

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, July 27, 1972

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MURRAY NEW TOWN

The Hon. M.B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On Tuesday last, in my Address in Reply speech, I commended the Government for the planning of a new town in the vicinity of Murray Bridge, and I went on to indicate that I thought that the announcement of this matter could well be premature. I said further that I thought that Sir Thomas Playford would have had the matter well in hand before he made any such announcement. The Hon. Mr. Banfield interjected with the one word "Underhanded!" which I thought, and still think, was a rather foolish interjection. On the following day (yesterday, July 26) the Hon. Mr. Banfield stated that I said that Sir Thomas Playford would have done it underhandedly. I want to refute that statement completely: the statement of the Hon. Mr. Banfield yesterday afternoon was completely incorrect.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is debating something that has been said, rather than making a personal explanation.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I just want to refute the suggestion that I made such a statement, because I did not do so. I believe Sir Thomas Playford would have handled the matter in the same way that the preliminary work for the city of Elizabeth was handled, and I do not think anyone has been so foolish as to suggest that that was "underhanded".

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member is commenting; it is not a personal explanation.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I am sorry. I completely refute the incorrect statement of the Hon. Mr. Banfield.

QUESTIONS

VALERIE ROGERS

The Hon. C.M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, the Leader of the Government in this Chamber.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to the case of Miss Valerie Rogers, a South Australian girl who has been living at 27 Glenunga Avenue, Glenunga. She is the daughter of Mr. N. F. and Mrs. P. N. Rogers of that address. At the moment she is imprisoned in Algeciras, Spain, pending charges concerning the transport of drugs from Africa. Her mother informs me that the alleged offence is denied by Miss Rogers. The girl's parents have been endeavouring to have her released on bail. Mrs. Rogers has travelled to Spain and returned. The sum of \$8,000 has been lodged with the British Consul for the purpose of bail, but Mrs. Rogers fears that her daughter may be transferred to a prison in Cadiz, where prison conditions are reported to be very bad. The parents' endeavours, through legal counsel retained in Spain and the British Consul, to have their daughter released on bail have so far been unsuccessful. Whilst realizing that the matter is primarily one at Government level for the Commonwealth authorities and the British Consul, I ask the Chief Secretary whether the South Australian Government will be so good as to contact its Agent-General in London to see whether any inquiries can be made that may in some way assist this South Australian girl.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I am willing to discuss this matter with the Premier, but I am not sure whether the suggestion about contacting the Agent-General is correct. I have an idea that the contact may have to be from the Premier to the Prime Minister. However, I assure the honourable member that I will discuss the matter with the Premier and, if anything can be done, we shall endeavour to do it.

LAND VALUATIONS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of July 19 about land valuations?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague, the Minister of Local Government, informs me that when he last communicated with the honourable member on this subject he indicated that the necessary amending legislation would be introduced by way of regulations under the new Valuation of Land Act. These regulations were gazetted on June 15, 1972, and are presently lying before the Council.

HONEY RESEARCH

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Early last month the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Hon. Ian Sinclair) issued a statement saying that, on the recommendation of the Honey Research Advisory Committee, he had approved the expenditure of \$9,025 on a number of projects designed to assist the honey industry. I believe that the research programme provides for support of a study into the nutritional and biochemical aspects of some eucalypt and acacia pollens and for work to be undertaken into the chemical composition and colour stability of Australian honeys. Mr. Sinclair said that the honey research projects were being undertaken by State Departments of Agriculture, universities, institutions and other organizations. Can the Minister of Agriculture say what research into these matters is being undertaken in South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I shall obtain the information from my department. I do not have the information at present but, since the honourable member has asked for it, I sincerely hope that some research programmes are being conducted.

RECLAIMED WATER

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I recently reiterated my interest in the efforts being made at Bolivar to ensure that the reclaimed water is safe for growing vegetables. The Minister has told me privately that he will be willing to make further reports on the matter available as soon as they come to hand, and I believe that the Deputy Premier has said that regular reports will be sought. Has the Minister of Agriculture a report available?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not have a report in the true sense, but I have some information that I think will be of benefit to the honourable member. Although a report will be available later, I promised the honourable member that when any information came to hand I would make it available to him, and I do so now. The information I have is as follows:

(1) The salinity laboratory is operational and 1,400 soil samples have been analysed for total dissolved solids and pH, and a further 500 saturation extracts have been prepared from selected soil samples. The saturation extracts are being analysed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department's Bolivar laboratories.

(2) The first irrigation trial comparing effluent with bore and mains water has been harvested, and the soils have been sampled and are being analysed.

(3) The irrigation of small single plots with effluent water has been temporarily suspended until the end of the winter. The soils have been sampled to investigate any changes after 42in. of irrigation.

(4) The trickle-irrigation experiment with almonds will continue at the beginning of the next irrigation season. Soil and plant analysis is being used to observe any changes due to irrigation with effluent.

(5) Soil and plant analysis is being used to monitor changes due to effluent use on vines at Angle Vale vineyards, and this work is continuing.

(6) Additional soil samples have been taken from the Munno Para glasshouse and adjacent irrigated areas for analysis and determination of changes in salinity.

(7) Soil samples were taken from the first glasshouses to use effluent on a commercial basis, and further samples will be taken at regular intervals.

(8) A survey of use of saline bore water in the district is almost complete, and soil samples are being taken to determine changes due to long-term irrigation with saline water.

(9) Some preliminary work on the soil survey has been done, and it is expected that the research officer will spend most of his time on this work for the next two months.

It is expected that the preliminary report will be made at the end of October.

KULPARA ROAD

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of July 20 about the Kulpara Road?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: My colleague reports that section of the main Yorke Peninsula road between the Snowtown turn-off near Port Wakefield and Kulpara has some areas of surface irregularity resulting from soil movement. However, the road is considered to be adequate for present needs and can be negotiated safely and in reasonable comfort by all types of vehicle operating at reasonable speeds. The road has been resealed in the last two years, and the rate of deterioration is expected to be reduced by such work. Major work on this road is not currently programmed, but the condition of the road will be kept under review during normal maintenance inspections.

LIGHT RIVER BRIDGE

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: On June 2, I wrote to the Minister of Roads and Transport seeking information regarding the new bridge over the Light River on the main road between Two Wells and Mallala, but I have not yet received a reply. Will the Minister of Lands obtain a report from his colleague on this matter as soon as possible?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes.

KINGSCOTE SCHOOL

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make an explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Recently, I visited the Kingscote Area School and, on an inspection of the school's buildings, I became aware of certain problems due, no doubt, to the age of the school and the nature of the buildings, some of which have been severely affected by dry rot. Will the Minister ascertain from his colleague whether new buildings are planned for the school and, if they are, whether this work can be given a higher priority, if this has not already been done?

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.

ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On July 18 I asked the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation, whether it would be possible for the Environment Committee's report to be made available to honourable members. Has he a reply?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Minister of Environment and Conservation reports that the Environment Committee has completed its findings and presented its report to the Government. This is a very good report, which is quite lengthy and contains much detail. The Minister of Environment and Conservation intends to provide members of Parliament with a copy of this report and also to make the report public. The report is being considered by Cabinet, and honourable members may be assured that it will be made available as soon as possible.

SOUTH-EAST FIRE PRECAUTIONS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I was recently approached by a number of people who own properties adjacent to the Taillem Bend to Keith main and who are concerned about the lack of fire water points being allocated on the main. Will the Minister ask his colleague to investigate this matter and ascertain whether more fire water points could be allocated on the route of the main?

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.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on the motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 26. Page 241.)

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK (Midland): I rise to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and, at the outset, I take the opportunity to pay my respects to His Excellency the Governor, Sir Mark Oliphant, who, as all honourable members know, is a noted scientist and our new Governor. I also extend my sympathy to the bereaved relatives of those members of Parliament who have recently passed away and to whom His Excellency referred in his Speech.

The first matter on which I wish to comment is the agricultural industry in this State. In his Speech, His Excellency referred to the seasonal conditions and the lack of rain during the opening part of the season. However, conditions have improved in recent weeks. Not a great deal was mentioned about assistance to primary industries in our State. Australia (including South Australia) is subject to world trends in primary production, and throughout the world the number of people engaged in primary industry has decreased. I have seen figures indicating that in America in one decade, from 1950 to 1960, the number of people involved in primary industry decreased from 7,000,000 to 4,000,000. In the European Economic Community countries in the same period the number decreased from 14,500,000 to 10,000,000, and by 1980 more than 5,000,000 additional people will have gone from the industry, half of them reaching retiring age and the other half being absorbed into other industries.

Because of this world pattern we find that the number of people involved in primary industry in South Australia declined from 48,869 in 1966 to 43,230 in 1970, a fall of

11.5 per cent. These people have been forced out of the industry for a number of reasons. One is the technological advancement in plant and methods of operation, the other is the reduced income for those involved in primary production. In the United States, Canada, Finland, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, France, Portugal, and other countries in close proximity to those areas, those involved in primary industry received an income equal to 40 per cent to 60 per cent of the income of earners outside the industry.

In the press today we see that the reduction of income is further aggravated because Australia is now forced to sell grain on extended credit, having made sales to oversea countries where extended credit has been granted for a period of three years. I am sure the Government could assist the South Australian primary industries by granting relief in various areas. One area of possible consideration is that of rural land tax. We often hear that taxes are increasing in South Australia to be brought into line with those in other States, but States bordering South Australia have dispensed with rural land tax, and I am sure this could be done to assist the industry in this State, and further consideration could be given to reduction of water rates.

I urge the Government that no measures should be taken to increase transport costs generally, particularly those relating to primary industry. I ask that everything be done to keep such costs to a minimum. Perhaps the greatest imposition on the primary producer is in the field of succession duties. This matter has been brought frequently before Governments, but it is of such importance and of such magnitude that it is necessary that it should be brought forward consistently. This is a form of taxation that possibly hits the primary producer more than any other section of the community. One of the most devastating aspects of this tax is the uncertainty of knowing or not knowing when and how many successions might take place.

I recall an instance, which I know to be correct, where a bachelor farmer was carrying on a property in the interests of his parents. The mother died and the son was married to a young widow who still had the responsibility of her late husband's estate and his death duties. Soon after the marriage, the father of this young man passed away, and there were three successions to be considered in this one family at the one time, which placed them in a difficult financial situation. Looking at the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, I find it states that death duties or

succession duties have been applied or introduced for two particular reasons, one being to provide revenue. I accept the fact that all Governments must have revenue, but there is one principle in imposing taxation—the ability of people to pay it. In many instances, there is not the ability to pay succession duties and quite often assets have to be disposed of in order to meet that iniquitous taxation. Recently, it was my privilege to visit many people and I suggest without hesitation that one of their main concerns was succession duties, where they have had to sell properties to pay that taxation. Because of the cost squeeze in primary industry, it has been necessary to have more and more land to make a farming unit viable, but because of succession duties these properties have had to be reduced in size.

I come now to the second definition in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* where it speaks of succession duties. It states that the second main purpose of death taxes is to secure objectives of social policy. Death duties are used to break up large estates in order to prevent their transmission from generation to generation. I suppose it would be most difficult to define a large estate. An estate that provided a comfortable living 20 years ago could have been worth \$20,000 but today that same property could have escalated in value to \$200,000 and yet not be capable of providing nearly as good an income. Therefore, what is a large estate is debatable. I am given to understand from a reliable source that there is a return of only 2½ per cent to 3 per cent on the capital investment in many primary-producing properties, so I would say that for a tax to be legitimately levied it must be a tax that the taxpayer can pay. In my questioning of people and discussing this point, many have said they would prefer to pay higher taxation in their lifetime because the hardest-hit person is the middle-aged person when the breadwinner dies unexpectedly. If people knew what taxation they had to pay, they would prefer this to paying succession duties, which are most uncertain; the number of times they can occur is also uncertain.

I am given to understand that on the average once in 15 years a family is obliged to meet succession duties and in the course of 45 years the capital cost of every primary-producing property is paid out in succession duties. I accept and know that in the arranging of other taxation there are difficulties but I am also given to understand that in other countries taxation is levied but certain areas of the property, which would provide a living

for the family in question, are made tax free. The residue is then taxed. Consideration should be given to some form of taxation other than succession duties. That would be a great help to those people engaged in primary industry. We all admit that in past years there has been a good return in primary industry but over the last seven or eight years the reverse has been the case, and great credit must be given to those primary producers who have made the grade under these adverse conditions. Mostly because of better administration, diversification and other means, they are still on their properties and are still able to make them viable. So I urge the Government that every effort be made in this sector of our community to make the taxation such that the primary producers will be able to come through this period of cost squeeze, when costs are rising and income is decreasing.

I now come to His Excellency's reference to the standard gauge railway between Adelaide and the East-West railway. Back in 1968 the present Premier referred to gauge standardization in South Australia and was reported as follows:

If Adelaide was to be connected to the standard gauge line between Broken Hill and Port Pirie, it was essential that other sections of the South Australian Railways be standardized at the same time or South Australia would have more breaks of gauge than previously.

In this article at that time, from Whyalla on February 16, 1968, he said that the Wallaroo-Snowtown-Gladstone line would receive attention and be placed on the standard gauge. If my memory serves me correctly, again within the last few months this line has been referred to. I therefore suggest that as soon as possible the line from Wallaroo linking up with the other standard gauge lines in South Australia should be considered, to coincide with the standardization of the line to Adelaide, so that grain and other goods may be transported with ease to the port of Wallaroo.

I come now to the Committee of Inquiry into Health Services in the State, which was set up in 1970. His Excellency said:

My Government expects to receive its report before the end of this year.

A letter from that committee was received by a domiciliary service with which I have been associated asking for certain particulars. Over the years there has been great co-operation and continuity of policy between successive Governments that have been in power in South Australia. When you, Mr. President were Chief

Secretary in the Playford Government and in the years that followed, under the Walsh-Dunstan Government, the Hall Government, and now the second Dunstan Government, there has been continuity that has been very beneficial to domiciliary care, and I compliment those who have been responsible for it. I compliment the Chief Secretary of the day, who does all in his power to assist in this respect. Pilot schemes have been introduced to keep elderly people in their homes, make them more comfortable, and ensure that they have the necessary nursing care and other requirements. There are three pilot schemes in the country and one in the city. I believe that, when the committee's report is made, further development will be considered in this field. I commend the Government in this connection, and I am sure it will continue to develop this work.

Many country towns are considering introducing effluent schemes. I realize that some country areas have been fortunate enough to have deep drainage installed, but I draw the Council's attention to a deficiency that must be remedied. The Public Health Department has done much to assist in designing and surveying effluent schemes in country areas, but I am concerned about a new Government policy that has recently been instituted concerning the payment of charges in connection with non-ratable properties. One council had an area surveyed and implemented a scheme; it had taken into account some Government non-ratable properties, such as schools, railway buildings, police stations, etc., but the school and some other Government non-ratable properties had not been connected. Therefore, the Government, in accordance with an instruction issued, withdrew its support in connection with paying the charges while the non-ratable property was not connected. The Government issued the following instruction:

Heads of departments are advised that Cabinet has approved the following policy for payment by Government departments of charges levied by councils throughout South Australia in respect of common effluent drainage schemes:

- (1) Where a ratable Government property is affected by an effluent drainage scheme, whether connected to it or not, charges are to be paid.
- (2) Effluent charges are to be paid where non-ratable Government property is connected to a scheme.
- (3) No payment is to be made where a non-ratable Government property is not connected to a scheme.

The Minister confirmed the Government's policy in a letter, of which the following is an extract:

I refer to your letter of April 7, 1972, expressing the concern of council in respect to the Government's policy which precludes Government departments from the necessity to pay effluent drainage charges on non-ratable Government holdings which are not connected to an effluent scheme.

I have given serious consideration to the points made in your letter, but believe that the Government is meeting its responsibilities in respect of ratable properties and is going beyond this in meeting those charges levied against the non-ratable properties connected to a common effluent scheme.

When schemes are initiated they are usually spread over a period of 20 years, and all ratepayers are assessed on a basis. An annual rate is paid by all ratepayers to repay the loan for the scheme. If any ratepayer or anyone who later becomes a participant in that scheme does not pay from the initial date, someone else has to pay more than his share. In these circumstances, if a school or a non-ratable Government property does not pay the rate from the inception of the scheme and wishes to commence participating 10 years after the scheme has been started, the other ratepayers in the area have shouldered the burden regarding that Government property. I believe that that is wrong.

All Government property, whether ratable or non-ratable, and particularly a school, should participate right from the inception of the scheme. These effluent schemes are introduced for the sake of public health, and surely no institution has a greater need in this connection than a school, where so many young people are involved. So, I hope the Government will alter its policy on this matter. I appreciate that the Government makes grants in this connection and I believe that, where a ratepayer is obliged to pay a rate greater than \$30 a year, a grant is made available.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You earlier referred to "the Minister". Which Minister did you mean?

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: I am sorry; the letter I referred to was from the Minister of Local Government. I hope the Government will review the position and participate from the inception of a scheme in connection with non-ratable Government properties. In country areas many people rely wholly and solely on primary industries. We all know that, because of the conditions prevailing in country areas, many smaller towns are declining. Perhaps

some of the bigger towns, which are becoming regional centres, are progressing.

I believe that the development of tourism will greatly assist in maintaining the viability of country towns, many of which have a historical aspect that is worth preserving. The National Trust has many country branches, and seaside areas are grasping the opportunity of providing tourists with better facilities. Tourism is increasing considerably in some parts of the Midland District. I refer, in particular, to possibly one of South Australia's most beautiful areas, namely, the Barossa Valley. People in the valley have accepted the challenge; they are conscious of the beauty of the valley and of what it can produce. They hold a vintage festival that is of great advantage not only to the valley but also to the State as a whole.

A certain area on Yorke Peninsula has a pronounced Cornish flavour and, recently, people there considered holding a Cornish festival, with the aid of Government assistance, for which I commend the Government. If people anywhere consider that their area has tourist potential, it is their responsibility to foster it and do their best to make it a viable and profitable undertaking. It is with pleasure that I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): It gives me pleasure to support the motion. I appreciated the Speech made by the new Governor, but it is unfortunate that his appointment was made necessary by the untimely death of the former Governor, Sir James Harrison.

I note with regret the death of former members, one of whom I knew well. I refer to Percival Hillam Quirke, who advised me from the time I first intended to enter politics.

I notice that the Governor's Speech contains considerable detail on proposed expenditure, and intend now to mention a proposal that I have been considering. As honourable members will no doubt be aware, I represented South Australia in the Senate for a short period. On entering this Council prior to the Budget speech last year, I noted the different procedure followed in presenting a similar measure in the Council compared with that in the Commonwealth Upper House. The Budget speech and the detailed line-by-line examination of proposed expenditure in the Commonwealth Parliament is conducted in both Houses simultaneously, and this procedure has been found to be most satisfactory.

However, such measure is not introduced in the Council until complete discussion on

it has taken place in another place. The Bill introduced in the Council is not subject to the same kind of detailed examination as is given to a similar measure in the Senate. There is up to a five-week delay between the presentation of the appropriation and expenditure accounts for the year, as introduced in another place, and their reaching the Council. When the measure reaches the Council, the Government is understandably impatient and, although the Council can delay it for as long as it sees fit, it is never obstructive. There is considerable pressure on this Council to pass the measure because the Government is waiting for it to go through both Houses so that it knows where it stands regarding expenditure.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Do they take too long on it in the Lower House?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Not at all, but we do not get the opportunity for sufficient discussion here. Although I know the opportunity exists, the Council does not wish to be obstructive, so it passes the measure as quickly as possible.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Any honourable member can discuss it in detail, can't he?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Yes, line by line. Nevertheless, there is an understandable feeling that the measure should be passed as soon as possible. By this time, certain proposals have lost much of their public interest; so many valuable contributions made in the Council do not perhaps receive the notice and attention they should. The Senate proposal was adopted not long ago; in fact, in 1961. In reading the debate on this matter, I noticed that the Opposition was opposed to any change in procedure.

On September 26, 1961, the Leader of the Government in the Senate moved for the Senate to resolve itself forthwith into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the Estimates of Receipts and Expenditure for the year ending June 30, 1962. The proposal was that the Senate should, in the Committee of the Whole, examine votes in the Estimates on a motion to "take note" of the proposed expenditure. The idea was to give the Senate more time for detailed examination of the Estimates instead of it having to wait for the scrutiny to take place on the Appropriation Bill and being involved in the inevitable time limitations brought about by the end of the session rush. The new procedure sought only to provide the Senate with more opportunity to consider the Estimates of Expenditure; any requests for amendment could

be made only when the Appropriation Bill came before the Senate.

In *Australian Senate Practice*, Mr. J. R. Odgers said that the new procedure could safely be said to be a success and that it was likely to continue. Having experienced the procedure, I assure honourable members that it is a success, so much so that it has been extended to such an extent that the Senate resolves itself into committees to examine specific parts of the expenditure in order to obtain even greater detail and have a more detailed examination of the various proposals.

During the discussion on the various proposals the advisers to the Ministers attend and are available so that members' questions can be answered promptly. I consider that a more detailed examination of financial measures in the Council would have the same effect as this procedure has had in the Senate, namely, of providing probably the most valuable debate of the session. I realize that, in years gone by, even less information was available to the Council. I understand that it was only during the time that you, Mr. President, became Chief Secretary and Leader of the Council that more information was made available to members on the Appropriation Bill. I believe that, with the vast sums of money now being expended by State Governments and the additional complications that arise with such expenditure, more detailed examination by the Council could assist us in our review of the Government's proposals for the year.

I do not wish to expand my remarks any further on such a proposal, but I ask whether the Standing Orders Committee could examine it to ascertain whether any change in Standing Orders would be necessary to introduce such a change in procedure, and I shall certainly raise the matter again. I understand there has been some change in another place in the method of introducing Appropriation Bills. In fact, that Bill and the Estimates of Expenditure are to be considered together, as is done in the Council.

I wish to refer briefly to the situation regarding boat havens in the South-East. I appreciate that the Government has taken steps to examine the situation at Port MacDonnell. Indeed, some investigatory work has already been carried out. In reply to a question, I understood the Minister to say that no information would be available until the end of winter. I can understand this because, having visited Port MacDonnell recently, I know that the rocks which were placed in position in order

to examine the effects of the waves and the tides were completely under water and likely to remain there for the rest of the winter.

I hope the positions of the rocks were marked clearly so that any movement in them can be detected. However, I cannot see how this will provide information on the effect of the breakwater which, I understand, is above water and not below it. However, I am not a marine engineer or an expert, and I have no doubt that some information will come forward. I only hope that the rocks have not been placed in their respective positions for the specific purpose of gaining time and delaying the measure until after the next election, because the people in this area require this protection. This port harbours many South-East fishing boats, which need the protection of a breakwater.

I also wish briefly to refer to forestry in our part of the world. In determining priorities this year, I hope the Government will consider the concept that has existed in Victoria for some time—the provision of funds for the planting of private forests. This money is provided on good terms: I understand that \$5,000 is provided on a 20-year term with no interest and no capital repayments for the first 12 years. I should like to see this happen in South Australia, because much waste land could be used for the planting of private forests. If this proposal was introduced, it might circumvent the necessity for so much good farming land to be taken out of primary production and put under forests. After all, pine trees grow as satisfactorily on waste land as they do on good land.

I refer also to the Kangaroo Island ferry service, on which two reports have been made, neither of which has been made public. I trust that some time this year the Government

will see fit to make them public, because it is difficult for honourable members representing the area to understand fully why the scheme is not proceeding when information is not available to enable them to study the proposals. While on Kangaroo Island recently, I also noticed that a Matriculation class is not available on the island. This makes it difficult for people with schoolchildren on the island, as the cost of sending the children to the mainland to do their Matriculation is indeed high and, of course, the financial position of most islanders is not particularly rosy. I hope the Government will see its way clear to provide a Matriculation class on Kangaroo Island as soon as possible.

This applies not only to Kangaroo Island but also to many other country areas. It is indeed difficult for people in country areas to find the necessary finance to enable their children to reach Matriculation standard. It is a poor state of affairs that, in a country as affluent as Australia, people are born second-class citizens merely because of their lack of opportunities to obtain a higher education because of the area in which they live.

I was concerned last year to see that, when the Commonwealth Government handed over to the State Government the right to levy pay-roll taxes, those taxes were increased by 40 per cent. I hope the Government will not take any further steps in this direction again this year. It is not easy for employers to continue handing on these costs to the consumer. After all, it is the consumer who finally pays. I support the motion.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.17 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 1, at 2.15 p.m.