

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 8, 1974

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

PETITIONS: LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE presented a petition from 584 ratepayers and residents of the District Council of Franklin Harbor expressing dissatisfaction with the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and praying that the Legislative Council would preserve the autonomy of the District Council of Franklin Harbor by opposing its proposed amalgamation with portion of the District Council of Cleve.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN presented a petition from 369 ratepayers of the District Council of Morgan expressing strong objection to the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, as it did not take into account the will of the majority of people of the district, and praying that the Legislative Council would reject any legislation to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission where such recommendations were contrary to the wishes of the petitioners.

Petitions received and read.

QUESTIONS**GAWLER RIVER FLOODING**

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I refer to the most unfortunate flooding that has occurred north of Adelaide in the Virginia, Two Wells and Gawler River regions in recent days and also to the newspaper reports concerning that tragedy. It appears from the reports that a loss of about \$1 000 000 is being suffered by those people who have lost their crops in the flood, and the question of possible compensation has been raised by them. I understand that the Minister made a comment to the effect that, as soon as he or his officers could make inspections of the area, that would occur. In addition, there was a rather disturbing aspect raised in yesterday's press that one gentleman who was seriously affected by the floods claimed that the authorities did not give sufficient warning prior to opening flood gates in the South Para reservoir. There was considerable detail in the press about that gentleman's claim, and a statement by Mr. Lewis for the department. I ask the Minister whether he has any statement to make on this whole affair, involving loss to these South Australians and also the possibility of some error being made regarding the flood gates. Is any compensation contemplated at all regarding the loss and, if compensation can be claimed, what must be the next move for the gardeners concerned to make?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member referred to the fact that I said at the weekend that my departmental officers would be inspecting the flooded area. That was done yesterday, and the officers are compiling a report. If that report is not in my office this afternoon it will possibly be there tomorrow morning, and I will be able to give the honourable member more information tomorrow than I can give him today, because that report will be the basis on which the whole matter will be assessed. I know that about 5 per cent of the market gardening area was affected. I will not know until I receive a report exactly how much damage has been caused to the

potato and onion crops, although I understand (as would be expected) that cauliflower, cabbage and lettuce crops have been severely affected.

Regarding the honourable member's other point about the release of water from the dams, I will ask my colleague to give me a report on the matter in order to clear up the situation. Until I can ascertain the full facts from the department, I do not know exactly what is the position. However, under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act people can lodge with the Lands Department applications for assistance if they have been adversely affected. Undoubtedly, the Government will examine this measure in its entirety and make an announcement when all the facts are known.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Will the Minister of Agriculture ascertain what level of water was in South Para reservoir prior to the recent rains: how many gates were opened on the night of the flooding; and whether a safety margin is allowed in relation to reservoirs at this time of the year in case of unusual rains such as those that have recently occurred?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain a report from my colleague and bring down a reply when it is available.

COUNCILS

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Reports on radio programmes and in the press today have indicated that a certain decision has been made regarding the amalgamation of councils. From the reports I have heard, I understand that eight metropolitan councils and nine country councils are no longer to be affected (as recommended by the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas) by the Bill that is to be presented to Parliament. The reason given by the Minister for this appears to be that the people in the areas concerned have protested successfully to him, and he has said that it is their wish that there should be no amalgamations in those areas. Will the Minister of Health ascertain whether, in the Bill that is to be presented to Parliament, those people whose councils are still to be subjected to amalgamation will be given the right of a local option poll to allow them, too, to express their views, not having done so already by public protest?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague.

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: In yesterday's *Advertiser* Dr. Tonkin was reported as having claimed that the Government was taking no action on the report of the Bright committee which inquired into health and hospital services in this State. Has the Minister of Health had an opportunity to study the report and, if he has, will he say what are his reactions to it? Also, are the statements that Dr. Tonkin has made correct and, if they are, will the Minister make a statement regarding the committee's recommendations that will perhaps be implemented by the Government?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I saw the report in yesterday's press to which the honourable member has referred. My first reaction was that Dr. Tonkin must have been showing his frustrations at the council meeting referred to as a result of the bitter struggle that is at present going on for the leadership of the Liberal Party. I know that he raised this matter in another place way back in the

middle of September and that his own Party has not seen fit to bring his private member's motion farther up on the Notice Paper so that it can proceed. I can therefore understand his frustration at the weekend Liberal Party meeting. I emphasise, however, that Dr. Tonkin's recent statement was no more correct than the statement he made in another place on September 11.

To enable honourable members to inform correctly the delegates at the Liberal Party Council meeting at the weekend, I will briefly outline some of the things being done that were recommended in the report. As a result, perhaps there will be one fewer in the stakes for the leadership of the Liberal Party. I will go through the Bright committee's recommendations clause by clause. The principles of health care outlined in chapter 1 are fully accepted, namely: (a) concern for "wellness" in addition to "illness"; (b) preventive measures; (c) community medicine; and (d) preservation of voluntary effort in the health field. Regarding chapter 2, dealing with preventive medicine, recommendations have been made by the Public Health Department for extensions of existing—(a) epidemiology services; (b) health education programmes; and (c) occupational health activities.

Regarding chapter 3, dealing with organisation of health services, I have already reported to this Council that the Government has not accepted the Bright committee's recommendation regarding setting up a separate authority. However, we are looking at the question, so that the health and hospital services can be integrated more thoroughly. I am sure we will come up with a very good solution. Regarding chapter 4, dealing with maternal and child health, action has already been taken by the Public Health Department to strengthen Government activity in these areas by developing a division of maternal and child health. Suitable staff will need to be recruited. Regarding chapter 5, dealing with family planning and abortion, the Family Planning Association has been given increased financial assistance by the Government. Additional hospital-based clinic sessions have been approved, additional social worker positions for abortion services have been established, and the position of the gynaecologist to provide liaison and advisory services related to family planning and abortions in the voluntary organisation and Government fields has been advertised recently by the Hospitals Department.

Regarding chapter 6, domiciliary care services are no longer restricted to the Woodville (Western), Murray Bridge, Port Lincoln, and Wallaroo/Kadina/Moonta areas as outlined in the report. Similar services are now available in the southern and northern areas of Adelaide, the Para region, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Whyalla, Loxton, etc. The expansion of domiciliary services throughout the metropolitan area and to the larger country centres has been a significant forward step in the last two to three years. Associated organisations such as Royal District Nursing Service and Meals on Wheels are represented on the local committee of management of domiciliary services.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Dr. Tonkin's statement must have worried you.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Honourable members opposite have already heard Dr. Tonkin, and they were called into line over the weekend. Honourable members heard Dr. Tonkin tell his story.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I point out to the Minister that questions are to elicit information, and he must not go into comment and debate. What the Minister is saying would be more appropriate in a Ministerial statement, but it is not a reply to a question.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: With due respect, Mr. President, I point out that the Hon. Mr. Chatterton asked me to outline some of the things being done in regard to the Bright report.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not want to debate the matter with the Minister. A question was definitely asked and, as long as the Minister complies with the request for information, I am happy. However, the Minister must not enter into a political debate.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: May I continue giving the information to the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, who asked me what was being done in regard to the report? The question of political implications came about as a result of an interjection.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not here to debate the question with the Minister. He may answer the Hon. Mr. Chatterton's question but, if he does not do that, I shall refuse to give him the opportunity to proceed. The Minister can answer the question.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Thank you, Sir. Chapter 6 deals with elderly persons and domiciliary care. A joint Commonwealth-States committee has been formed to consider requests for extensions of nursing home accommodation, whether this be public or private. The main deficiency of nursing home beds is in the public sector. The construction of additional public nursing home beds has been approved by the State for the Home for Incurables and Northfield Wards. Previously vacant beds at Kalyra Hospital have been converted into public nursing home beds. Day care and treatment areas for the elderly have been established at Northfield Wards, Glenside, and Hillcrest, and a property for use as a day care centre for the elderly has been recently purchased at Mount Gambier.

Chapter 7 deals with habilitation and rehabilitation. A Director of Rehabilitation has been appointed to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The physical medicine department at Queen Elizabeth Hospital has extended its services, and the rehabilitation section at Flinders Medical Centre has reached the final drawing stage. New sheltered workshops have been opened by the Mental Health Services for the rehabilitation of the mentally ill. The whole issue of rehabilitation services, including associated compensation components, has been the subject of a committee of inquiry by the Australian Government, chaired by the Hon. Mr. Justice Woodhouse.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How many more pages have you got?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Chapter 8 deals with mental health. The general principle that mental health services should be closely linked and integrated with other health services at both hospital and community level is fully accepted, and all planning has been based on this concept in recent years. Designs for psychiatric units in general hospital areas are well advanced for Modbury Hospital, the new Para Districts Hospital and the new Whyalla Hospital.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How about Glenside?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I should hope so. The development of community mental health centres has required close co-operation with the Mental Health Services and, in view of the importance of merging psychiatric advice and consultation with similar consultative requirements in other disciplines, such as geriatrics, paediatrics, and so on, a complete adolescent unit has been opened at Enfield Hospital to augment existing services for emotionally disturbed adolescents. The comment of the

Bright committee that "the State has made significant advances in Mental Health Services in recent years" is naturally supported.

Chapter 9 deals with intellectual retardation. While it has not been accepted that the intellectually retarded services unit should become a section of a division of maternal and child health, the general principle of keeping the enlargement of existing institutions for the mentally retarded to minimal levels and of developing alternatives to institutional care (hostels, occupation centres, supporting community care, etc.) is fully supported. Such units are being progressively established. The care of totally or substantially dependent multiply handicapped and severely retarded children presents a major problem area and it is expected that the development of Ru Rua Hospital as a nursing home for this specific group should improve the situation. This newly renovated unit will be closely integrated with associated services at Adelaide Children's Hospital.

Chapter 10 deals with drugs. Additional Australian Government financial assistance has been provided to improve the drug education programmes in all States throughout Australia. As far as treatment is concerned, additional moneys have also been provided by the Australian Government for the purchase of additional facilities such as Osmond Terrace Private Hospital, which, incidentally, will be opened by the Premier in November. The Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board has progressively expanded its programmes throughout the State.

Chapter 11 deals with medical manpower and education. Despite some building delays, the construction of Flinders Medical Centre is proceeding at an expenditure level on buildings of about \$1 200 000 a month. It is appreciated that there will be a considerable "lead-in" time before graduates of Flinders Medical Centre are available for community practice.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That was not a Bright report recommendation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It commenced before the committee started to sit.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. The recent report of the Committee of Inquiry into Medical Education throughout Australia, chaired by Professor Karmel, has confirmed the situation that the main medical manpower problem relates to inadequacies of distribution of doctors rather than to any major deficiencies in overall numbers. This pattern is common to all Australian States. Both Commonwealth and State Government support has been given to the family medicine programme and to the progressive establishment of community health centres in South Australia as methods by which increasing numbers of medical graduates can be attracted into general practice and primary care settings. A submission has been made by the Postgraduate Committee in Medicine of the University of Adelaide for increased State Government support, but a decision on this issue has been delayed until the Sax Commission's proposals for postgraduate education in medicine throughout Australia are known. An Australia-wide conference on this matter has been arranged by the Postgraduate Federation in Medicine for August 17 and 18, 1974.

Chapter 12 relates to nurses. State Government approval has been given for the development at Sturt College of Advanced Education of a three-year full-time diploma course in nursing. It is considered that the introduction

of this particular type of course should provide valuable information on improved academic components of existing courses of nurse training. Prototype courses of training for community practice nurses have been introduced and a more comprehensive curriculum for community health nurses has been developed for introduction in 1974-75 to assist in the area of deficiencies of nursing services in the country regions. A programme for a relieving nursing service has been developed and it is hoped to introduce this service within the next several months, subject to availability of finance.

Chapter 13 deals with dentists. With Australian Government support a vastly accelerated programme of training of school dental therapists has been undertaken and an ever-increasing number of schoolchildren is receiving the benefits of this service. It is agreed that the dental department of Royal Adelaide Hospital has not been able to cope with the large numbers of pensioners and indigent patients seeking attention, despite recent increases in staff establishment positions in this department. A complete review of services in the dental department of Royal Adelaide Hospital is currently under investigation by an external firm of management consultants, and it is expected that a reprogramming of staffing facilities in this area will be required to cope with the ever-increasing demands being placed on the department. Investigations are also being made of the possibility of extending services beyond the dental department of Royal Adelaide Hospital to various community health centres, for example, proposals for Angle Park and other hospitals such as Flinders Medical Centre. The training of dental hygienists to augment manpower deficiencies is currently under consideration by the Further Education Department.

Chapter 14 deals with personnel and training. The recommendations of both the Bright committee and the Shea committee relating to increased numbers required in the paramedical and social work areas have been progressively implemented by the colleges of advanced education.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: On a point of order, Mr. President, is this a Ministerial statement or is it a reply to a question?

The PRESIDENT: I think it goes beyond the intention of Standing Orders concerning the reply to a question. It savours of what is commonly called a Dorothy Dixier rather than a reply to a direct question. If the Minister has any more to say, I ask him to be brief.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There are only three other chapters, and an honourable member did ask me what we were doing in regard to the Bright report. I will be as brief as possible. In regard to Aboriginal health services, these have been substantially improved, and the Public Health Department has now assumed full responsibility for the public health of Aborigines. Regarding research planning and development services, the development of a State health resources unit providing services to both the Hospitals Department and the Public Health Department has resulted in the correlation of statistical, epidemiological, demographic and other data for use in health service planning. In conclusion (and I emphasise this, because honourable members did not want to hear it) but the fact remains that I was asked to provide this information—

THE PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister must not comment.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The emphases on humanity, imagination, universality and economy are fully supported. It is agreed that the delivery of health services cannot be based on rigid organisational patterns. The

report states in chapter 17.7, "Over the next 20 years, the only constant in a good health service will be constant change". It is also accepted that the final paragraph of the report cautions against progressing too quickly. This final paragraph (17.13) states:

Finally, we urge that the new health authority, if constituted, should not attempt too much too quickly. Some of our recommendations involve radical changes in organisation and outlook. Many changes, although not all, can better be gradually introduced as satisfactory personnel with sufficient time can be found to superintend the transition.

We have accepted the Bright report with the exception of chapter 3, and we are already implementing much of what has been recommended, which has been pointed out in this statement and which has been made in response to a question by my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Chatterton.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, as Acting Leader of the Government in the Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My question concerns a newspaper report of last Friday's date, the headline being "Stop money-wasting queries, MPs told". The article states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) warned yesterday that the Government would not waste public money answering unnecessary questions from MPs. In a Ministerial statement to the Assembly, Mr. Dunstan said: "It is quite improper to spend Government funds on unnecessary inquiries." He said the Leader of the Opposition (Dr. Eastick) had asked a Question on Notice on September 17 which had been expressed in very general terms. "I have been able to establish that at least 148 persons worked on finding the answer and that more than 78 man-hours were spent on the job," Mr. Dunstan said. "This is a conservative estimate—

that is something—

as many departments could not provide the names of clerks or typists who are involved in file-searching and typing." The article goes on to state what was actually in the question, but that is not material to what I want to ask. First, is the Government sincere in its threat that honourable members are to be denied information they require? Secondly, in view of the instance today when 20 minutes of honourable members' time was taken up in the reply to one honourable member by a Minister, thus eroding honourable members' time for questions without notice, can something be done to shorten Ministers' replies? Thirdly, could a "guesstimate" be given to me of the amount of man-hours spent in researching the research that went into the assessment of how many man-hours were spent on the question referred to by the Premier? I should like the Acting Leader of the Council to give me specific replies to those three questions.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am sure the honourable member will agree that I do not think there is any move by the Government to keep information from honourable members when they ask for it in this Council. We should get that straight right from the start. We know how honourable members play politics and try to embarrass the Government as much as they can. This is the role of the Opposition, as honourable members know.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It appears to have been the role of the Government this afternoon.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: All the Government is asking is that honourable members, whether Government or Opposition members, use a little common sense when ask-

ing a question, in the light of the information that can possibly be given more succinctly than was the case in the answer referred to—namely, 148 persons, excluding typists, and about 78 man-hours being used in compiling the information. I am sure honourable members would not want to be found guilty of a similar occurrence, and perhaps repetition, and all that sort of thing, because, if that occurred, the Government would be brought to a standstill running around collecting information. What I am trying to say to the Council is that I am sure honourable members do not want that sort of thing to happen. At the same time, honourable members are entitled to information. I think that is what the Premier was conveying in his answer. The situation as I see it (I do not think anyone has been guilty of offending in this Council, and I sincerely hope he will not be) is that it is not a fair crack of the whip, to use a typical Australian expression. The other questions asked by the honourable member I shall need time to study, but I will give him an answer as soon as possible.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Can the Minister of Health say how many hours work was involved in the compilation of his reply to the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, and when the question was first directed to the Minister? Evidently it was directed to him prior to its being asked in the Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Chatterton told me at 2.10 p.m. that he would ask me a question about the Bright committee's report. I have had information about the matter for some time, because Dr. Tonkin in another place got up on September 11 and was going to condemn the Government for its lack of activity in connection with the report. The information has been in my bag. It is a progress statement which I got from my officers on what was being done in regard to the Bright committee's recommendations. It would be impossible to find out how long it took to compile the statement, because it was completed some time ago.

MURRAY RIVER FLOODING

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In the Lower Murray area, there are a number of Government irrigated swamps where the Government is responsible for the management of the irrigation and, in the case of these swamps, the Government has been doing considerable work in strengthening and raising the banks against the present and expected flooding of the Murray River. However, there are also a number of private irrigated swamp areas on the Murray River. Most of these are managed by boards under the Irrigation of Private Property Act. The boards manage the irrigation and pass on the costs by way of rates, pursuant to that Act, to the landowners. These boards, too, are finding it necessary to strengthen and raise the banks. I understand the situations of the two kinds of swamp are different because, in the case of the Government swamps, where the Government is doing these works (strengthening and raising the banks), it is only protecting its own undertaking, which is natural.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Where?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: On the Lower Murray, between Mannum and Lake Alexandrina. There are about 15 private swamp areas, including the Toora Irrigation Board, the Long Flat Irrigation Board, and so on. Will the Government consider giving some assistance to the irrigation boards established under the Irrigation of Private

Property Act in strengthening and raising the banks, and if so, what?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As the honourable member is aware, the Minister of Lands is inspecting the Murray River flood areas today and tomorrow, so I understand. I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague when he returns so that he can assess the situation. Whether he is inspecting these particular areas at present I am unable to say. Nevertheless, I will draw his attention to the question.

RACING

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister representing the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The Government has given notice that it intends introducing legislation based on the Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Racing Industry (the Hancock report). I refer the Government to the evidence recorded at page 316 of the report in relation to the lease of the Harold Tyler Reserve. This reserve is on lease from the Enfield council to the Days Road Social Club for a period of 21 years, with a right of renewal, the rent being fixed at \$400 a year. In the recommendations of the report, at page 335, we see, at paragraph 23:

The present lease of the Harold Tyler Reserve, Angle Park, to the Days Road Social Club Incorporated and the licence to the Adelaide Greyhound Racing Club to use the reserve should be set aside. The A.G.R.C. should be direct lessees of the reserve, but access to the trotting track for trotting trainers should be safeguarded.

Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to cancel the lease between the Enfield council and the Days Road Social Club and, if it intends to introduce legislation based on the report, will the Minister say on what grounds should the Government interfere with a lease signed by a council and another organisation?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, who will no doubt bring down a reply.

GLADSTONE GAOL

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Acting Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Employees of the Prisons Department and residents of Gladstone and district are concerned about the possible closing of Gladstone Gaol. Will the Minister ascertain what are the Government's plans regarding the future use of the gaol? Will it be closed permanently, or does the Government intend to use the property for another purpose?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, who will no doubt bring down a reply.

SHEEP EXPORT

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I refer to a report in the *Sunday Mail* of October 6, headed "\$4 000 000 sheep market doubt", part of which states:

South Australia is in danger of losing its \$4 000 000 sheep export market in Iran.

This is alarming news not only to primary producers but also to any logical person in South Australia, as we cannot afford to lose this kind of export market. Mr. Ken Dingwall, Managing Director of Metro Meat Limited, was reported in the same article as having said:

I would say the Iranians are safeguarding their supplies. They couldn't get any security from South Australia because of problems with the unions.

We are all aware that there have been disputes between the union and the meat industry regarding the shipping of these sheep. As a result, Iran has apparently been able to make a contract with Bulgaria. My question is based more on what the Minister said recently in reply to questions asked by the Hon. Mr. Chatterton and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. In reply to the Hon. Mr. Chatterton on September 17, the Minister said that representatives of the meat workers union, the meat exporters and shippers, as well as members of the Australian Meat Board, were to be called together for a meeting chaired by Colonel McArthur, Chairman of the Australian Meat Board. In reply to the Hon. Mr. DeGaris on the same day, the Minister said:

A major point of contention was that members of the meat industry unions did not know exactly what was going on within the industry itself.

Later, he said:

Unions have recently lifted their ban on the shipment of livestock from South Australia and Western Australia, but with certain provisos.

However, those provisos were not spelt out. One point made strongly was that the sheep being exported were heavy wethers that were unsuitable for the Australian trade, and I am sure other points were made to the union. Will the Minister say, as a result of this meeting, what steps South Australia has taken to ensure that further shipments of live sheep will not be cancelled because of union action?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think the honourable member's basic question was, "What steps has South Australia taken to ensure that its future shipments to Iran will be in order?" I do not know what the honourable member means by "South Australia". If he had read the full report in the *Sunday Mail*, he would have seen a sentence that read something like the following:

I believe the private industry people in Australia are still dealing with the export of live sheep to Iran.

Although the honourable member did not refer to that statement, I remember reading it. As I told the honourable member, a meeting was called (at my instigation, incidentally)—

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Yes.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: —and, as a result of that, a subcommittee was formed. I understand that that subcommittee has met, but I have not yet received a report of what happened at its meeting. Nevertheless, I hope to contact Colonel McArthur soon and ascertain what transpired at the meeting. It was also stated at the initial meeting that Iran was interested in purchasing sheep from Rumania and Bulgaria. No-one can do anything to stop Iran from conducting those investigations: if it wants to go elsewhere for its stock, that is up to it. Of course, Rumania and Bulgaria are closer to Iran than is Australia; a vast amount of water separates Iran from this country. However, I believe there are other markets in the Middle East that we can supply at present, and I sincerely hope that we will be able to do so.

HOUSING FOR ABORIGINES

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Has the Acting Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question regarding housing for Aborigines?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: At the request of the Community Welfare Department and, more recently, of the Aboriginal Affairs Department and the Aboriginal Housing Policy Committee, the trust has been inspecting and, when suitable, buying houses at Murray Bridge under the funded house scheme. Initially, local agents were asked to provide details of available houses but, under the sponsorship of a member of the National Aboriginal Consultative Council, a housing subcommittee has been formed at Murray Bridge, and now Aboriginal members of the community inform the trust as suitable houses are located so that inspections can be carried out.

About 20 houses have been bought since March, 1973, and the trust has been told that up to 30 Aboriginal families could be in need of housing. At this stage, however, the trust has only 15 applications on hand from Aboriginal families requiring housing in Murray Bridge. The rumour that the trust is setting out to house an Aboriginal family in every street of Murray Bridge is without foundation.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister representing the Attorney-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I refer to the question asked by the Hon. Mr. Hill on September 11 and the Minister's reply to that question on October 3. The question dealt with some provisions of the Land and Business Agents Act. The effect of the Minister's reply was that a land broker could not perform private brokerage work on behalf of a land agent who was his employer. Does that reply mean that land brokers employed by stock agents or trustee companies are also prohibited from doing such work for their employers?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I ask leave to make a brief statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I believe that some elderly folk who are inmates of Glenside Hospital are living upstairs and that there is no lift whereby they can be transported to the ground floor. Consequently, each such patient has to be carried by two people down an internal staircase in the event of a fire or any other emergency. Is the Minister aware of this situation, and can he say what steps are being taken to remedy it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am aware of the conditions existing at Glenside Hospital, and no-one is more concerned about the situation than I am. Further, the Labor Government was concerned about the situation when it came to office, with the result that we have spent money at the hospital and we are attempting to upgrade the conditions there. Within the next day or two an announcement will be made that a tender has been let in connection with stage 1 of our rebuilding programme at Glenside. The Australian Government has announced that more than \$600 000 000 will be spent over the next five years for the general upgrading of hospitals, and I believe that we will get a considerable portion of that sum. Glenside Hospital is high on our list, and we are attempting to do everything possible to improve the facilities there for the patients, who I recognise are not living in the best conditions.

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yesterday it was announced that the number of unemployed people in South Australia had increased during September by 1251 to 11 187, and these estimates did not include school leavers. As this situation is causing serious concern in this State, can the Minister of Agriculture, as Acting Leader of the Government in this Council, make any statement concerning this very worrying situation, and can he say whether the State Government has any plans for trying to improve it?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I can assure the honourable member that the South Australian Government is concerned about the level of unemployment. I am not referring to school leavers, because the end of the school year is not yet here. Nevertheless, we will have to look at that situation in the next few months; I think the honourable member was playing politics in regard to the question of school leavers. I assure the honourable member that the Government is concerned about the matter. I will discuss it with the Premier and the Minister of Labour and Industry to see what the present situation is in South Australia, and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE BOARD

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Lands. First, how many appeals on South-East drainage rates have been heard; secondly, how many appeals have still to be heard; thirdly, how many appeals have been dismissed in part or as a whole; fourthly, how many appeals have been accepted as a whole; fifthly, what has been the cost involved; sixthly, what is the average weekly cost to the Government for each member of the appeal board; and, finally, where an obvious discrepancy appears in the findings of the appeal board, is it possible for a person, as there is no further right of appeal, to approach the Ombudsman for correction of the discrepancy?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: In fairness, I think the honourable member ought to put his question on notice, and I ask him to do that.

KANGAROO APPLE

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of September 18 about the possibility of commercial opportunities for growing kangaroo apple in South Australia?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Director of Agriculture states that kangaroo apple is a native plant which occurs mainly in the Lower South-East and the Mount Lofty Ranges, as well as Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania. I am informed that Mr. David Symon, Senior Botanist, Waite Agricultural Research Institute, is the authority on the solanum genus. He has been working on solanum species for a number of years. There are more than 20 of these, most of which are native plants. Currently Mr. Symon is working with colleagues in Victoria in regard to the drug content of kangaroo apple, as well as a number of other solanum species. I am also informed that similar work is being carried out in New Zealand, and Mr. Symon is in close contact with this group. I believe that Mr. Symon considers that more investigation work is necessary before any decision could be made in regard to a commercial venture.

LIFE SAVING ASSOCIATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Acting Chief Secretary a reply to my question about the Life Saving Association?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: There is no possibility of the Government's providing a helicopter in South Australia for the use of the Surf Life Saving Association of Australia, as the cost of the service would be prohibitive.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Order 69 be so far suspended as to allow Question Time to proceed to 3.30 p.m.

Because the Minister of Health wasted 20 minutes of the time of this Council in replying to a question, I believe that the Council should have the advantage of an extended Question Time.

Motion carried.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: REPLY TO QUESTION

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris suggested that I wasted 20 minutes of Question Time. Surely honourable members are entitled to replies if they ask questions. I was giving a full and comprehensive reply to the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, without any intention of wasting the time of the Council. I believe that the honourable member was entitled to a reply to his question.

CHILD CARE

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: My question is directed to the Minister of Health, and it refers to a child who has suffered brain damage and has been institutionalised. Am I correct in my understanding that, once that child is too old to be cared for at Adelaide Children's Hospital, there is no other institution especially catering for the needs and requirements of such a child? Can the Minister say whether that is so and, if it is, whether any steps are being taken to remedy this appalling situation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I should like this question to be placed on notice. I do not know why the child would not be eligible for admission to Strathmont. If the honourable member can give me details of the case in question, I shall be pleased to seek a report for him.

RAIL TRAVEL TO SYDNEY

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health a reply from the Minister of Transport to the question I asked recently regarding booking arrangements on the Indian-Pacific rail service between Adelaide and Sydney?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague states:

Bookings for the Indian-Pacific open 12 months ahead of the date of travel for passengers undertaking the journey from coast to coast, but only two months ahead for bookings between Adelaide and Sydney. This, of course, means that very little accommodation is available to South Australian travellers. However, all Railways Commissioners endorsed this arrangement in 1970 because the best utilisation of accommodation is gained by giving preference to coast-to-coast passengers. Furthermore, Adelaide passengers have the alternative of travelling via Melbourne. In an attempt to overcome this difficulty, the possibility of hauling an additional carriage between Port Pirie and Sydney was examined, but this proved to be beyond the capacity of New South Wales locomotives. An additional Indian-Pacific service is currently being examined and, should it be introduced, the situation should be eased to some extent.

GOVERNMENT WORKS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health a reply from the Minister of Transport to my recent question regarding the possibility of the Public Buildings Department's carrying out work for the Highways Department?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: My colleague states:

Apart from maintenance servicing of lifts in the Highways Department building at Walkerville, the Public Buildings Department is not carrying out work for the Highways Department.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: From activity I have seen at the end of the South-Eastern Freeway, I understand that there will be at least some access to it, or at least that is the impression one receives from travelling along the road now. Many people in the southern part of the State are anxious to use the road before it is cluttered up with commuter traffic from Monarto. Can the Minister say when the next section of the freeway will be opened to traffic?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall seek a report for the honourable member.

PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I understand that it was recently made known that work on the reconstruction of Highway No. 1 (Port Wakefield Road) is to cease soon. I understand, too, that some of the work will be left in a rather unsatisfactory state of construction when the work ceases. I further believe that a metropolitan gang will be substituted in due course on this work. In view of the unsatisfactory state in which the highway will be left on the apparent cessation of work, can the Minister say when work will be resumed and whether the reconstruction of the Waterloo Corner intersection, which was due for completion in early November, will be completed before what I trust will be a temporary cessation of work occurs?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a report.

FLEURIEU PENINSULA

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: On October 2, in reply to a question asked by the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, the Minister said:

No, the report—

referring to the report in the *Advertiser*—

is not correct. What concerns me in this matter is the fact that information is sometimes conveyed to the media, and then it is reported completely out of context. The situation is that the department is building a firebreak to protect its own small forestry plantation on the peninsula.

That was in reply to a question in relation to the Woods and Forests Department's clearing a large area of land on Fleurieu Peninsula. First, is it true that the firebreak referred to by the Minister on Wednesday, October 2, is in fact within or on the boundary of the area covered by the call for tenders to clear natural scrub; if so, can the Minister explain why firebreaks were being made within this area on September 30 and October 1 when, early in September, tenders had been called to clear the whole area; finally, can the Minister inform me whether it is for a firebreak, a track for access for firefighting vehicles, or a track to demarcate the area it was proposed to clear?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Let us get one thing clear. The Leader is implying that tenders are still open for the clearing of this land, but—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I didn't say that.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: —that is not so. Let us get this right from the word "Go". The Woods and Forests Department was quite entitled and was within its rights to call tenders, because it was concerned with forestry land, where it wants to plant pines; only about 21 hectares of pines was to have been planted this year. How the Leader can ask whether it is a firebreak or a fire track is beyond me, because I think they are one and the same thing. It would be necessary to build a track in order to get into the area to make a firebreak. Let me assure the Leader (and I have told him this) that I have made statements to the effect that this matter would be resolved between the Minister of Environment and Conservation and me, after looking at the whole picture. I assure him that it will be resolved in the interests of both the parties concerned. I am sure that, when a statement is made on just exactly what the future situation will be, everyone will be quite satisfied in the interests of the Woods and Forests Department as well as in the interests of the Environment and Conservation Department.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (on notice):

1. Has the Woods and Forests Department recently called for tenders to clear native forest in or near Boat Harbor Creek?

2. Was the Environment and Conservation Department informed in advance that the Woods and Forests Department proposed to clear native forests in this area?

3. On what dates was *Pinus radiata* planted in section 48, hundred of Waitpinga?

4. Is it true that work has already commenced on clearing native vegetation in sections 48 and/or 50, hundred of Waitpinga?

5. How many hectares of native vegetation have been cleared by or for the Woods and Forests Department in

each of its forests in each of the last five years and in the current year?

6. How many hectares of native vegetation are presently owned by the Woods and Forests Department?

7. How many hectares of native vegetation does the Woods and Forests Department propose to clear in the next five years in each of the forests under its control?

8. Has it been the policy to inform the Environment and Conservation Department of any proposal to clear areas of native forest?

9. If the answer to 8 is "Yes", for what areas referred to in question 5 was this policy not followed?

10. If the answer to 8 is "No", is it the policy of the Woods and Forests Department to make its files containing information on future operations available to the Environment and Conservation Department?

11. What procedures are followed to determine whether areas under consideration for clearing or planting have value for conservation purposes?

12. What procedures are followed to determine whether areas under consideration for clearing and/or planting are also under consideration for future acquisition for reservation under the National Parks and Wildlife Act?

13. What procedures are followed to determine whether areas under consideration for acquisition for forestry purposes are also under consideration for future acquisition under the National Parks and Wildlife Act?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, but on patches left in a previously cleared area. These tenders have been withdrawn.

2. No.

3. June, 1974.

4. No, but some firebreak work was recently undertaken.

5. *Vide* table shown below.

AREAS OF "VIRGIN" NATIVE VEGETATION CLEARED (IN HECTARES)

Forest Reserve	1975	Planting Year			
		1974	1973	1972	1971
Bundaleer.....	—	—	—	—	—
Wirrabara.....	—	80	113	72	80 (All graze woodland)
Wanilla.....	—	—	—	—	—
Mount Crawford.....	—	47	23	13	8
Kuitpo.....	—	—	33	—	—
Second Valley.....	—	—	—	—	—
Noolook.....	—	—	—	—	—
Mount Burr.....	—	—	—	—	—
Tantanoola.....	—	72	119	122	240
Mount Gambier.....	—	—	—	21	—
Myora.....	—	—	—	—	—
Caroline.....	—	54	40	250	270
Penola.....	—	—	—	—	28
Comaum.....	—	—	—	—	—
Cave Range.....	—	—	—	—	—

6. About 25 000 ha.

7. Negligible—occasional patches in pasture land only.

8. No.

9. *Vide* 8 above.

10. Yes, where there is any proposal to clear any area of natural vegetation.

11. Evaluation by the Woods and Forests Department.

12. Inquiries will be made of the Environment and Conservation Department.

13. *Vide* 12 above.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act relating to the marketing of wheat and the stabilisation of the wheat industry, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Honourable members interested in this matter will recall that there is a stabilisation system for the wheat industry in Australia which has been in operation for several years.

The purpose of this Bill is to continue this scheme in operation for the season commencing on October 1, 1974, and each of the next six succeeding seasons. The legislative scheme of which this Bill is part consists of a Commonwealth Act that is presently before the Australian Parliament and a supporting State Act. It is unnecessary at this stage to outline the constitutional reasons for this approach. This Bill which presages the supporting State Act is based on a uniform Australian draft Bill, this being the practice that has continued in this matter for some time. In fact, with the necessary changes made, it is similar in form to similar previous Acts in this matter.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act pre-saged by this Bill to come into operation, or to be deemed to have come into operation, on the day that the corresponding Commonwealth Act comes into operation. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 provides for appropriate repeal and savings. Clause 5 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 6 makes the temporal application of the Bill plain. Clause 7 sets out the powers of the board, which is continued in existence under the Commonwealth Act but which will derive its powers in relation to this State from an Act of this Parliament. Clause 8 empowers the Commonwealth Minister to give directions to the board. This is consistent with the legal situation that the board is a Commonwealth instrumentality.

Clause 9 provides for the licensing of receivers of wheat, and subclause (2) preserves the rights of existing licence holders in this State. Clause 10 enables persons to deliver wheat to the board and in certain circumstances, set out in subclause (2), compels them to deliver wheat to the board. The usual exceptions to this power of compulsion are contained in subclause (4). Clause 11 provides the method of delivery of wheat to the board which in this State is to a licensed receiver. Clause 12 sets out the circumstances in which wheat may be lawfully dealt with. Clause 13 sets out the method by which the price of wheat of a season will be determined, and I commend it to honourable members' close attention.

Clause 14 deals with quota wheat, which in this context may be regarded as wheat in relation to which the application of a fixed minimum price is certain. In this regard I draw honourable members' attention to subclause (3) of this clause, which admits of the possibility of some "non-quota wheat" being admitted into the system. Clause 15 provides a method of payment by the board. Clause 16 provides for the separation of wheat of the various seasons. Part III, clauses 17 to 20, sets out the "stabilisation provisions" and again I commend this Part to honourable members' close attention.

Clause 21 provides maximum flexibility in the use of the board's funds. Clause 22 is formal and provides for returns. Clause 23 requires persons having wheat, the property of the board, in their possession to keep it safe from damage. Clause 24 is an "entry and search" provision. Clause 25 is formal. Clause 26 is a usual indemnity provision. Clause 27 is a general penalty provision. Clause 28 is formal. Clause 29 provides an appropriate regulating power.

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

JUDGES' PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1271.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): As the Estimates have been thoroughly discussed in the Council

and in another place, and as the faults in the Budget, as pointed out to the Government, are apparently to be ignored by it, I do not intend to waste the time of honourable members. Instead, I wish merely to refer to some principles of administration and to the inability of Labor-controlled Governments to operate frugally. First, I would mention the balancing of the income and expenditure accounts. Every woman who runs a home and family knows the reality of this; every trading organisation knows the reality of this. A budget can be balanced by keeping expenditure within income or by spending freely and then bleating for more income to meet those extravagances. It is easy for people who never have had the training required to administer large sums of money to become flamboyant with other people's money, very much like children denied sweets for a long time suddenly being given a large bag of lollies.

The second thing I wish to mention is the necessity of obtaining value for money. We see only too clearly in South Australia today the very opposite—namely, the failure to recognise any necessity for real production. We see all around us the employment of more and more money for less and less output. We have had 48-hour weeks, then 44-hour weeks, and then 40-hour weeks. From my own observations around here, let alone from reports from industry, we now have a 15-hour week.

Our great financial problem in this State alone is that a percentage of people are loafing the rest of us into a depression. The inefficient use of money is evident not only in the fields we see around us but also in the areas we do not see; the proliferation of expert advisers, committees, boards, researchers and analysers, who are absorbing large slices of our income and producing not one iota of substances and goods required for the sustenance of the people of South Australia or for the earning of export income.

Money spent on paper work and office work makes us, as a State, poor. Money spent on producing goods and food makes us, as a State, rich. I am thinking of producing my own *Little Red Book*. In other words, money is going out for no usable, saleable or exportable goods. This whole field (of employing more and more outside advisers and consultants for Government operations) needs close examination. Owing to the fact that it is drowned in other figures, it is not possible for honourable members to assess accurately, from the papers before them, how much money has been or is being spent on consultants for roads and highways, consultants for town planning, consultants for this, and consultants for that; or to assess the effect of this upon the Treasury, or to what extent the money involved here means the denial of funds to functions under the departments of the Public Service—hospitals, schools, etc.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The Government appoints consultants regarding local government and then ignores them.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Those recommendations were very productive! Moreover, the employment of outsiders is likewise undesirable, for other reasons. It is detrimental to the status and wellbeing of the senior staff of our Highways Department, our Public Buildings Department, the Housing Trust, etc. It is downgrading our permanent public servants in the eyes of other professionals in Australia and suggesting that they are incapable of carrying out what comes under the ordinary assessment and planning in any well-organised department today.

While speaking of wasting money, the establishment of a media or other public statements analysis organisation, equipped with the latest scientific electronic marvels, to supply the Labor Party's public relations experts with basic information, and for this to be done at public expense,

may not be illegal; it may not be criminal, but it is certainly improper, unethical and wasteful of public funds—although I must admit it is probably no more wasteful of public funds than some of the pseudo-artistic extravaganzas on which our Treasurer has expended our money.

I come now to the major part of my speech: I refer to the extraordinary increase in State taxation in South Australia over the past four years. As the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, said in his speech, the Treasurer always puts the blame for this increased taxation on to someone else. It could be just feasible, could it not, that the true reason for the increase in State taxation over the past four years is that we now have the most wasteful Treasurer that this State has ever had? Every time the Treasurer returns from a Canberra finance conference, we are told that the Commonwealth Government has been unrealistic and has refused South Australia the money essential (that is the usual word) for its progress: perhaps I should say for its maintenance, for there seems to have been no progress during the past four years. Indeed, South Australia has failed to maintain its position of five years ago. We have less employment, less production, on an adjusted monetary basis, and less rate of increase of population.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Don't you feel ashamed that we have to go cap in hand to the Commonwealth Government for a mall in Rundle Street?

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Yes. It is time our Treasurer learned that strength in Government requires that one should live within one's income and not bleed one's friends and subjects for assistance. By this I mean that the people of South Australia should not be bled white to provide the Treasurer with money for many unnecessary activities and for many wasteful public works, which neither advance the State nor produce the goods for a better living standard for its inhabitants.

The Hon. Mr. Creedon in his speech last Thursday made much of the fact that costs in all businesses are going up; that business proprietors make provision for this by appearing before the Prices Justification Tribunal. He also said:

It is a great pity that more attention could not be paid to the facts of life and a realisation of the truth that the problems that confront us are brought about by outside influences.

It is accepted that Australia's inflation cannot be controlled by the South Australian Government but, for honourable members' information generally and for the Hon. Mr. Creedon's in particular, I will now give some figures that pertain to the inflation of taxation in this State. It will be realised from these figures that a large part of our wounds is self-inflicted and not caused by outside influences.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Hear, hear!

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Perhaps it will become clearer who is feeding inflation. In five years, the State taxes of South Australia have increased from \$58 658 000 in the year 1969-70 to \$208 921 000, in the 1974-75 Budget. I will now give honourable members the totals. Total State taxes for the year 1969-70 amounted to \$58 658 000; for 1970-71, \$61 550 000; for 1971-72, \$96 161 000; for 1972-73, \$115 569 266. In 1973-74, it jumped to \$150 938 912, and in the period that we are now dealing with it is going to \$208 921 000. Taking that per capita, in 1969-70 it was \$51.05; in 1970-71, \$52.69; in 1971-72, it was \$81.24; in 1972-73, it was \$95.63; in 1973-74, it was \$123.66; and this year it has jumped to \$169.47. Some of the percentage increases to which I am now going to refer will be interesting to honourable members as they grossly exceed the rates of inflation running over recent years.

In the 1971-72 taxation year, the rate increased 54.1 per cent over the previous year; in 1972-73, it increased 17.7 per cent over the previous year; in 1973-74, it was 29.3 per cent over the previous year; and this year it is 37 per cent over last year's figure. One sees, therefore, the picture that, in the 1972-73 financial year when inflation in Australia was running at 7 per cent, South Australia's taxation inflated by 17.7 per cent, or nearly three times the running rate of inflation.

In 1973-74, when inflation in Australia was more than 12 per cent, South Australia's taxation inflation was 29.3 per cent, or more than double the national rate. In 1974-75, the financial year for which we are now estimating, when inflation (if we are lucky) will be in the 17 per cent to 20 per cent range, South Australia's taxes are being inflated by 37 per cent or, again, about double the national rate. It is particularly interesting to compare this State's rate of taxation with the Commonwealth grant made to it, which grant is generally in proportion to Commonwealth taxation income.

Whereas in 1971-72 the Commonwealth grant increased (and I will take these on a per capita basis) by 5-6 per cent on the previous year, State taxes increased 54 per cent over the previous year. In 1972-73, the Commonwealth grant increased by 11.8 per cent, whereas State taxes increased by 17.7 per cent over the previous year. In 1973-74, the Commonwealth grant increased by 13.3 per cent, whereas State taxes increased by 29.3 per cent over the previous year, and this financial year, when the Commonwealth grant has increased by 15.4 per cent, State taxes are to be increased by 37 per cent over last year's figures. I ask the question: Who is causing inflation? I ask another question: how soon will the South Australian taxation contribute more to our Budget than the Commonwealth grant? I will also give the answer: at the present rate of increase, I should say this will happen within the next couple of years. This is a fairly nasty picture.

I shall now give a few more figures. South Australian State taxation increased over the two years 1972-73 to 1974-75 from \$115 569 266 to \$208 921 000. Therefore, it increased \$93 000 000 or, on a per capita basis over those two years only, \$73.84 for each man, woman and child. If the average breadwinner represents a household of four, he will this year have to find an extra \$295 for State taxes over what he had to find two years ago; that it, of course, after he has paid his normal Commonwealth taxation on his wages. To put it another way, this year the breadwinner in a family of four will have to find a total of \$677.88 in this respect whereas last year he had to find \$474.64. No wonder the working man is crying out for much more money if he is living in South Australia!

But let us ask another question. Who pays this vast increase in taxation? Who pays the \$93 000 000 that has been applied in this State over the last two years? It does not come from any particular section of the community, and it does not come out of the profits of enormous businesses: it comes from the manner of living of our people at all levels of the community, and it hits those in all levels similarly. We have to examine, then, an increase of \$93 000 000 in two years.

But what does one find? An increase of \$9 000 000 comes from motor vehicle registrations and fees. Honourable members will agree that almost everyone in the State is involved in that, as just about every family has a car. Also, there is a \$2 000 000 increase in land tax, to which virtually everyone contributes. There is also a \$19 000 000 increase in stamp duties. Few matters in which one is

involved escape this. There is also an increase of \$1 000 000 in Licensing Court fees; a few honourable members would certainly contribute to this. Finally, and by far the largest, there has been a \$59 000 000 increase in pay-roll tax in two years. In a sense, this hits all equally, because it does not come from business profits in the generally accepted sense. It is a cost of production, and it increases the cost of the product that comes off the farm, out of the radio factory, from the man who makes our clothes, and from the fisherman who catches our seafood. It is part of the cost and is an integral part of the price we pay.

To sum up, it will be seen, then, that these costly increases in South Australian taxation have over the past four years been many times greater than the increase caused by inflation. These increases are hitting us all more or less in equal proportions, and they are making the cost of living and manufacturing in South Australia almost insupportable. The Hon. Mr. Creedon has criticised honourable members for being gloomy. It is not that we were born with glum faces: it is just that we were taught to analyse figures. I would rather be a giraffe looking into the distance over the treetops—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I would not like to see the honourable member looking like a giraffe.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I like giraffes. As I was saying, I would rather be a giraffe looking into the distance over the treetops than be an ostrich burying my head in the sand.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1271.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): Here we have another Bill dealing with the marketing of that important food, the potato. I say "important" because the potato is one of the eight main food crops of the world and because it is one of the most valuable food crops in the world.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Very expensive, too.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: It is an important source of vitamin C in one's diet; 100 grams of cooked potato, without fat or additives, gives 70 calories. This is really good news for diet-conscious people, because the same amount of bread yields 200 calories. The potato is widely cultivated: it matures farther north and at higher altitudes than can most other food crops.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: They are having trouble at Virginia growing them.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: It is the altitude up there. It is a comparatively recent discovery in the history of food, yet its importance in shaping world events cannot be denied. In European history, the first specimen was brought to England from South America in 1563 by—guess who?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Murray Hill.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I thought honourable members would nominate Sir Walter Raleigh (we were told in our youth that it was Raleigh), but actually it was Captain John Hawkins. True, Sir Walter brought samples back from Virginia, but he did that 20 years later. The potato achieved fame when it stemmed the famine in certain parts of Germany after the Thirty Years War. By 1688 it had become the staple food of the Irish peasantry and continued to be so. In the middle of the nineteenth century the potato crop failed in Ireland, thus causing the beginning of Irish immigration to America. So, the potato is really the source of the New York Police Force.

Moreover, the potato was the subject of suspicions and dismay. It met with prejudice and misrepresentation, many people suspecting it of being the cause of fevers, even leprosy. Between 1773 and 1789 a Frenchman named Parmentier even went so far as to write a series of booklets and pamphlets in defence of the potato. The potato even had its royal admirers; Louis XVI of France wore its flower as a buttonhole in order to popularise it, and Frederick the Great of Prussia also championed its cultivation. All this being so, it is an everlasting mystery to me why, with our much vaunted high standard of living in South Australia, we should need such a flurry of legislation in order to procure our daily consumption of potatoes, and to find that year after year we are consistently getting worse and worse potatoes.

Today we have the choice, as honourable members know (or their wives know), between white potatoes with green spots, on the one hand, and pink potatoes with brown blotches on the other hand. As one peels either variety, one often discovers a tuber with what I can only call dermatitis. It is a depressing picture. The Act setting up the South Australian Potato Board was passed in 1948, not without misgivings from members in both Houses of Parliament and from both Parties. It was the brainchild of Sir George Jenkins, who could see the need for orderly marketing and for resolving growers' problems, but he could not agree with the Labor Party members of the day who tried in vain to get some representation of consumers on the board. It was not a popular piece of legislation with members of both Parties; they disliked the idea of continuing the controls imposed in the war years, but after lengthy debates in both Houses the Bill was passed.

From the beginning, the legislation covered the registration of growers and the licensing of merchants. In 1964 an amendment was made to cover the licensing of washers, and we now have before us a Bill to license packers. Before passing this Bill honourable members may well ask: what has brought it about? What has been wrong with potato packing? Has it been unhygienic? If it has, why does the Public Health Department not have power to control it? Could this be a scheme to prevent interstate purchases of potatoes and to prevent breaking down such purchases into packs for sale to retailers? For years South Australian housewives have been held to ransom by the wholesale potato trading houses. Every impediment has been put in the way of the sale of potatoes from interstate sources. For the past five years the cost of potatoes in South Australia has been higher or as high as the cost of potatoes in other States.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That's not so.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: We have been denied fresh, cheap potatoes in South Australia, both from other States and from South Australia, by the activities of the Potato Board and its associated wholesalers. In fact, I will go so far as to say that for the past four years 70 per cent of the potatoes sold in South Australia have been green-coated, time-expired tubers. I, as a housewife, say that this is not good enough. I hope that the next time we get a Bill amending the principal Act it will be to improve the quality of potatoes sold in South Australia. The old fears I mentioned earlier as to potatoes causing disease are not so fanciful after all. The following report was published in the *Advertiser* of November 1, 1972:

Pregnant women were warned last night not to eat green, blighted or damaged potatoes.

The warning follows United Kingdom reports linking some congenital birth abnormalities with the consumption of blight-affected potatoes.

The Minister for Health (Sir Kenneth Anderson) said last night the Australian Drug Evaluation Committee believed that the relationship had not been proved.

But it would be prudent, pending further study, for women who were pregnant or likely to become pregnant to avoid eating those potatoes.

The drug body's congenital abnormalities subcommittee had considered the United Kingdom reports at the week-end.

It had pointed out that the abnormalities which the British reports suggested were linked with the consumption of blighted potatoes also had a high incidence in countries where potato consumption was low.

The subcommittee would continue its investigations. The advice to pregnant women was purely precautionary at present. A further statement would be made.

Perhaps the Minister who so confidently introduced the Bill would like to inform the housewives of South Australia where they can buy potatoes that are not green, blighted, and damaged. I will listen avidly.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I could not remain seated after the Hon. Mrs. Cooper threw out such a challenge. I am afraid I cannot be of any assistance to the honourable member, because this is a commodity produced by the potato growers of this State and, if they wish to market a green potato, I suppose they can do so. I think that, for the benefit of the consuming public at least, a nice-looking potato should be available. However, over the past few years the industry has had its ups and down; as a matter of fact, in some areas of Virginia it is under water at the moment. Going back some years, we can see just how cheap potatoes were. Perhaps now they are reaching a more sensible price in relation to other vegetables, but there is room for improvement.

At the moment, we have a problem in relation to seed potatoes. As honourable members know, we get most of our seed potatoes from Victoria, but the price of ordinary potatoes is so high that it more or less balances out with the price of seed potatoes. People do not want to grow seed potatoes because it entails a great deal of highly concentrated work, and apparently the effort and energy is not compensated for by the price as compared with the price of ordinary potatoes. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper said that prices in South Australia were higher than those in other States.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: Or as high.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have answered this question many times. Factual reports I have read from the Potato Board over the past 12 months proved quite conclusively that, over a period, the price of potatoes in South Australia was lower than the prices prevailing in other States. On occasions they could have been higher, but only for short periods. I would be willing to get the facts and figures to back up that statement if the honourable member wishes me to do so.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Does the Potato Board set maximum or minimum prices?

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: A recommended price.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I understand it, it sets a price to be adhered to by the industry. This is a small Bill, and the amendment being introduced on this occasion relating to the registration of packers unfortunately was overlooked when the Act was amended previously. I understand it was an oversight by the lawyers: most lawyers tend to forget things at some time. It is unfortunate that this provision was not introduced some time ago so that it could have been brought into operation at an earlier date. I hope the matter will proceed so that the packers can be registered in the interests of the orderly marketing of potatoes in South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Does the definition of "potato packer" include a proprietary company?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I am not sure. I would think it does.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The whole of the Bill is drawn in this way. I know that, in most cases, "he" means "she" under the provisions of the Acts Interpretation Act and that proprietary companies and bodies corporate are sometimes included in this category. Another clause refers to the death of a licensed person. If this provision is meant to apply to a company, the death of any officer of the company should not make it void; the licence should carry on. How does this fit into the scheme of things?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot say specifically how it fits into the scheme of things, but I think it would be like any other licensed person under any other Act. If the licence is granted it can be easily renewed under similar conditions. We cannot write into legislation what will happen on the death of a person. I think it is just normal procedure.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The answer probably lies in the fact that, if I remember rightly, the Acts Interpretation Act says that, unless the context otherwise indicates, a person includes a company.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It is not very clear in the Bill before us.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Licensing of potato packers."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I should like some further explanation regarding the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Story. It seems to me the intent of the clause is that one person is to be responsible to the licensing authority, and one can understand the placing of responsibility on some party who may be subject to inquiries as to whether the licence is being held as was intended at the time of issue. The Hon. Mr. Story made the point that subclause (5) refers specifically to the death of the holder. It would appear to me that, no matter what the Acts Interpretation Act provides, there is an inference that a person is to be responsible, whether the application for the licence was made by a person or by a company.

Does the Minister intend that a nominee of the company is to be named in the application and held responsible for the conditions of the licence being maintained, or what does he intend if a company is holding a licence and the death occurs of someone in that company? Subclause (5) might, in fact, be invoked. In other words, who is responsible, when a company holds the licence?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If a company holds a licence, can more than one person be nominated as being responsible for that licence? If one person dies, does another person continue the operation?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not know what honourable members are driving at. If a company applies to be licensed to wash or pack potatoes, it is the company that is licensed.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Who is responsible?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: A company has a board of directors and, if one member of the board dies, the licence is not cancelled, because the company still carries on. The same situation currently applies to potato washers, and whatever applies in respect of the licensing of washers will apply to the licensing of packers. This matter should have been dealt with when washers were licensed, but for some reason it was overlooked.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It is clear that, under the Acts Interpretation Act, the word "person" when used in an Act of Parliament includes a body corporate. A company cannot die; it can perhaps go into liquidation. The reference in new section 196 (5) to death would have no application in respect of a company that held a licence. Probably what needs to be said is that a licence shall cease to be in force on the death of the holder, if he is a natural person, or on the liquidation of a company. A small amendment to clarify this situation should be considered.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This provision refers to the death of the holder, but how can this apply to a body corporate? Surely we should differentiate between a person and a body corporate.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot see what honourable members are driving at. The Hon. Mr. Potter has said that companies do not die, which is correct. If a company has a licence, and if a director dies, the company still has the licence. This subclause refers only to an individual licence holder. If the Hon. Mr. Story had a washing and packing licence in his name, and if he died, the licence would cease, and someone would have to apply to carry on his business. That does not apply to a company, however, because a company cannot die.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I believe that new section 196 (5) is in order. A company is usually referred to as an artificial person, and it is a person in the eyes of the law. The new subsection provides, first, that a licence is not transferable. That is absolute. If a company were to go into liquidation, the licence could still not be transferred. The new subsection may be going further than is necessary, but its reason is to make clear that, if a person who is a holder of a licence and is a natural person dies, the licence cannot be transmitted or transferred to the legal representatives of the deceased person. If a company goes into liquidation, the first part of the new subsection applies: the licence cannot be transferred. New subsection (5) makes clear that, if the licensee is a natural person, the licence cannot then be transferred to his executors, or to his legal administrators when he dies.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: The new subsection does not say, "If a licensee, being a natural person, dies"; it refers merely to a licensee's dying. The Acts Interpretation Act provides:

In this Act, and in every other Act whenever passed, unless the contrary intention appears . . . "person" or "party" includes a body corporate.

Does new subsection (5) indicate a contrary intention, thereby disentitling a company to hold a licence? It could be interpreted that way. If a provision is ambiguous, words should be incorporated to indicate exactly what is meant, especially if the problem is found while the legislation is being considered by the Council. If the Minister makes up his mind about whether he wants companies to be included (and I believe that he does), I believe that we should amend this clause to read, "A licence is not transferable and, in the case of a natural person being the holder, shall cease to be in force on the death of the holder."

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It may be more simple to amend new subsection (5) by striking out all words after "transferable". The matter could be complicated by the insertion of other words. I move:

In new subsection (5) to strike out "and shall cease to be in force upon the death of the holder."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: One would expect that a licence would not go to the executors, trustees or administrators of a person's estate, and it would be hard for a dead person to operate a licence.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Orders of the board."

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

To strike out paragraph (a).

It has been brought to my attention at this late stage that the proposed amendment contained in this paragraph has in fact already been effected by the Commissioner for Statute Revision and therefore this paragraph is redundant.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I agree with what the Minister wants to do, but once again I return to the point that much of this sort of thing has been happening lately. I do not know whether the instructions given are not clear, whether the Parliamentary Counsel are overworked, or what it is, but this sort of thing is creeping in. A few years ago we did not get nearly as much of it. Whether we are trying to push through too much legislation in a short time I do not know, but the Minister, in collaboration with the Parliamentary Counsel, should check thoroughly the Bills before they are put on file. That would save this Committee much time and would not waste the time of the Parliamentary Counsel. I do not think the Minister answered the point raised by the Hon. Jessie Cooper during the second reading debate in regard to quality control.

The Potato Board, besides fixing the price of potatoes (it is the price-fixing authority in this State), has, as one of its most important functions, the quality control of potatoes. Washers were dealt with previously and had to conform to fairly strict rules laid down by legislation about the way in which potatoes were washed and I thought the Minister was going to say that the packing provisions would raise the quality, the control of quality being a function of the board. Much of what the housewife pays for is the inspectorial charges made and the packaging. I was hoping the Minister would bring down regulations as soon as possible to ensure that the quality of potatoes when packaged was up to the required standard.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The consumer was not considered in the original Act of 1948 and is not considered today. The quality of potatoes is not good. I meant every word I said. I am sick of buying white potatoes with green spots or pink potatoes with brown spots. I am sick of peeling them and then having to throw them away; I am sick of buying pink bags pretending to contain pink potatoes.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: There is nothing wrong with pink potatoes without spots.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: They are magnificent potatoes. When they first came from Western Australia, they were beautiful potatoes, as beautiful as Tasmanian potatoes, on which I was brought up in the Eastern States. But, within two years, pink potatoes have become blotched beyond recognition. Again and again, I find that, in the setting up of boards, the one group of people given no consideration is the consumers. I brought up the history of this matter merely to show that it was the Labor Party that first wanted to get two consumer representatives on the board. If I had been in Parliament at that time, I would have supported that move. It has never been done, and until it is done—

The Hon. C. R. Story: But we have a consumer representative.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Well, two would have helped.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments. Committee's report adopted.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1272.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I agree with the previous speakers who have pointed out how difficult it is to follow the legislation right through from 1936 until the present time without a consolidated Bill. The Hon. Mr. Story mentioned this, and said that the Statutes should be upgraded. The Swine Compensation Fund is in a healthy state: I understand that at present it has a credit of \$701 000. The industry has for some time been talking about the upgrading of this legislation, and it agrees to the Bill's being introduced; but it is not quite in agreement with its drafting. As was said in the second reading explanation, the Bill was introduced after a number of alternatives had been considered and the industry had been consulted. Apparently, however, the industry did not quite understand what was going to be done in the Bill. It agreed to most of it, up to clause 4, which amends section 12 of the principal Act. The Bill provides that bulk payments of duty can be made to the Minister. For some time the industry has followed this practice, instead of paying the duty by means of stamps. For some time agents have deducted amounts payable from proceeds received. The Bill merely spells out this aspect more clearly. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

Apart from the increase of the grant to the research unit referred to above—

that is, an increase of \$15 000 a year—

the most significant alteration made here is to enable annual surplus amounts to be applied for the benefit of the industry. The Government intends that, in the disbursements of these amounts, it will pay close attention to the views of the industry expressed through an informal committee intended to be established.

Nowhere in the Bill is there any suggestion of the constitution of the committee. The industry is therefore concerned that the personnel of such a committee ought to be spelt out in the Bill. They have suggested that it should comprise the Chief Inspector or his delegate, the Chief Livestock Officer or his deputy, two members of the department's pig section, and one person from the Pig Breeders Association of South Australia. They suggest this because, with the present inflationary situation in which we find ourselves, the value of the fund could be depleted. Although the fund seems to have a large sum in it at present, the industry is concerned that it should be kept buoyant and, as well, that any excess above the requirements referred to in the legislation ought to be distributed in the manner desired by the pig breeders themselves. New subsection (3) (d) of section 12 provides:

in any amount not exceeding the aggregate of the surplus amounts for the time being declared by the Minister and for the time being unexpended for any purpose that, in the opinion of the Minister, is for the benefit of the pig industry or any part thereof.

Members of the pig industry to whom I have spoken believe that provision should read "in the opinion of the Minister and the advisory committee", the latter being as I spelt out previously. They consider that this should be written into the Bill as a separate part of clause 3. New subsection (3a) of section 12 provides, in part, as follows:

... the Minister may on the advice of the Auditor-General by notice in the *Gazette* declare an amount not exceeding that excess to be the surplus amount (in this section referred to as "the excess amount") in respect of the financial year next succeeding the financial year in respect of which that excess occurred.

The industry believes that the advice should be given not by the Auditor-General, as referred to in the Bill, but by the advisory committee. Members of the industry to

whom I have spoken are well aware that the Cattle Compensation Fund is now in a chaotic condition and in their industry they want a representative body that can advise the Minister on the disbursement of their funds. I cannot see why this request cannot be granted and, for that reason, I intend to move an amendment that will achieve this end. I am sure that the Minister, having said that he wants to pay close attention to the views of the industry expressed through an informal committee that is intended to be established, will have no objection to the establishment of a committee of a kind wanted by the industry.

Calls on the fund have declined somewhat because of the Commonwealth Government's taking over the responsibility for all exotic diseases and leaving only a few compensable from State funds. In this respect I refer to tuberculosis, infectious rhinitis, infectious pneumonia, swine dysentery and paratyphoid. As a result, the fund is in a buoyant position. The gentlemen in the industry to whom I have spoken seem to think that the amount of stamp duty could be varied from time to time so that it would not be necessary for the fund to have in it a sum that exceeded requirements. Clause 5 inserts in section 14 new subsection (2), as follows:

On and after the commencement of the Swine Compensation Act Amendment Act, 1974, for every \$10 or part of \$10—

- (a) of the amount of purchase money in respect of one pig or one carcass sold singly; or
- (b) of the total amount of the purchase money in respect of any number of pigs or any number of carcasses sold in one lot,

there shall be payable stamp duty of an amount, not exceeding 5c, as is prescribed but the stamp duty in respect of the amount of purchase money of any one pig or any one carcass, as the case may be, whether sold singly or as part of a lot shall not in any case exceed 21c.

I believe that the sum is at present about one-third of a cent in the \$1; if one deducts 5c from every \$10 or part thereof, and a carcass is valued at \$29, for example, a payment of 15c would be involved. On the other hand, a pig bringing only \$2 more would incur a cost of 20c. It is believed that, if 1c in every \$2 was charged, it would be the same ratio as 5c for every \$10 but would be much closer to the actual value of the pig. Having raised this point with the Minister (who has been intent on what I have said today about amending the Bill), I hope he will be willing to accept my amendments. If those amendments are carried, I shall be pleased to support the Bill.

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

ART GALLERY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 3. Page 1273.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): Like some other honourable members, I am very interested in art. However, I am not terribly enthusiastic about the Commonwealth Government's purchase, at a time of high inflation, of relatively few works of art at very high prices. What has happened recently in this State is very commendable. In their contributions to the debate, the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill and the Hon. Mrs. Cooper gave us the benefit of their great experience. I should like to hear the Minister's reply to the questions raised by some honourable members, because the crux of the Bill is the alteration in the Ministerial control of the arts in this State. In this day and age, in most cases it is left to the Government to decide under whose control a department should be placed. For example, the responsibility for conservation was transferred from the Minister of Agriculture to the Minister of Environment and

Conservation, and that matter was not brought before Parliament for approval, yet a change which, on the surface, does not appear terribly important is now before us. When one has been in politics for a fair while one is prompted to wonder why the change is being made.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why was the Art Gallery put under the control of the Minister of Education in the first place?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Perhaps because in those days art was a visual part of education. In those days the Ministers of Education would have been in close affinity with art and teaching. If there is to be a change, I cannot see why the responsibility should be transferred to the Premier. If there is to be any logic in the change, it should be to the Treasurer; first, because the art of the State is really part of the State treasury and, secondly, because the sums granted should be supervised by the person in charge of the purse strings, and he will be able to see whether a work of art is a wise purchase. It is better that the Treasurer deal with such matters directly, rather than have those matters filter through another Minister. I therefore cannot see why the Premier has been picked out for this responsibility. Of course, the Premier and the Treasurer do not necessarily have to be the same person. In the Hall Government, the Premier was the Hon. Steele Hall and the Treasurer was the Hon. Glen Pearson. The Council will be very interested in the reasons that the Minister gives for the change. His reply will influence many honourable members in the way they will vote.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): It seems to me that the Hon. Mr. Story has answered his own question: he was right on the ball when he said that he could not see why in this day and age the Art Gallery should be under the control of the Minister of Education, and he suggested that it should be under the control of the Treasurer. I agree with the honourable member. The Hon. Mr. Potter put the case very simply: the Premier can and does create portfolios within the Government, and he can allot administrative duties to various Ministers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Except those determined by Statute.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Premier, who is also the Treasurer, deals out grants to the arts.

The Hon. C. R. Story: He does not have to be both Premier and Treasurer.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That is so, but in this case he is. He deals out grants to the various arts.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Why isn't the duty vested in the Treasurer, as he is the one who gives out grants?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The expenditure allocated by the Treasury is perused by the Treasurer, who happens to be the Premier, too. He has decided that he wants

to take over responsibility for the Art Gallery, and I see nothing sinister in that move. If, for some reason, the next Premier wants to hand the responsibility to someone else, he can do so; there is nothing wrong in that. I do not know why the responsibility was given to the Minister of Education in the first place or why that is spelt out in the Act.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Hon. Mrs. Cooper told us why.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: Art galleries are education establishments all over the world.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: But they are not necessarily administered by the Minister of Education. I doubt whether the Victorian Art Gallery is administered by Victoria's Minister of Education, and I am not certain about the situation in New South Wales and Queensland. Every Government has a different series of priorities for the distribution of certain portfolios, and it is up to the Premier of the State, who is given this power to delegate. I believe the Premier of South Australia is quite entitled, in existing circumstances, to take over the administration of the Art Gallery. That is what the Bill provides and, if any future Government thought it would be in the best interests of the Art Gallery for it to be placed under the administration of some other Minister, that could be done.

It is purely an administrative role, and I cannot see that there is anything sinister in the change. Perhaps it is because some honourable members do not like the Premier that they do not want to see him administering the Art Gallery. However, he is most concerned and shows a great deal of enthusiasm for the arts, as honourable members will know, and for that reason he is probably the best person to administer the Art Gallery. I do not think honourable members need be at all alarmed about the situation.

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

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ROYAL INSTITUTION FOR THE BLIND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.1 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 9, at 2.15 p.m.