an interest in tourism, good luck to it; it should have been done a long time ago. Under the previous Government, the Tourist Bureau in this State was the Cinderella of all the departments.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Who started the subsidy scheme on caravan parks?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I am not talking about that: I am talking about general tourism. The honourable member who is interjecting said, "We do not want tourists, because all the tourist does is come here with \$10 and a shirt and he does not change either of them." That sort of statement is a great help to this State in developing something that has been of interest to every other State but South Australia up to this point! We are interested in tourism, and we need tourists, because tourists bring something here.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I said, "A clean shirt".

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It is the same thing, and it is a statement that is not designed to help South Australia in regard to tourists.

The Hon. C. R. Story: When you get as much out of tourism as you get out of primary industry, you will be all right.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I have here a reply to a query raised by the Hon. Mr. Hill regarding quarrying at Anstey Hill. This report, provided by the Secretary of the State Planning Authority, is as follows:

Land was purchased by the authority at Anstey Hill (Reserve 13) on October 5, 1970, following approval given by Cabinet on December, 15, 1969. At the time of acquisition there was an operative quarry on the site. Cabinet approval was sought and obtained before acquisition was completed on August 31, 1970, to permit the continued use of the quarry after acquisition. No right of renewal exists beyond the initial lease period. The adjacent site was under separate ownership, but quarrying operations were being undertaken across the property boundaries. The State Planning Authority has successfully negotiated for acquisition of the second property and operating quarry operations (approved for acquisition April 5, 1971, acquired August 13, 1971).

The State Planning Authority has not "opened up" or permitted to be "opened up" any new quarries on land purchased by it, nor has it operated any quarries in its own right. The

authority has negotiated at length with the quarry operators and has reached agreement that the quarrying operations be permitted to continue, to allow *inter alia* the rehabilitation of the quarry under conditions compatible with the long term use of the land as a recreation reserve. The details of the lease were prepared in conjunction with the authority's Extractive Industries Committee. It has been agreed that the particular quarry operations will be undertaken in such a manner that detailed rehabilitation, tree and shrub planting (under the guidance of the Botanic Gardens) will be an excellent model for similar operations. It appears impracticable to stop the operation of quarries once purchased, because their retention without detailed rehabilitation and development may render the properties so acquired completely unsafe and unsatisfactory for the long-term use of the land. Continued quarrying in some cases will obviate the need for the authority to expend considerable sums of public money to develop the properties for safe use as public recreation reserves.

The Hon. Mr. Hill also asked a question about the railways. A small committee was recently appointed by the Government to investigate the efficiency of the South Australian Railways and to report on economies that could be introduced to effect savings in expenditure. The committee consists of Mr. W. Voyzey of the Premier's Policy Secretariat, as Chairman; Mr. I. J. Lees of the Highways Department; and Mr. D. C. Rodway of the Policy Secretariat. The question of staffing will be among the matters to be considered by the committee.

The only line in the Minister's Department for field officers which shows an increase refers to administrative staff and field officers of the Road Safety Council. That relates to the office of the Minister of Roads and Transport. Also, four additional field officers and also one clerk and one typiste were appointed in February, 1971, as a result of the Government's decision to expand the work of the Road Safety Council.

There has not been any increase in the staff of the office of the Secretary for Local Government. The increase in the actual payments last year compared with the amount voted was caused solely by the cost of living increase in December, 1970, and a Public Service award increase in January, 1971. It is pointed out that this one line includes also the staff of the Transport Control Board. The field officers and inspectors referred to in this line include an inspecting accountant in the Local Government Office and an inspector with the Transport Control Board.

The \$100,000 for the purchase of land refers to the land at Warradale to be used for the

Road Safety Instruction Centre, as the Hon. Mr. Hill had assumed. The land is being purchased from the Public Buildings Department at a figure that was approved by Cabinet. If I have not replied to all the queries raised by honourable members, I should be happy if they would ask their questions again during Question Time, when I will endeavour to answer them.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I want to thank members for the attention they have given to the Bill, although naturally I would not agree with everything that has been said. However, I do not intend to reply other than to give direct answers to specific questions, all of which, I think, concern the Hon. Mr. Hill. During the second reading debate the honourable member said:

I am not particularly critical of the expected increase in such expenditure, but I am worried about some mysterious figures under the heading "Contingencies". The sum of \$27,000 is provided for feasibility studies by consultants, but no other details are given. Then \$21,000 is provided for the item "Overseas representation—Fees and displays".

Concerning the feasibility studies, an industrial "Gaps Study" expected to cost at least \$15,000 has been provided for. It is hoped that one or two other in-depth studies may also be commissioned. In overseas representation, fees and displays, retaining allowances for overseas representatives are at present being debited to the publicity account. Creation of a special line for this expenditure appears to be warranted. The details are as follows:

Retainers	4 @ \$2,500	\$10,000
(Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore and Indonesia)		
Displays	4 @ \$1,500	\$6,000
Service		\$5,000
making a total of \$21,000.		

The next question concerned publicity and information for industrial promotion. Expenditure last year fell short of the projected \$85,000 because some advertisements were not lodged in foreign newspapers. This was in part due to inability to prepare copy in time for certain special issues, but also because of increasing doubts as to the effectiveness of such advertising, following poor responses. The sum of \$57,000 for 1971-72 includes \$30,000 for publications and \$25,800 for agency work and advertisements. The balance covers cine services and minor promotional expenses, including assistance to trade missions. Last financial year amounts paid for fees and displays, and so on, were included in this line, but they have been separated this year.

The next matter concerns the grant to the Waikerie Gliding Club, to assist the club to stage the World Gliding Championships in 1974. The grant covers approximately half the cost of an administration building, public toilets, and an irrigation system.

I hope this information will satisfy honourable members, but if I have missed a question on which any honourable member requires more information regarding any of my departments I would be very pleased to get the information for him if the matter were raised again.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Appropriation of General Revenue."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to line 11 on page 2 under the heading "Premier", and the amount alongside that. This heading covers the item I referred to in the debate regarding the quarries being operated at Anstey Hill. The Minister of Lands gave me a reply concerning this matter only a few moments ago. I have not had time to study that reply, but I was further disturbed by some of its contents as I heard it across the Chamber.

I do not want to place any blame or responsibility upon the State Planning Authority. My main objection and my main criticism must be of the Government. In August, 1969, according to the Minister as I heard him a moment ago, the Government authorized this operation to continue. The State Planning Authority says it is not operating its own quarries and it has not opened up any of its land for quarry purposes. However, the State Planning Authority has leased the land to a quarry operator.

There is not much difference, when one is concerned with conservation, whether it is done by the authority or by the lessee of the authority; the quarry is being operated. As I understood the Minister, he said that the authority has intimated that it does not intend to renew the lease. That is a most gracious statement after the lease has been signed for a 10-year term! Then the authority continues to try to give the impression that it is simply a tidying-up operation so that the old quarry can be used for recreational purposes.

I repeat what I said in the second reading debate. If it is a tidying-up operation, why is it expected that about 2,000,000 tons of

stone will come out of it? It may well be 4,000,000 tons if we look at the two quarries concerned, but I am not certain of that because I could not quite follow the wording of the Minister's reply. Forgetting for the moment the figure of 4,000,000, and coming back to the admitted estimate of 2,000,000 tons to be taken from the quarry, the lessor of which is the State Planning Authority, a body that is now balanced in the interests of conservation through its membership, the whole story is an ugly one.

How will we ever make any real advance in our path towards conservation when the Government allows the authority to lease some of this land it has bought for open spaces on the Hills face? How can we do this when the Government allows one of its departments, the State Planning Authority, to give a lease of this kind, and admits that probably 2,000,000 tons of stone is to be taken out of it in the 10-year period? This makes a mockery of conservation and I lodge the very strongest protest.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what portion of the \$311,170 allocated to the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation relates to fisheries and what portion relates to fauna conservation? Will a portion of the allocation be transferred in due course to the department of the Minister of Environment and Conservation?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I shall get the information for the honourable member. Until the Minister of Environment and Conservation gets his staff together, we will not know what sum needs to be transferred or whether a new provision will be made available.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I thought that a sum would have been earmarked.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Not at this stage.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what progress has been made in rehousing the Chemistry Department?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I assure the honourable member that the matter has been referred to the Public Buildings Department and that new houses will be provided for the Chemistry Department.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I was not referring to houses. When will the Chemistry Department be provided with a satisfactory set of offices?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That matter is also under consideration. I believe that a block of land in Angas Street was under consideration, and plans are being drawn up.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1955.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill imposes a series of sharp increases in the rates of stamp duties in South Australia. According to the Chief Secretary's second reading explanation, the increases will raise more than \$4,000,000 in a full financial year and about \$2,250,000 in the remainder of this financial year. I am sure that honourable members must view with deep concern the magnitude of the increases. During the debates on the Appropriation Bill and the Public Purposes Loan Bill I questioned the Government's wisdom in imposing heavy increases in duties and charges, in view of the dramatic changes that had been made in Commonwealth-State financial arrangements. I shall briefly restate those changes. The Commonwealth Government has assumed responsibility for about \$27,000,000 a year of the existing State public debt. Further, it is making available about \$27,000,000 a year to the States not by way of loan but by way of grant, free of interest, for capital purposes. This has had and will have a continuing effect on the resources available for budgetary purposes in South Australia.

We have recently passed legislation providing for the transfer of pay-roll tax from the Commonwealth to this State and increasing the rate of that tax from 2½ per cent to 3½ per cent. This means an increase in funds available from pay-roll tax of about \$10,000,000 a year. We must also bear in mind the proposed increases in charges, yet the Government still sees a need to budget for a \$7,500,000 deficit and to increase stamp duties steeply.

I should like quickly to refer to the increases in taxation included in the Bill, and I refer first to the stamp duty on motor vehicles. The stamp duty, when one is registering a motor vehicle, is to be \$1 for each \$100 or part thereof up to a value of \$1,000, beyond which there is to be a graduated scale at the rate of \$2 for each \$100 for that portion of the value

that exceeds \$1,000 but does not exceed \$2,000, and then \$2.50 for each \$100 on that portion of the value in excess of \$2,000. At present, the rate of duty is \$2 for each \$200 of the purchase price. One can see, therefore, that there is to be a considerable rise of about 100 per cent (although I have not worked it out exactly) in stamp duty on motor vehicles.

The rate of duty on voluntary conveyances or conveyances on property sales, the value of which does not exceed \$12,000, is to remain unaltered at 1½ per cent. Then, a graduated rate is to apply, increasing finally to 3 per cent on the portion of the value of a conveyance exceeding \$12,000. Without examining the principal Act, I think the duty is at present 1½ per cent, graduating to 1½ per cent. If one examines this matter, one will see (although I have not yet checked the figures) that there is to be an increase of nearly 100 per cent in stamp duties on property sales.

Duty on conveyances of marketable securities is to be increased from .4 per cent to .6 per cent, and the duty on instalment purchase agreements is to increase from 1.5 per cent to 1.8 per cent. The duty on cheques is to be increased from 5c to 6c, and the duty on mortgages in excess of \$10,000 is to be increased from .25 per cent to .35 per cent on the excess. Although I have not made any calculations in this respect it appears that the increased duty on sales of motor vehicles and voluntary conveyances on property sales will be about 100 per cent, the other increases ranging from 35 per cent on mortgages up to 50 per cent on other transactions. Any honourable member would have to agree that these increases are considerable and are another form of capital taxation.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Values of properties, except in country areas, have risen steeply, thus giving rise to more revenue for the State at the existing rates.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: True, but we have heard much from certain politicians over the last two or three years regarding regressive (and sometimes the word "repressive" is used) forms of taxation. What eludes me is the reasoning behind the use of these words "regressive" and "repressive" when we see before us this type of legislation, which will have such an impact on South Australia's business world. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 30. Page 1824.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill, which is a somewhat difficult one on which to speak. It increases the salaries of some of South Australia's top, key officers. It is always difficult for one to support salary increases in times such as these. However, these increases have been recommended by the Government in order to restore relativity between the salaries received by the officers referred to in the Bill and those of other senior public servants. It is correct to describe these officers as key officers, as they hold some of the most important positions that can be held by anyone in this State. I refer, first, to the Auditor-General, who is responsible for auditing the Government's accounts and for presenting to Parliament an annual report, which becomes a work of reference for members when they are discussing legislation, particularly that dealing with the collection or spending of this State's revenue. The position that he holds is therefore important in relation to this State's welfare.

The Commissioner of Police is also a man of the highest integrity, who must be beyond reproach. We in South Australia are fortunate that we have in this position a man who is regarded as being the best Commissioner of Police in Australia. I refer also to the Chairman of the Public Service Board, who fulfils an important function in the administration of this State. In his second reading explanation the Chief Secretary referred to the relativity of the salaries of these three officers and those of other senior public servants. Because of the importance of the positions held by these three officers, it would be impossible for one to arrive at a suitable rate of salary based purely on merit. These men are holding offices, the salaries for which it would be impossible to assess in monetary terms.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1881.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): When I asked leave on Tuesday night last to conclude my remarks, it was for the purpose of having a further look at this Bill because, as I pointed out then, it covers a completely new

set of circumstances and alters largely the set-up under which the Citrus Industry Organization Act was passed in the first place. All this has been done without a poll of growers, so it is necessary that we study this legislation carefully to see what its real ramifications are, because two important things have happened since we last had a poll of growers: (1) the original committee has been disbanded and a nominated committee put in its place; and (2) the form of striking a levy upon the producers of South Australia will come into operation on the passing of this Bill. Therefore, it warrants a close scrutiny.

Several things happened when we debated this Bill in the last session of Parliament, when the necessary amendments were introduced to disband the properly elected committee of producers. Many of the undertakings I received from the Minister then have been ignored as though they did not matter in the least, the most important of them being the assurance he gave me that none of the people who had served on the committee would be put back on it. Of course, that did not happen, because three of the people who had previously served on the committee went straight back on it. I am not reflecting upon those people but am saying that I believe that some advice that I gave and some feelings that existed and still exist strongly in the industry (that there should have been an opportunity for growers to have a poll to decide which of the recommendations of the Dunsford report this committee should have followed) were disregarded. The committee at present is not following any of the Dunsford report's recommendations. What it is endeavouring to do is to follow various portions of the recommendations of that report, picking out bits and pieces here and there.

I do not know and have not been able to gauge fully how well the new committee has done since it started its operations, because the position has been clouded. However, I do know of instances where confusion has arisen between the two major producing areas and the two marketing areas—those areas that market under the Riverland brand on the Upper Murray in South Australia and Sunraysia in Victoria, where there has been conflict. Some people call it a misunderstanding; other people call it obstruction of one set of officers by another set. Call it what we may, the effect is the same, that it has lost for the Mildura growers, in respect of mandarins, some 50¢ a case, which is serious.

I have had a long talk with the Chairman and members of the Citrus Organization Committee and I think we have come to the conclusion that what has been done so far is about all that can be done, in the hope that we can retain this organization long enough for us to try to get an Australia-wide organization—something we have wanted for a long time. I venture to say that there have been one or two improvements in the C.O.C. in fairly recent times, one being the staff resignations. That will be of some real benefit to the operations of the organization.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You say that without being terribly uncharitable?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Without being really uncharitable, I do not think I want to be charitable.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Your nature is such that you could not be otherwise.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I see. I thank the honourable member for his impression of me. The whole position is difficult. Of the original contingent that started with the Citrus Organization Committee (the General Manager, the Secretary, sales managers for about three principal markets, and an accountant) all that remains today is the Sydney sales manager (who is probably the best value of the whole lot). There is a new manager of the whole outfit, Mr. Galvin, who has been with the organization just a few months. The rest of the "experienced personnel" (as they have been termed all the way through by the committee) have left, and I do not suppose one can blame them, in view of the uncertainty that has surrounded the whole period of the operations of the C.O.C.

The propaganda that in the last few months has gone out to the growers is very good. If the committee can live up to what it has said it will do, there is some hope of that organization getting going. However, in a reply that was prepared for the Minister to a question I asked about the amount of fruit handled under the Riverland brand for export and for the home market, I was given the figure of 80 per cent for export and about 60 per cent for the home market. I do not believe those figures, though I know they were given to the Minister. I do not believe that that was the situation because, if it was, the balance sheet did not disclose it. The Samor group, a very efficient group of growers with an excellent name on the export market today, has been, slowly but surely, increasing its pack. If the C.O.C. can bring the same group back or get close enough to it to be able to get

prices and standards that are exactly the same on all markets, at least it will have accomplished something.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: All markets in Australia?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I was referring particularly to export markets. I am quite interested, too, in all markets in Australia, because this is very important. We have been a thorn in the side of the New South Wales growers for years because of our presentation of fruit on the Sydney market. When I was Minister of Agriculture there were constant moves for the New South Wales Minister to adopt a certain standard that would have almost prevented our fruit from being sold on the Sydney market. We have slipped, and there has been virtually no controlled marketing for a considerable time. Mildura has been sending fruit into that market and flooding it, and we have been doing likewise.

Whatever we do in this legislation, it can only control fruit that is sold in this State. Until we can get an overall scheme to control the Australian market, this organization is not going to effect what the growers want to call orderly marketing. I believe there is a big difference between orderly marketing and absolute compulsion. There are sufficient powers under this Act to make this a matter of complete and utter compulsion from the tree to the can and from the can into the hands of the retailer. Sufficient powers are contained in the Act for the committee to undertake any one of these things. I do not know whether it has it in mind to do so.

I was terribly interested to read a speech made by an honourable member in the other House recently. This speech appears on page 1791 of *Hansard* of this session, so it is on record for any honourable member to see. I read it again only a few moments ago. From what I have read, there seems to be some idea that the C.O.C. has set up a subcommittee to investigate the purchase and processing of surplus Valencia oranges. I mentioned in my speech the other day the history of buying up fruit and putting it into cans against the day when we will have a shortage of fruit. I do not imagine, nor do the statistics on plantings in Australia indicate this, that we are likely to have that shortage in Australia.

If we just put Valencia orange juice away in cans we are not going to get the same effect as we got in relation to grapes. It seems that a certain gentleman in another place has suggested that we did a good thing once when we bought up all the surplus grapes and took

them off the market. That is a good thing, because once wine is turned into spirit and put in wood its value is enhanced every year it is left there. When Valencia orange juice is put into a can or a plastic bag inside a 44gall. drum, one is immediately up for the cost of chilling it, watching it and testing it constantly, and at best it has a shelf life of between 12 months and 15 months. Therefore, I do not believe it is a good bet to do that. I know that Governments can be put under tremendous pressure to do this. Even if the Government does not undertake to finance a deal like this, it will invariably get caught up in the net somewhere, particularly as it has amended the Act recently to give guarantees to the C.O.C. I was violently opposed to that action at that time, and I am still opposed to Governments getting involved in primary production in that way. I believe that if we want to help primary production we should do it through loans to producers, in the way that we have worked our co-operatives over many years. I can only assume what is happening because, as I said the other day, it was mentioned by a gentleman who is fairly close to the seat of power at the present time.

The Chairman of the committee (Mr. Morphet) has circulated growers informing them that it is the intention to apply a levy of \$6 an acre on all citrus plantings in South Australia. An additional amount will be deducted from those people who market through the organization. The \$6 an acre will be paid by everybody who produces citrus. There will be an additional 7c a case for administration, 1c a case for Riverland royalty, and 2c a case for promotion. This will apply to export. In the case of the home market, the charges will be 6c for administration, 1c for Riverland royalty, and 1c for Australian promotion.

To my way of thinking, that is completely cockeyed. The most affluent people in the world today, taking them generally and as a whole, are the Australian public. Some people in America, the United Kingdom and West Germany are in the very high income brackets, but as a whole the Australian people are probably the best off of any people in the world. If there is one place we ought to be promoting citrus as much as possible it is within Australia. Our consumption of whole oranges in Australia is very large, and our consumption of juice is in the world class, but we are not promoting and we are not distributing our citrus in the way I believe it can be distributed in the best interests of the producer.

There are a few changes that I think are worthy of note. In the past the levy has been struck on only those people who have been marketing their Valencias and navels through the case market. At one time I insisted that a charge be put on package fruit, but somehow that seems to have gone by the board. Whether they found it could not be collected, I do not know, but apparently it did not happen. That was to try to balance the C.O.C. budget. It will now apply to everyone producing citrus, so it will ensnare many more people. "Citrus" is defined as follows:

"Citrus fruit" means citrons, lemons, limees, grapefruit, mandarins, oranges, sevilles and tangerines:

I take it sevilles would include common oranges. Many more people will be involved in making this sum of money available. I am not sure on what basis the figures are computed, but I quote from a newsletter under the heading "A matter of finance", as follows:

It is interesting to note that the budget costs for all sections for the year ending April 30, 1972, are in total \$75,000 less than the actual costs of operation during the last season, before the new committee was appointed. These savings are the result of new organization of the committee, elimination of the Adelaide office, the new marketing set-up and general very tight control of all expenses. Despite a disappointing amount of support from the growers and packing sheds our marketing income to date is only slightly below budget, but our costs are also a little below budget. In summary our financial situation is about in line with our forecasts.

When the budget was drawn up the figure for staff salaries and wages was estimated at \$35,000. That seems very high, because it must be remembered that this budget is only for the operation of C.O.C., and not for the operations of the marketing company, because it will get an extra 10c a case, or a proportion of it, for every case marketed under the Riverland brand. General administration, including printing and stationery, telephone, telex, postage and depreciation, is shown at \$9,000; board, travelling, entertaining and all vehicle expenses, \$15,000; promotion, market developments, newsletter, and A.C.G.F. costs and contributions, \$18,000; legal costs and policing the Act and the cost of terminating the Adelaide office lease, \$8,000. The next item is of tremendous importance, but it does not rank very high: research into crop estimation, consumer survey, pests and diseases and quality control, estimated at \$13,000. The figure for contingencies is shown at \$10,000, making a total in all of \$108,000,

which the growers are being asked to pay to keep C.O.C. in operation without really getting any marketing service except that which is provided for the promotion and market development and an amount for research.

Fairly heavy losses are stacked up against the organization, some of them because of bad merchandising, and some because of the failure of a company which owes C.O.C. a fairly considerable sum of money. Money is also required for the initial setting up fees which have not yet been repaid to the Government. Funds are also required because of the position regarding Riverland fruit in Holland, Hong Kong and Singapore, all of which must be forked out of the growers' funds.

If the growers cannot pay, of course, the State Bank will be expecting the Government to come good, because, under the last amendments made, the Government is responsible in the long term for any deficiencies that may occur. Finally, there is the point of whether the fruit will now come under direct control. I refer to section 24 of the principal Act, which is amended by clause 8, under which the total acreage of citrus trees, whether planted or grown for the production and sale of citrus fruit, as at the date or within the period specified in the notice, will be eligible to pay the full charge.

A person who has one-year-old trees at present will pay for about eight years without getting any commercial return from his trees. He will pay the full levy, just the same as in a year of frosts, when growers receive very small returns, they will still pay \$6 an acre. In cases of defoliation, as in 1967, when the salinity, over which they had no control, reached such a high level, they will still pay \$6 an acre. Nothing is specified in this Bill about how this money will be collected. It is left entirely to the discretion of the Minister whether he confers with the committee on the method of collecting. The Bill provides for the amendment of the principal Act so that section 23 (1) will provide as follows:

The Committee may, with the approval of the Minister and subject to this section, from time to time require all growers to pay to the Committee contributions towards the cost of the administration of this Act and the carrying out of the powers, functions and duties of the Committee under this Act.

Subclause (2) provides:

The Committee shall, before it requires payment of any contributions under this section—

(a) give notice, published on the same day in the *Gazette* and in a daily newspaper circulating generally in the State, of its intention to require payment of those contributions;

and

(b) specify in that notice the manner in which contributions are to be computed, the period with respect to which they relate and such other information as the Committee thinks fit.

That is an absolutely open cheque. If the Minister understands fully what the committee wants to do, that will be good; if he does not understand, some quite difficult situations could arise with certain growers. There may be an escape clause that I have not seen, but I cannot see where the Minister has discretion to alter the method, once it is gazetted and becomes law. I believe that the term "computed" is too broad.

The one redeeming feature is that the Minister has, irrespective of the advice given to him by some people, undertaken (after some prodding from the Murray Citrus Growers Association) to require that a poll of growers be taken if 100 persons have petitioned 30 days after the committee has informed the public in the *Gazette* and the daily paper. The matter is then put in the hands of the State Returning Officer, who must carry out a poll to ascertain whether the growers accept the levy. At the time when provisions relating to the committee were rescinded, it was believed by some people that that rescission precluded growers from presenting a petition in connection with disbanding the whole of the C.O.C. That was a misapprehension; the real position was that the growers could have had a poll at any time after last May in connection with disbanding the whole of the C.O.C.

So, they now get two bites at the cherry: they can have a poll to disband the whole of the C.O.C. or they can have a poll within 30 days of gazettal if they do not want the levy of \$6 an acre. That levy is by far the most equitable way of collecting the finance, provided the growers get value for money. I do not think anyone should be able to slip out through the back door. In view of the way C.O.C. has functioned until very recently, I do not blame those growers who have not paid their contributions, because they did not get much service from C.O.C. I can only hope that this Bill will bring about greater unity in the industry. I repeat that, if the first test case in connection with this Bill fails, it will be paid to the C.O.C. altogether.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I support the Bill. It allows the C.O.C. to make its levy on the whole of the citrus grown in this State instead of on the comparatively small volume that goes through its hands. Anyone involved in the fruit industry must favour orderly marketing, because for many years we have been bedevilled by people in organized marketing schemes providing a good market for those outside the schemes. As a result, some growers have been loaded with costs all the time, whilst others have escaped all imposts.

It is a very good move by the C.O.C. and the citrus industry to accept this charge. The charge is quite heavy, and it can be varied considerably without any great reference to the growers, except through a poll.

The C.O.C. is unchanged, apart from one aspect; it will still experience all the difficulties that it has been struggling with from the beginning. Legislation of this kind is extremely difficult for any industry to digest. Warnings should be sounded that, if the scheme continues as it has in the past, it inevitably (like the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities and other marketing schemes) will sow the seeds of its own destruction, and also the destruction of the tremendously valuable co-operatives that have grown up along the Murray River.

This very serious matter should be carefully considered, because those co-operatives are the basis of Murray River prosperity. The co-operatives have been tremendously valuable, particularly in the fruit industry, but only when it has been possible for a co-operative to provide for the growers a service that can be carried out more cheaply on a large scale than by individual growers.

The one thing that binds growers to co-operatives is that it pays them to belong. As soon as a co-operative (or the C.O.C., for that matter) has to impose charges that are higher than those that would be experienced by individual growers or growers in conjunction with other organizations, that co-operative is doomed.

This is an ever-present worry in most of our fruitgrowers' co-operatives, our canneries and the whole merchandizing system that has been built up over the years for our fruit crops. At present we are over-supplying fruit of nearly every kind. Inevitably, when we have an open market with many suppliers and many buyers, an over-supply means decreased prices: the price falls in proportion to the over-supply.

The hard fact in connection with all foodstuffs is that a lower price does not result

in much greater demand. The tendency is for the demand for fruit, meat and other foodstuffs to be inflexible in this State. Most people in Australia are well fed, and it is only those on lower incomes who exercise a greater demand for foodstuffs in response to lower prices. We have found in the apple industry, the industry with which I am most concerned, that there is little difference in the amount of fruit sold, whether the price is \$1.50 a bushel or \$3 a bushel.

This is a basic fact of life in relation to most of our fruit industries. When an organization such as the Citrus Organization Committee, which really only comprises co-operatives working together, becomes inflexible and imposes high charges, the grower in times of glut and when prices fall cannot live unless he takes over some of the functions of such an organization.

As an example of this, earlier this season \$1.70 to \$1.90 a bushel was being received for citrus sold in Melbourne. The charges of most of the co-operatives with which I have contact in the river areas amount to about \$1.50 to \$1.90 a bushel. Those charges are made for handling every box of fruit that goes through the organization. Then, one must consider the cost of carting the fruit to Melbourne and selling it there, which cost is not met by the market returns.

What happens in these circumstances? If the grower is to make a living, he must take on some of the functions of the co-operative and the selling organization, because with a selling organization of this nature every charge incurred along the line must be paid. I refer, for instance, to the man who carts the fruit to the market, the girl who packs it, the man who makes the carton in which the fruit is packed, and the man who carts the fruit into the store, all of whom must be paid before the grower receives anything. In order to make a living, practically everyone who supplied the Melbourne market early this year had to pack his own fruit and cart it to the market himself. In this respect, the co-operatives begin to fail.

This is a tremendously difficult problem for all our fruit handling organizations, as in periods of glut when prices fall we must be flexible and be able to cut to the bone the costs that must be placed on growers' fruit as it passes through to its final destination: the consumer. I regret that there is no indication of the C.O.C., our co-operatives or, indeed, the Central Fruit Sales organization in the Adelaide

Hills, being sufficiently flexible to be able to meet this situation. This is obviously a technical and complex problem, which must be solved.

It is easy for one to say that we could do anything we liked if we had complete commodity control. However, that is something I hope this State never sees. We had it during the war years, when our crops were taken over by all sorts of different boards, most of which we were glad to see the last of as soon as hostilities ceased. The present situation in the citrus industry is fairly bad. Indeed, the apple industry is in as difficult a position now that it is faced with a 25 per cent increase in freight charges imposed on it by British shipowners. This means that we must lose an export outlet which has been so valuable to us in the past, enabling the industry as it did to obtain a certain degree of commodity control.

The Citrus Organization Committee and, I am afraid, the co-operatives that handle our fruit will face a difficult period until we overcome the problem of surplus and of the handling charges that must be levied on our fruit to get it into a marketable form. It would be possible for one to speak on this subject at great length; I have only scratched the surface. Although I have studied this subject for many years, I still do not fully understand it. However, I sound a warning once more—that the Citrus Organization Committee is as good as we can make it.

We must try to give these people what they ask for, as was done in the original Bill. This Bill has been drafted as the industry desires, but whether it will succeed only time will tell. Much more thought must be given to the basic weaknesses of our fruit marketing system than has been given to them in the past. I support the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank honourable members for their contribution to the debate and their support of this Bill. This has not been an easy matter with which to deal because, as the honourable member who just resumed his seat said, it is a complicated matter. All our primary industries, particularly the fruit industry, are in difficulties because of their marketing problems. Only recently, honourable members saw what happened to Tasmania's apple industry, which is worth \$20,000,000 annually, but which is in dire straits at present.

It appears that the people on the river have two alternatives: either to support the Citrus

Organization Committee, which is an orderly marketing organization (as it was initially intended to be), or to throw it out. If they do the latter, what will be left: a fragmentation of the industry, which would not be beneficial to growers. If one examines the situation regarding primary industries throughout Australia today one finds that most of the industries in the box seat are those that have an orderly marketing system. I refer, first, to the Australian Wheat Board and the Australian Barley Board, which takes in only two States, South Australia and Victoria. The other States (New South Wales and Western Australia) are thinking about operating through an all-Australia board.

The end solution to the problems facing us is, I think, an Australian citrus growers statutory body, and I am indeed pleased that the Citrus Growers Federation is working towards this end. However, it will have to enact stringent measures (indeed, much more stringent than those which the Citrus Organization Committee could hope to enact) if it is to achieve this end and to control citrus fruit marketing for both local and export consumption. We have endeavoured in South Australia to organize the orderly marketing of citrus, both in other States and overseas. This has not received very good support from most of the organizations on the Murray. It is a splendid organization and, as I have said, the growers can either have it or throw it out. I am led to believe that moves are now afoot on the Murray (and I am sure the Hon. Mr. Story knows this) to hold a poll of growers to try to determine exactly whether or not this levy will be successful. I do not doubt that information for a moment; I have been told it on good authority.

I now want to answer two points raised by the Hon. Mr. Story. He said that we were thinking of sending citrus fruit to Israel. My information is that there has never been any suggestion that we should export South Australian citrus to Israel. On the contrary, there have been feelers from Israel that people there may act as sellers of our fruit in the Northern Hemisphere during the off season. One consignment went to Holland but it arrived not in 100 per cent good condition, because of some hold-up on the wharves in Victoria, which was beyond our control. Those are some of the problems involved. Exporting our citrus to Europe on a standardized basis has never been intended by the Citrus Organization Committee. However, if there has

been a surplus crop, arrangements have been made to send fruit to the Northern Hemisphere.

On the point that the Hon. Mr. Story made about the Government being asked to contribute money for the processing of this fruit, I assure him that, if there is a restricted juice intake by Berri Fruit Juices in this Valencia season, it is probable there will be a surplus of fruit, unwanted fruit. What are we to do about it? There are only two alternatives: one is to dump it and the other is to process it. There is not much future in processing fruit if we have no market for it, so I give the honourable member the undertaking that, if there is no market for this juice, there is no point in processing the fruit.

The Hon. Mr. Story referred to the new Citrus Organization Committee and said that I had told him that no members of the old committee would continue to serve on the new committee. I question that statement, because the only two members of the old committee who went on the new committee were the two grower members. If my memory serves me correctly, one of them had just been elected for a new term by the growers of his district; I think the other member had also just been elected. It was under those conditions—the fact that they had been only recently elected by the growers—that they were put on the new committee. I understand that one of them has probably been on the committee longer than any other member of the committee. That is only a minor point, but I wanted to clear it up.

It is not easy by legislation to get orderly marketing for citrus fruit in South Australia, because so many factions are operating on the Murray. Without their co-operation, I do not see how we can get the industry on a level plane. If we can get the industry together (as I sincerely hope we can, in the interests of the growers, who are people I am interested in; I want to see that they get a fair price for their products) we can tell them that they must produce quality goods at all times and, if they do not, their prices will suffer. We must get that through to the growers today: quality comes first. We can always sell a quality product but, if the quality drops, we shall have the greatest difficulty in selling. I thank honourable members for their contributions to this debate.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—“Levy to meet expenses.”

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This clause, which repeals section 23 of the principal Act, is one of the most important clauses in the Bill. Under its provisions, the committee, having obtained the approval of the Minister, may go ahead and do the things set out in the clause. New section 23 (2) (b) provides:

specify in that notice the manner in which the contributions are to be computed. . . .

Again, I question the use of the word “computed”. I have discussed this with the Minister. It is one thing to “compute” the method; it is another thing to extract the money from those people who have been “computed”. “Computed” is an all-embracing word.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: Why not use the word “calculate”?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think it would be much better from the point of view of comprehension by some fruitgrowers who, like me, are fairly dumb. The word “computed” appears twice in this clause. I want to be assured that this word “computed” means that it will be the method by which the necessary calculations will be made. Is that so or not? Can the Minister tell me clearly what the word “computed” means here?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I think the honourable member is playing games here.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Oh, no!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think he has had words with the Parliamentary Counsel and has been given a dictionary and an interpretation of the words “compute” or “computed”. From the information I have received from the Parliamentary Library, where we referred to various dictionaries, and from the Parliamentary Counsel, who uses legal jargon, which I do not, I gather that the word “compute” means “reckon”. That should satisfy the honourable member.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I reckon it will!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am assured that this is the legal terminology used by many people today. I do not think the honourable member need be unduly alarmed about the word.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I suggest that we return to plain English and substitute the word “calculate”.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: From the information supplied by the Parliamentary Counsel, I am quite convinced that the word “compute” is much better than any other word.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: You won't accept an amendment?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—"Power to require returns."

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I move:

In new paragraph (iii) to strike out "whether".

I do not think this paragraph makes sense as it stands.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Parliamentary Counsel has assured me that, whilst the word was included to differentiate between two things, it would not matter if it was deleted. Therefore, I am happy to accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 9—"Powers of inspectors to enter upon lands, etc."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This clause amends section 27, which deals with powers of inspectors to enter upon lands. This section specifies the things that inspectors may do. The clause provides for minimum penalties for both first and second offences. There was an attempt in the very early stages of this committee's life to force Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative, a private company, to take fruit from persons other than its shareholders, consisting of seven principal co-operatives and two smaller co-operatives. Some of those people would be running under the brand of Samor at present and some under the brand of Riverland. This caused great consternation among the shareholders.

I believe that this company has in its possession a letter from the former Minister (Hon. G. A. Bywaters) instructing the C.O.C. that it was not to interfere in any way with the management of Berri Fruit Juices Co-operative. The powers are there, and the penalties are severe. If a private or a co-operative company is directed by the committee to take fruit against its will, will the Minister do everything in his power to protect the rights of the companies, as did his predecessor?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Regulations."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This important clause has not been understood by many of the producers on the river. It will give growers the right to call for a poll if 100 growers request it. When the Minister changed the whole set-up regarding the committee, I do not think he meant to mislead the people. I was accused in another place during the last debate of having misled certain members of the C.O.C.

I categorically deny that, and I think the Minister could have taken his colleague to task. It is important that the growers be given their rights. I am not aware of a petition being taken up on the river at present.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I did not say there was a petition. Moves are probably afoot.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I want to make it quite clear. I have not heard of it.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1890.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I support the Bill, the purpose of which is to increase from \$6,000 to \$10,000 the maximum amount by which the Government may subsidize the cost of erecting senior citizens clubs or centres. Over the past few years, I have been privileged to visit many of these clubs, and it is an eye-opener to see how happy and contented are the club members. Individual membership and the number of clubs are rapidly increasing. At present 92 clubs are in operation throughout the State with a membership of more than 10,000, and several clubs are being set up at present.

The members are finding a new interest in life, having reached the stage in their lives when they have become known as elderly citizens. They are finding new interests and outlets to express themselves in many different ways, taking an interest not only in themselves but also in helping less fortunate people in the community. Some members knit knee rugs, mittens and bedsocks for patients at Hillcrest, and others assist charitable organizations with appeals, with collecting and so on. Although at their age one might think they were past it, they still take a keen interest in helping other people and, generally speaking, in proving to themselves that they are responsible and useful citizens. By their individual and concerted action, they are repaying the community for what has been done for them by providing these clubs.

The added subsidy proposed in the Bill will greatly assist our elderly citizens, and I commend the Government for giving this financial assistance. It appears that this is one of the Bills on which we can get practically complete agreement, although I understand the Hon. Mr.

Hill has placed an amendment on file. However, it has nothing to do with the principle of the Bill, and in the event of a division I shall be quite happy to cross the floor in support of his amendment.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill. In 1963 the State adopted a subsidy scheme for the erection of senior citizens clubs or senior citizens centres. Since that scheme was introduced we have seen in South Australia a very rapid growth in the provision of these facilities. The original subsidy scheme was on a \$1 for \$1 basis up to a maximum of \$6,000. This Bill extends the subsidy to a maximum of \$10,000.

I am certain that we all appreciate the importance in our community of providing these facilities. From very humble beginnings many have grown to quite large organizations, and with the inflation in currency the increase from \$6,000 to \$10,000 really only keeps the subsidy within the range of value of the original 1963 Bill. Since the State Government introduced the subsidy scheme in 1963, the Commonwealth Government has provided a subsidy of one-third of the total cost of any building for a senior citizens centre and, I believe, any extension to such a building. So, if my mathematics are correct, a club costing \$18,000 would receive one-third of that cost from the Commonwealth Government (\$6,000) and up to \$10,000 from the State Government. That means that the senior citizens would have to find only about \$2,000. Those costs would be appropriate for a reasonably small centre, perhaps in the country. In 1963, of course, \$6,000 would pay for as much building work as \$10,000 would pay for today.

It can be clearly seen that senior citizens centres have provided a worthwhile amenity in the community. The growth that has taken place in this field would give satisfaction to any Government. In the senior citizens centres that have been established one sees people who desire to continue to be active members of the community and to work in that community. I see in these centres people who have had considerable experience in many walks of life; indeed, I see people who have found a new desire to play an active part in the community; the Government should recognize that. I suppose that the care of ageing people has always been a problem, but it is now a rapidly expanding problem because of the increasing number of people in that age group whose lives have been extended

by modern drugs. Consequently, a greater measure of social services must be made available in this field.

I see in these centres a base for extending various types of social service into the community. We can all see the time coming when we will have to extend greatly our domiciliary services—services to keep ageing couples in their own homes for as long as possible. I see the senior citizens centres as providing a contact in the community for this type of service. One can see the time coming when we will need a rapid extension of the services provided, such as Meals on Wheels, physiotherapy services in the home, occupational therapy services and home nursing services.

I see senior citizens centres playing a most important part in the extension of those services into the community. I stress that I do not think all those services should necessarily be based within the centres, but I believe that social workers could be based in the centres, those social workers being the contacts with the ageing in the community and with the organized domiciliary services. So, the senior citizens centre is more than a meeting place for people in a certain age group for the purpose of fellowship: it is also a means of collecting together people in a certain age group with experience and with willingness to perform worthwhile services in the community. All Governments, whether Commonwealth or State, should be giving all their attention to that type of extension. I support the Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): In 1963 I was pleased to support the original Bill, and I commend the Government for introducing the present Bill, which I support. It has the most worthy object of subsidizing senior citizens centres to a greater degree; of course, we must remember that the real value of money has decreased considerably since 1963. Only yesterday I spent some time with the President of a senior citizens centre and with a person associated with a council that was interested in helping senior citizens centres. As the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has said, senior citizens centres do much more than provide a meeting place for elderly citizens; in addition, the energies of those citizens can be channelled into worthwhile pursuits that benefit the people and help them to get away from what might otherwise be lonely situations.

One of my relatives has, since he retired as a full-time social worker, put in part-time social work for the central body of an organization

associated with senior citizens. I am convinced about the need for senior citizens centres and about the wisdom of assisting them financially. This Bill is not associated with politics and should be passed as soon as possible. I therefore support it.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I do not intend to delay the Council by speaking at length. However, I should like to reply to a direct question asked by the Hon. Mr. Russack. I make it clear that extensions to senior citizens centres will be eligible for assistance provided the total State Government expenditure in relation thereto does not exceed \$10,000 on any one centre. I thank honourable members for the attention they have given to the Bill and for the nice comments they have made about senior citizens centres.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

New clause 1a—"Interpretation."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move to insert the following new clause:

1a. Section 2 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from the definition of "council" the passage "The City of Whyalla Commission and".

The new clause has the purpose of deleting from the principal Act the words "the City of Whyalla Commission". The commission no longer exists, and this amendment is moved simply for the purpose of tidying up the Act in the cause of Parliamentary efficiency.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): The Government has no objection to the insertion of the new clause.

New clause inserted.

Clause 2 and title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

PRESBYTERIAN TRUSTS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1958.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): This Bill has two main purposes, the first of which is to create a trust corporation to put in order certain trust titles relating to Presbyterian properties. I understand that at least six such properties in South Australia are at present without trustees and, indeed, have been so for up to three generations. Because of this, the titles cannot be protected. At the same time, it is impossible to vest the properties in the church itself or to transfer them in the interests of the church.

Under the Bill, the Moderator will be able to bring these at present unprotected titles under the care of the trust corporation to be established. This corporation will be appointed by the General Assembly, which can invoke the trust section of the Bill. The appointment of the new trustees always raises the difficulty that on their demise the present situation of unprotected trusts will recur, but this difficulty will be avoided under the new scheme now before the Council. The trust corporation envisaged cannot take over the property of any continuing congregation after union. (A continuing congregation is one that persists as an individual local Presbyterian body after any union has taken place in the district.)

The corporation can take over the property of any congregation only if a two-thirds majority of those who are eligible to vote so approve and agree before such a trust can be placed in the hands of the corporation. No attempt is to be made to change the details of any individual trust existing as it was set up: in other words, any trust that has purely local application will remain in the hands of the local congregation but certain trust bequests are not meant for the local congregation: they are really meant in their origin to be in the interests of the whole Presbyterian Church. These will straight away come under the proposed corporate body of trustees.

Another point is that the Bill will also allow borrowing on a specific title without prejudicing other titles in the hands of the church. Such prejudice did occur in the days of the depression in the 1930's, when one title was insufficient and others became jeopardized. This will not happen as a result of the passing of this Bill. That is the first object of the Bill—to create a trust corporation for these purposes.

The second object of the Bill is concerned with the proposed church union. At present this union is involving the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregationalist denominations. It is not restricted to only those three; there is no restriction on union extending further. In each State there is at present an autonomous Presbyterian General Assembly body, which manages its own affairs. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia itself is responsible for certain functions including doctrine, discipline and foreign missions. This has been so ever since the agreement of 1901 between all the relevant State bodies. The Presbyterian Church of Australia at present has no power to enter into union with any other denomination. It seems to me that the

situation is something like the relationship between the Commonwealth Government and the State Governments except that here we have the Presbyterian Church of Australia and Presbyterian churches in the States of Australia. As I say, the Presbyterian Church of Australia has at present no power to enter into union with any other denomination.

As far as South Australia is concerned, the third schedule to this Bill sets out the procedure that will make union possible. Identical and parallel legislation to this that we are now discussing is being sought in every other State. It is being sought following acceptance by the church itself at all levels, after agreement at the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, where the State assemblies agreed. This was followed by agreement of the presbyteries and then by the local churches. The reverse order from the local church upwards has ensured that the normal channels of church life have been followed and have given the right of expression to every Presbyterian Church member, the right to vote. When the agreement has been approved by all the States, the provisions will be invoked and the General Assembly of Australia will proceed to move on that basis for union, because it will then have power to negotiate for union. Protection for minorities who do not want to unite is provided. If one-third of a congregation's members are against union, that local church will remain a continuing congregation. I referred to that matter earlier.

At the same time, a commission consisting of seven for union and seven against union, together with three others, will be set up to settle any point at issue. Further, in South Australia itself any decision of the commission is subject to approval by the Supreme Court. I understand that a meeting of the General Assembly of Australia is due to be held in Sydney at the beginning of December. It is hoped that by this time all the appropriate State legislation will have been passed.

On going through this Bill I was very conscious of the fact that the Christian church has come a long way in a very short time. Not many years ago the factions and branches of the church were at loggerheads with each other. More and more throughout the world now we see the effects of ecumenicalism, the coming together of the various bodies in the church, and I think this is to be applauded. I think it is summed up by a story I was told a long time ago. A vicar was asked by one of his parishioners, "What must God think of all these divisions in His church?" The wise

vicar replied, "God is a loving father, and He says 'My children must have their toys.'" With the end in view of the sharing of the toys and the bringing together of the churches in union, I have great pleasure in supporting this Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I also support the Bill, which I have read in some detail. It has run the gauntlet of a Select Committee of the other House; therefore, I commend it to other honourable members.

I was rather interested to read what I look upon as the principal purpose of the Bill. At present, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church is not empowered to negotiate to enter into union with any other branches of the Christian church, and this Bill will give the Presbyterian church that right.

I had the very great pleasure last Sunday night to attend the first church service of the new Adelaide East United Church, which was held in the Clayton Congregational Church at Norwood. In fact, the congregation consisted of people from the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian churches. It seems to me as a result of that service that the Presbyterians have already made a move, so to speak, in this direction. I do not say that in any way unkindly; I commend them for their keenness and enthusiasm in endeavouring to join in union with the other denominations, namely, the Methodists and the Congregationalists.

The service last Sunday night was enthusiastically received by all members of the congregation, and it was a most successful one. The guests who had been kindly invited, as evidence of growing Christian fellowship in that particular eastern region of metropolitan Adelaide, thoroughly enjoyed the service, and it was indeed a most memorable night.

This Bill is part of the measure to put beyond doubt that the Presbyterian Church can enter into such negotiations and into such unions. That is a principle that I wholeheartedly support. The Bill also deals with the question of church property and property under the control of church organizations. I was interested to see what the position would be of two of the principal private schools in Adelaide, namely, Presbyterian Girls College and Scotch College, because I have an interest in both those institutions.

The Bill clearly lays down in clause 19 that, concerning Scotch College and Presbyterian Girls College (and also, incidentally,

St. Andrews Presbyterian Hospital Incorporated), the ownership of their properties is not affected in any way by this measure.

Accordingly, I support the Bill, which I think all members will agree introduces a worthwhile and progressive change affecting the Presbyterian Church in this State.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.42 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 12, at 2.15 p.m.