LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 30, 1974

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

QUESTIONS

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: A report in this morning's *Advertiser* states that the Premier has said that the cost of a power station for the proposed Redcliff petro-chemical plant has increased from an estimated $9 000 000 in 1971 to an estimated $69 500 000 in 1977. This represents an inflation rate of about 40 per cent per annum. First, was the original estimate of the cost hopelessly wrong; secondly, were any changes made in the power station complex that caused this escalation in cost; thirdly, does the Premier expect a much higher inflation rate between now and 1977; and, fourthly, in view of the press report, will the Premier make a clear Ministerial statement on all the aspects that are causing public concern in relation to the Redcliff project?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the Leader's questions to my colleague and bring down replies as soon as possible.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a further question on this matter of the Chief Secretary, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: It has been reported in this morning's press that the Premier has stated that the estimated cost of the petro-chemical plant is escalating at the rate of $2 000 000 a week.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think the Premier said $2 000 000 a month.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I am basing my statement on the newspaper report. Will the Chief Secretary ask the Premier on what grounds the industry is able to assess the figure to which I referred, and for how long the increase in costs has been going on?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall be pleased to convey the honourable member's question to my colleague the Premier and bring down a reply as soon as it is available.

WHEAT PAYMENTS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: On the front page of today's *Advertiser,* a report states that wheatgrowers are expected to be offered an increase in first advance payments of up to 25 per cent. The report also states:

> Under the plan, they will get about $1.45 to $1.50 a bushel as a first advance payment on next year's crop. Growers have been asking for a first advance payment of $1.80 but industry representatives said last night the growers were likely to accept the Government's offer.

It is the next paragraph that concerns me, namely:

> With higher world wheat prices and assurances of long-term contracts, the increase would cost the Government up to an extra $30 000 000.

As I understand that the operations of the Wheat Board are financed entirely through Loan funds, on which interest is paid at no cost whatsoever to the Government, I ask the Minister whether the statement in the *Advertiser* is correct.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Although I have not read the statement in the *Advertiser, I* would say that the last paragraph to which the honourable member adverted in his question could be incorrect. On the other hand, I suppose it could be correct, if the Government directed the Wheat Board to sell to certain areas, concerning which under the present Act there is a guaranteed payment to growers in respect of any money that may be lost through directing a long-term contract in that way. I have heard that the Federal Government is looking closely at the matter concerning this increased first payment to the wheat industry. As I think that the buoyancy that exists at present in relation to wheat prices, which exceed $4, justifies an increase in the first payment to the wheat industry, I sincerely hope that Senator Wriedt makes a statement soon to that effect.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: My question refers to a matter that was partly covered by the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan. It refers also to an article appearing in today's *Advertiser* headed "Advance on wheat may rise". I have no quibble about that part of it, but the article further states as follows:

> It is understood the Federal Government will put the proposal to growers in Canberra today. Under the plan, they will get about $1.45 to $1.50 a bushel as a first advance payment on next year's crop.

The article further states:

> With higher world wheat prices and assurances of long-term contracts, the increase would cost the Government up to an extra $30 000 000.

One gets heartily sick of incorrect reporting by the press, because there is no possibility that that advance will cost the Government anything. The Government is well in kitty. It charges interest on any money advanced to growers. Let me quote, for example, the 1968-69 pool: the advances cost the growers $18 000 000. At present, the home consumption price is $1.93, and the guaranteed price is $1.60. As I pointed out when speaking to the Wheat Stabilisation Act Amendment Bill, the average bread-eater would be subsidised to the extent of 6c a loaf by the grower. Could the Minister, through his officers, perhaps correct some of these anomalies that give the public the impression that everything the primary producer produces today is subsidised, to some extent, at the public's cost? The wrong statement made in this morning's press should be corrected.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am not responsible for what is reported in the newspaper by the reporter of whoever published the statement. I think it would be outside my jurisdiction to try to telephone the newspaper and tell it where it had made a mistake. I do not know where it got this information from. I have already answered a question by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and pointed out to him that, if the Government does direct the Wheat Board to sell wheat to any country and losses are incurred because of that, the Commonwealth Government is responsible for making good those losses. I reiterate what I said to the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. I know there is much poor reporting, in many cases reporting that is not true to the facts as we know them. I do not know whether in this case it is a mistake on the part of reporters or what it is but, if I can do anything to help, I certainly will.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: My question did not refer to the Minister's personal ability to report but, as one who is appointed by the Crown to accept responsibility in this State for the industry (and I emphasise this), despite what sales are made or how protracted they may be, the Wheat Board does in fact pay interest on any money it borrows at current interest rates. Therefore, it would not cost the Government either $30 000 000 or 30c.

PARK LANDS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the last few days, the controversial issue of the proposed acquisition of park lands has been given much publicity, but I have not been able to read of any suggested alternatives to that acquisition. I refer to the official publication of the South Australian Railways, *Keeping Track,* of July of this year. In this publication, under the heading "Problems of Mixed Gauge Track", the general subject of a third rail being constructed within our broad gauge track is discussed at length.

The article explains that, if a third rail making a standard gauge track of 144 cm is constructed, there is a distance of 17 cm between two rails on one side of the track. It appears that, when the standard gauge proposal was being investigated earlier, the thinking within the Railways Department involved working mixed gauge trains over distances between Wallaroo and Snowtown. That was part of the proposed standard gauge complex. The Railways Department, the article states, set up a working committee to carry out further investigations. On April 27, 1971, tests were carried out at Port Pirie, and the article claims that all tests were carried out with flying colours. Subsequently, another test was carried out in the presence of Commonwealth Railways officers and other interested personnel. On September 27, 1972, a much more conclusive test was carried out over 5.6 kilometres of track in the Snowtown area, and the article states that the experiment was carried out without mishap and without any signs of trouble.

At the time of the article (July, 1974) the view seems to have been that, from tests carried out, there would appear to be no reason from a physical and engineering point of view why the idea should not be successful. In regard to the first experiment in the Wallaroo and Snowtown area, the article states:

> At that stage thinking was taking shape along the lines of having mixed gauge trains over some long distances such as Wallaroo to Snowtown, as well as around the metropolitan area.

In view of the considerable amount of criticism that has been raised by the proposal to acquire park lands, my questions are these: first, has the concept of a third rail been fully considered by the Government where the proposed standard gauge line passes through the park lands along the existing railway routes; secondly, if not, will that proposal be given full consideration; thirdly, if it has been investigated, is it feasible to adopt such a proposal, thus eliminating the need for acquisition of precious park land space?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I shall be happy to refer the question to my colleague.

VIRGINIA WATER

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: A fortnight ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about recycled water at Virginia. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Agriculture Department has issued a third progress report on the use of effluent for irrigating market gardens. This report, together with reports from the Engineering and Water Supply Department on the cost of chlorinating the effluent as required by the Public Health Department before use for general irrigation and the cost of distribution to the market garden areas, has been referred to the Underground Waters Advisory Committee for consideration. This committee is meeting regularly so that it can reach a conclusion as soon as practicable, and the matter will be examined further when the committee's recommendation is received.

HISTORIC KETCH

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the historic ketch at Wardang Island?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The ketch in question is the property of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, and its future use is a matter for decision by that trust. A check with the trust elicited that the vessel, which is old and not in a serviceable condition, is anchored off Wardang Island. The trust is aware that it takes in water, and for this reason makes regular service calls to pump it out. The vessel has never been in any danger; it does not drag its anchor and is pumped out regularly. The answer to the honourable member's question is, therefore, that the information given to him is not correct.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about unemployment relief?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The disagreement referred to between the District Council of Lacepede and the Department of Lands involves a request for reimbursement of unauthorised expenditure. In late September, 1973, immediately prior to the scheme being terminated in the South-East, this council applied to the department for a grant of $10 000 to reimburse over-expenditure incurred in establishing an ablution block in the Kingston Caravan Park (an approved project under the scheme). This was not the first instance of over-expenditure or, for that matter, disregard of written conditions under which grants could be spent by this council, which it became necessary for me to regularise by granting additional funds. Consequently, it was with a good deal of reluctance that I finally partially agreed to its request by granting an amount of $6 800. My principal reason at the time was, if possible, to finalise a project that was of benefit to the community. However, the council considered that the whole of its unauthorised expenditure should be met, and approached me again in April this year through its local member. This latest approach was not for the balance of the original request but for a further $10 000. By that time, the scheme had been finalised and Commonwealth grant funds at my disposal were exhausted; that is the position now. I reported this fact to the member for Millicent, who assured me that this information was relayed to the council.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was reported in the weekend press that the Commonwealth Government had asked the States to ban all forms of cigarette advertising by September, 1976. The Commonwealth Minister for Health, Dr. Everingham, stated that he would be acting soon to ban all radio, television and press advertisements within Commonwealth Territories by that date, and requested the States to follow his lead. I ask the Minister whether that request has been received and what is his attitude and that of the Government to it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I understand that the request to ban all cigarette advertising relates to radio and television advertisements, over which this Government has no control. State Ministers of Health are at present trying to frame legislation requiring warnings regarding cigarette smoking to be included in all forms of advertising. However, at present we have no control over the advertising of cigarettes.

VIRGINIA FLOODING

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question regarding Virginia flooding?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act, 1967, provides that advances shall bear interest at the rate charged by the State Bank of South Australia in respect of overdraft loans made to primary producers at the time of making the advance, and that, with the concurrence of the Treasurer and after due inquiry, the Minister of Lands may remit part or the whole of any advance made under the Act.

As the honourable member said when asking the question, it has previously been announced that advances made under the Act to assist growers in the Virginia area to overcome losses caused by hail damage that occurred in October, 1973, would be interest-free for one year. When making this announcement, I also stated that the matter of interest rates to be charged on advances beyond the first year would be reviewed in the light of individual circumstances and experience during that period. In reviewing the question of interest rates, I will take into account the effects of the recent flooding on the economic position of growers.

FARM INCOMES

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Prime Minister has stated that he is commissioning an inquiry, to be conducted by the Industries Assistance Commission, into the stabilisation of farm incomes in an attempt to increase the efficiency of rural production. Will the Minister of Agriculture seriously consider making available Agriculture Department officers who will be able to give expert advice and, if necessary, evidence to the commission so that the case advanced on behalf of South Australia's primary producers will be the best possible?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I should like first to comment on the Prime Minister's statement. I made a similar statement yesterday over the *Country Hour* but, unfortunately, it could not get in yesterday's *News,* as I understand that the printers were on strike for the last edition. Nevertheless, the press asked me yesterday how I viewed the situation, and I said I believed that the matter should be referred to the Industries Assistance Commission. I have already taken steps to make officers available to give expert advice to the I.A.C. at any time. I have already spoken with the officers concerned, and I believe that if they have not already given evidence they will soon give evidence to the commission on behalf of South Australian primary industry.

WHEAT QUOTAS

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: It was reported in yesterday's *Advertiser* that the major wheat exporting countries were holding discussions to build up wheat reserves to help overcome food shortages in under-developed countries. Has the Minister of Agriculture any further information about these discussions? Does he know whether the discussions were successful and whether a world reserve supply of wheat is to be established? What effect would such a build-up of reserves have on the wheat quotas currently imposed on Australian wheatgrowers?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I did read the article referred to by the honourable member, but I think it was in the *Australian* rather than the *Advertiser.* I was interested to read that report, because it appears that talks have been held in an attempt to build up grain reserves throughout the world to help overcome food shortages in under-developed countries. If Australia becomes part of this operation it will be necessary to examine closely our grain production system, and I refer specifically to wheat quotas. The only way in which Australia can build up a reserve of grain is to abolish wheat quotas.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: Do you mean immediately?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: If we become part of the agreement to establish a reserve of grain throughout the world, especially if we become party to this organisation, I believe it would be in the interests of Australia to do away with the quota system in order to build up grain reserves. I will be interested to find out exactly how these negotiations have proceeded, and what the attitude of the Australian Government will be to this scheme. I know that the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation is in favour of lifting wheat quotas, perhaps for that reason. Doubtless, Canberra will soon make an announcement about exactly what the situation is.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Following the question asked by the Hon. Mr. Chatterton, I ask the Minister further to consider the situation applying in respect of wheat quotas. The framing of wheat quota legislation involved much negotiation in getting agreement to it from all States. The final agreement provided for a non-quota year whereby through a simple declaration the legislation could be declared to be inoperative for one year. Because of the work that was involved in establishing wheat quotas it seems that the States could, perhaps by agreement of Ministers at Agricultural Council meetings, bring this section into operation or, if that is not sufficient, the legislation in each State and the Commonwealth could retain the principle of the wheat quota system, because I believe that to abandon it now would be unwise, as to reintroduce such a system at a future time would cause much trouble and expense. If one examined what it cost to set up the quota scheme in South Australia, one would be amazed. Will the Minister consider those points when he is deliberating on what this State's attitude should be during discussions on abandoning wheat quotas?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This matter has been discussed at two Agricultural Council meetings. In the first instance I raised the question of doing away with quotas for one year. We are protected under our legislation; we can remove quotas while still retaining the legislation. That is the ideal set-up, but some States did not consider that aspect when they introduced their wheat quota legislation. If quotas are lifted in New South Wales, the quotas are abolished automatically, and they might have to be reintroduced later. I am not sure about the situation in Queensland. Those States would probably have to amend their legislation to facilitate the reintroduction of quotas. I agree with the honourable member: the whole idea was to lift quotas (I did not mean abandoning them altogether) for one, two, three or four seasons so that, if there was

tremendous over-production of wheat, quotas could be reimposed. We have catered for that situation in this State.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: If we participate in the world reserve scheme, more storage will be needed. Will the storage be built, as in the past, by the use of growers' funds, or will the money for the new storage be provided by the Government?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I would not be able to answer that question, because it would be a matter for a decision by the Commonwealth Government—the Australian Government.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You were right the first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Australian Government. I would be very reluctant to put money into storage facilities if it was possible that there would be a decision made by the Australian Government. We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

WILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1640.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): The effects of the 1972 amendment to the Wills Act have been under study by the Attorney-General's Department to the present time. Submissions have been received from the Law Society as well as from individual practitioners. The matter has been under consideration by Mr. Justice Zelling and Mr. Justice Wells, who were members of the Law Reform Committee upon whose recommendations the Bill was based. It is clear that some amendment is needed but the Government is not yet in a position to make a final decision as to the best form of that amendment. The Government will support this Bill in this Council. It may, however, be necessary for the Government to propose amendments to the Bill in another place when the studies of the Attorney-General's officers have been completed. I therefore support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Will attested by a beneficiary."

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I thank the Chief Secretary for his support of the Bill or, rather, of the subject matter intended to be covered by the Bill. I agree with him that the matter is not as easy as it may appear at first glance. In fact, only this morning I received a suggestion that would possibly improve the wording without in any way altering the subject matter of this clause. To enable me to consider further the proposed new wording with the Parliamentary Counsel, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: When the Committee reported progress, I intimated that I would look again at the provisions of new subsections (2) and (3) of section 17. I have conferred with the Parliamentary Counsel (Mr. Hackett-Jones) and, after some anguish over whether or not we were doing the right thing, I have decided to move only two amendments, to new subsection (3). Accordingly, I move:

In new subsection (3), after "person", to insert "who holds professional qualifications and"; and to strike out "charges for discharging the duties of an executor of the will" and insert "professional charges for work done by him in connection with the estate of the testator".

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I should like to clear up a few points.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister is out of order. Standing Order 314 states:

Before any Bill which has been referred to a Committee of the whole Council shall be read the third time, the Chairman of Committees shall certify in writing that the fair print is in accordance with the Bill as agreed to in Committee and reported, and the President shall announce that the Chairman has so certified.

Having certified in accordance with Standing Order 314, I now call on the Hon. Mr. Burdett.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Southern) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I should like to correct a few things so that we know exactly where we are going. I have stated clearly that I believe that, when the wheat quota legislation was first introduced, the whole concept was that quotas should be taken into account as a unit, and the unit belonged to a farm, not to a particular person. This Bill, if passed, will be a complete departure from the original legislation. I am not saying that honourable members cannot amend legislation, but I point out that in this case the Hon. Mr. Burdett is departing from the principles enunciated in the original 1968 legislation. The second point is that the Hon. Mr. Burdett claims that a motion was passed at a meeting of the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, moved by Mr. Forrest, as follows:

That the people whose properties were compulsorily acquired at Monarto should be allowed to take their quotas with them.

The motion was seconded and carried. Mr. Forrest moved:

That wheat quotas held on properties likely to be acquired by Government authorities be transferable to properties purchased by displaced landowners.

There is then the following note in brackets:

To thus enable the person, the amount of up to the original quota.

At that time Mr. Roocke came to see me at my office and asked what I thought of the idea of transferring the quotas of these displaced persons. I said I thought the idea had merit and that I would look at the situation, if necessary taking it to Cabinet, because it would involve a Cabinet decision. I have already stated that in this Chamber. Some time later, when I looked at the matter more closely and found out what monetary considerations were taken into account by the Lands Department, I had second thoughts about the matter. I also said that some time ago in this Chamber.

The Government has a responsibility to the wheat industry generally and to the farm unit. I do not want to disadvantage anyone, but I think these displaced persons (if we like to call them that) have certain openings within the wheat quotas legislation as it now stands. Their position will improve when the Government introduces shortly a Bill that has been in the hands of the Parliamentary Counsel for quite some time. Due to other measures, however, he has not been able to draft it yet. I have already indicated that to the Hon. Mr. Burdett, and I will indicate to the Council what will be involved. For these reasons, the people whose properties were acquired at Monarto can grow wheat if they wish and grow other grains that are equally profitable in the present grain situation.

The Bill I will introduce into this Chamber will provide for the formation of a new advisory committee that has been asked for by the industry. There is no need today

for such a big advisory committee, because wheat quotas have been finalised and it is purely a matter of administration. I think three people could do the job admirably, and at a lower cost to the wheatgrowers of the State. After all, that is where the money comes from to pay the committee's expenses. Secondly, I will declare all non-quota wheat (as well as over-quota wheat) to be wheat of the season, because we have no possible hope of arriving at the 2 548 000 m^3 crop, which does not take into account an extra 145 600 m^3 of hard if we produce 145 600 m^3 hard within the 2 548 000 m^3.

I think everyone can be adequately taken care of under the existing legislation and the measure I intend to introduce. I do not agree with the legislation as it stands. I want to see that people who have been displaced are taken care of, and I think they can be taken care of. However, I think it is wrong at this stage to go against the principle of wheat quotas. It is getting away from the idea of the farm unit quotas and transferring the quota to a person. Such an action could cause many anomalies if wheat quotas were to continue for a considerable period. If the situation should arise when quotas were lifted for a specific period, anyone could grow wheat and, when quotas were again introduced, all the growers then producing wheat would be taken into consideration, so they would start off again on a clear basis. These are some of the things we must look at very closely. We want to keep a tight rein on the situation rather than let it get away from us. Another matter is this letter I was supposed to have written to Mr. Saint.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You said you did write it.

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

The Hon. C. R. Story: Come, come!

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I resent members trying to pry into my personal—

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: Privacy.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: —correspondence. I take a dim view of it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You said you wrote it.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I take a dim view of members trying to cross-examine me about whom I write personal letters to. That is the attitude I adopted in the replies I gave to the Hon. Mr. Burdett when he asked me about this matter in the first place. I have not wanted to give him an inch, because, knowing he is a lawyer, he will come back again and twist things around; that is what he has done very well indeed.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: He has twisted things around?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have never written to Mr. Saint the letter to which the honourable member referred. If he likes to check with Mr. Saint he will find that is true.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: How about checking *Hansard?*

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am not worried about *Hansard* at this stage. The honourable member asked whether I wrote a letter to Mr. Saint.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That's right. You said you did.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I have probably written many letters to Mr. Saint, but the honourable member's question was so framed that he was trying to get me to admit that I had written to Mr. Saint saying I agreed that the quotas should go with the farming unit. He insisted that that was what I wrote to Mr. Saint about. However, I did not write to Mr. Saint about that at all. If the Hon. Mr. Burdett likes to ask Mr. Saint, he will find that is perfectly true.

From information I have and which the Government has, I understand Mr. Saint is most upset about this, otherwise I would not be worrying about such a trifling thing, because it has nothing to do with the Hon. Mr. Burdett or other members in this Chamber. However, if the honourable member likes to check with Mr. Saint he will find that I did not write a letter to him. I have heard that Mr. Saint is upset that his name has been mentioned along these lines and that he has implied that he did not receive a letter from me such as the Hon. Mr. Burdett has insinuated. That is the other part of the story.

It is no good a member's saying in this Chamber that Mr. Roocke or anyone else was told by me that I would let the people from Monarto whose properties were compulsorily acquired take their quotas with them. That is a ridiculous statement to make, and the decision is not mine, in any case. It is a Government decision, and such a decision would involve changes in the Act. I can say quite definitely that no official statement was made by me to Mr. Roocke. We talked about the matter in my office, and we have heard about it in this Chamber. I indicated here that I thought it was a good idea when I first heard about it. In all fairness, I was trying to protect people who could have lost something. However, as the story unfolded it became obvious that these people had been adequately compensated, and I do not think they should have two bites of the cherry.

I think we would defeat the whole purpose and principle of wheat quotas, and I have had to make this statement to make sure everything is fair and above board as far as I am concerned. I have nothing to hide in this matter, letter-writing or otherwise, but I take offence at being questioned in the Chamber on personal matters concerning me and people outside. I do not think it is right and proper that anyone in Parliament should be questioned along these lines. It is a personal matter, and surely we have some personal things we can keep to ourselves. If I had done something wrong, that would have been a different matter. The fact remains, however, that everything was completely above board. I oppose the third reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I had not intended to buy into this argument, but now that the Minister is going to take the matter to a vote I must make my position clear. I regret that we are to be taken to a vote. However, if that is the way it is to be, it has to be so. There has been much loose talk about the original quotas, the original concept, and various things. The original concept was quite different from what is now being discussed here: it was a seven-year average of wheat farm production over the whole State. To arrive at the percentage figure that must be produced from the farm average in order to reach the State's quotas, which had already been allocated by an agreement reached at an Agricultural Council meeting in collaboration with the Wheat Federation, seven years did not suit us at all in some areas, and it was agreed that five years would be the period used for the State average.

We proceeded on the basis of a five-year average less 10 per cent across the board for the whole State. That was the first concept. Then I set up a committee, the names of members of which were provided for me from the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia's grain section. It comprised representatives from Ceduna to Bordertown and all centrally placed points in between. After that committee (called the Wheat Quotas Advisory Committee) had deliberated, it was immediately found there were anomalies, among which were such things as disadvantaged areas of the State which had had two or three years of

drought, as a consequence of which seven years would have been much fairer to them. So, they were looked after by the drought being brought into the formula.

Another thing that came to light was that many people had committed themselves financially in a big way, particularly on the West Coast, for new land, which they were bringing into production, expecting that they would, in many cases, get 728 m^3, which would help them develop that country. They had committed themselves to banks that had financed them on that basis. If we had stuck rigidly to five years, those people would have been absolutely disadvantaged. So once again the system had to be varied, and this was done.

In the Upper South-East, where there was pasture reconstruction (an important matter), the people were precluded under the proposed legislation from using wheat, which was a part of their rotational plan. So once again the advisory committee changed the system to accommodate those people. I have cited at least four instances where the original concept was changed, and there are others. There were people who were dealt with by the Wheat Quotas Advisory Committee and the Wheat Quotas Appeals Committee, both those bodies allocating additional amounts of wheat. It seems to me that the original concept (as it has been called) is not really being departed from in this Bill.

One of the principal planks in the Labor Party's rural policy, which was enunciated by the Deputy Premier (Hon. J. D. Corcoran) in the Gawler Town Hall in 1970, prior to the election, was wheat quotas: he said that the first thing a Labor Government would do, if elected, was inquire into the operations of the Wheat Quotas Advisory Committee and the Wheat Quotas Appeals Committee. Secondly, he said that the new Government would institute a system whereby quotas could be traded, and those quotas would, from my memory of this, have been—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Transferable.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —transferable.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That's right.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If I decided not to plant wheat in 1971, I could sell or, for a consideration, I could trade my quota to my next-door neighbour, who would grow the wheat.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Did you say "sell"?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I used the word "sell", but it is not quite "sell"; the Minister is right. I do not want to be misquoted, so I will not use "sell". I was using "sell" only loosely. I wanted to say that the farmer would be encouraged, if he desired, to transfer his quota to his next-door neighbour who, for a monetary consideration, would then produce wheat on behalf of the other person, but the quota would remain the property of that other person who had originally held it. That never really got off the ground. At the time the wheat industry was most apprehensive about it, as I think the Minister is now.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I was in those days, but the industry was not.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The industry was wrong in that case. If the industry is supporting the Minister now, it could again be wrong. Therefore, as I have to make up my mind on this and as no-one will be disadvantaged (if I thought that some farmer would be disadvantaged by this Bill, my attitude to it would be different), I will adopt the same attitude I adopted about water quotas in the Kennedy case, which was brought before this Parliament. In that case the Ombudsman stated that Kennedy had not been given his water allocation when the land was transferred. This case is on all fours with Kennedy's case. No-one in Kennedy's case would have been disadvantaged because the quota had already been allocated. It was not taking a water quota from anyone, any more than this Bill is taking a quota from any farmer. The only way in which we can get a true valuation of a wheat quota is to put a property up for sale with and without a wheat quota on it. That is the only way we can assess the value of a wheat quota; we know that the value is considerable.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What if you put up for sale a property that had been growing barley against a property that had been growing wheat; which would bring the greater price?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There is no doubt about that. For wheat, there is a first payment of $1.20 and perhaps there will be another payment of $1.40 (as it appears there will be soon, from reading the newspapers), and there is a payment of 85c for barley. What the farmer wants today is quick cash, and he most certainly will go for the property that has a wheat quota so that he will get the quickest return. If he is paying 12 per cent or 13 per cent interest, he cannot afford to wait around to get $6 000 or $7 000, but he could get this immediately on first advance on wheat but not on barley. What is more, the liquidity position with wheat is greater than it is with barley. I believe that no-one will be disadvantaged by the Bill. However, this man is being victimised, and other people fall into the same category.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Are you sure that barley producers get only 85c?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am not sure about that figure. The Minister having asked me for an illustration, I said that one would pay more for a wheat property because one's first advance would be greater. It does not matter about the $1.20 or the 80c: my point is that the first advance would be greater.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I think you will find that the barleygrower gets just as much on the first advance as does the wheatgrower.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am sure that if two properties alongside one another, one having a wheat quota and the other not having a quota, were put up for sale, the one with the quota would sell more readily. I have always been opposed to quotas for one reason: unless we watch the situation carefully, the piece of paper on which the amount of the quota is written becomes more valuable than the farm itself. That has happened in relation to every commodity of which I can think, including crayfishing and prawnfishing vessels. The Minister knows what the values of those licences are. I make no apology for saying that I will support this Bill. I have seen the needs of so many people accommodated under this legislation, and I cannot see why this group of people should not be treated in a similar manner.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I am surprised at the attitude the Minister has adopted and some of the things he has said about this Bill. I reiterate that the suggestion that this Bill is a complete departure from the original philosophy of wheat quotas is not true. This was clearly demonstrated in the second reading explanation. The Minister said that the unit belonged not to the farmer but to the farm. That basis for wheat quotas is accepted by every honourable member.

All the Bill does is provide that, where the unit is destroyed by Government acquisition, that unit should be replaced. The whole matter is as simple as that. The original resolution of United Farmers and Graziers of

South Australia Incorporated, referring to any property that was likely to be acquired, went even further than the Bill goes. This Bill deals only with the situation where the Government acquires a property other than for rural purposes. The Bill allows the quota from that property to be transferred to another property. It does not destoy the unit: it merely replaces it when the unit is annihilated by the Government. The Minister has talked about creating anomalies. What anomalies can the Bill create when it does not depart from the fundamental principle of the original legislation? In all matters things happen that were not predicted when the original legislation was passed.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You don't think that under this Bill the person who gets the wheat quota transferred to him would be advantaged monetarily?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, I do not. The Minister said by interjection, when the Hon. Mr. Story was speaking, "How can you put a value on a wheat quota?" One cannot value a wheat quota; it is not possible to do so. As he said, barley would probably be just as valuable. All the Bill does is preserve a person's wheat quota when his unit is destroyed as a result of Government acquisition. What other anomalies can be created is beyond my comprehension. I am surprised that the Minister was upset by honourable members' questions regarding the letter he wrote to Mr. Max Saint.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I didn't write a letter to him. I thought I made that clear.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am surprised at the Minister's attitude, because, after all, Opposition and Government members are here to answer these questions, and I believe the Minister had a case to answer. If he did not write a letter to Mr. Saint, all he had to do was say so in the first place. Any feelings the Minister has, he has brought on his own head.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No, he hasn't.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The only thing that has suffered in this whole matter is the Minister's credibility.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I have listened with much interest to the debate. I well recall when quotas were first introduced. It seems to me that no provision was ever made for, or any thought given to the possibility of, an occurrence such as this, when it would be necessary to acquire land for which a quota had been granted. I should have thought that, if the Minister was not in accord with the Bill, it would surely be a let-out for him to accept part of it and perhaps amend it. However, he has refused to do any of these things. I have been unable to follow any of his arguments in the debate. He said the Bill ran counter to the intention of wheat quota legislation. It does not do so; it merely introduces a new aspect. It should, therefore, have been considered objectively from that point of view. Had the Minister wanted to refer an allocation back to the advisory committee, he could have done so by amending the Act and not just repudiating any suggestion that this was a worthwhile Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I want briefly to indicate my support for the Bill. I am sorry the Minister has seen fit to take umbrage at the statements that have been made. I cannot understand why, if he did not write a letter to Mr. Max Saint, it has taken him until now to say so. I believe the situation that has brought about the introduction of this Bill was not contemplated when wheat quotas were introduced. Had it been thought there was a possibility of the Government's acquiring land for a new town, it might have been possible to provide for such an eventuality in the Act. The Hon. Mr. Story referred to the period of seven years that was intended to be used as a base period, and said that the period had been reduced to five years. I think it was a great pity that it had to be reduced to five years. I was opposed to that suggestion at the time, thinking that many areas would have been assisted if the original seven-year period had been used. We are in an entirely different situation at present, with the Minister talking about getting rid of quotas.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I would like to get rid of quotas. I make no secret of that, but it is not up to me to do it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I think everyone would like to get rid of wheat quotas, but the situation can change dramatically in only a few years. When wheat quotas were introduced several years ago there was a tremendous surplus of wheat. Although the situation is different now, that position could apply again in a few years. For that reason, I should like the wheat quota legislation to be retained so that it can be used if necessary. I support the Bill. It provides for a special category of people who have been disadvantaged by the present system. I do not believe that it creates any anomalies, because it provides only for that category of person who is displaced as a result of compulsory acquisition of land and whose wheat quota, instead of being transferred to the new owner, is virtually abolished. I support the third reading.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Midland): The Hon. Mr. Story has pointed out the anomalies resulting from the Bill. He stated firmly that a property to which a wheat quota applied was more valuable than a property without such a quota.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Minister disagreed with him about that.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Hon. Mr. Story's point was that land with a wheat quota was more valuable.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I think you are supporting the Hon. Mr. Story.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: These people have been compensated on the basis of the quota applying to their land and, if this Bill had been in force before the land was acquired, these people would not have been paid for the land on a basis including the quota. The anomaly is that the land has been purchased and allowance has been made for the quota in the purchase price. As the Hon. Mr. Story has pointed out, this has made the land more valuable. Therefore, to be strictly fair, the people who have had that land purchased should make due allowance to the Monarto Commission if they seek to have their original quotas transferred back to them. This is the anomaly to which the Minister has referred. Otherwise these farmers would have two bites at the cherry, because they have received compensation in respect of their land and the quota applying to it, and then they would have the quota transferred to them as well. This is the problem.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): How does one compensate a farmer for a wheat quota? A farmer whose land is acquired and whose compensation includes provision for a wheat quota can manage if he buys another farm with a wheat quota. I understand there were some Monarto farmers who were lucky enough to be in that position. That type of farmer has been adequately compensated in respect of the quota he had, and he has had two bites of the cherry. There is also the grower who has been adequately compensated, as claimed by the Government, who sells and buys land without a wheat quota. If it is claimed

that the farmer has been adequately compensated, why is he not allowed to buy another quota? If the argument used by the Government is correct—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: He should be able to buy back his quota from the Monarto Commission.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: True, he should be able to buy it back from the Government, and it would be adequate compensation.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: They could have done that.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: How?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The person to whom the quota applied and whose land was acquired by the Land Commission could have had the quota applying to his land transferred to him under the present Act, under the transferability clause.

The Hon. J. C. Burdett: But only on an annual basis.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Yes.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): How does one properties have been acquired and who want to continue in the industry. Wheat is an annually planted cereal. Farmers seek to make profits, and no farmer can afford to undertake the capital costs involved and to continue to run a farm incurring such capital cost in wheatgrowing merely on the promise of an annual replacement of his quota, especially in a period of the over-production of wheat. His opportunity to produce wheat could be restricted or curtailed.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: When was the last year we had an overflow of wheat?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I am talking not of the past but of a person trying to make a living in the future from growing wheat and other foodstuffs. If such a person has been adequately compensated, as the Minister claims, why does not the Government allow him to continue to produce wheat by allowing him a quota such as is provided in the Bill?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That would increase the value paid to him, and he would have three bites at the cherry.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): A matter of grave importance has arisen as a result of the Minister's speech in this debate. Pages 1225 and 1226 of *Hansard* specifically disclose that reference was made by the Hon. Mr. Burdett to a letter, or a suggested letter, from the Minister to Mr. Max Saint concerning "the transferability of wheat quotas in respect of land acquired by the Government where the owner intends to buy land elsewhere?"

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The Minister doesn't deny then that that letter was written.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On the following page the Minister refers to "the letter", and I stress the word "the". Although I will not quote the letter, honourable members can refer to that page if they wish.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Let's not quibble about "the" and "a".

The Hon. C. M. HILL: At the bottom of page 1226, in answer to a question asked by the Leader, the Minister said that he preferred not to divulge any information he gave to Mr. Saint. In the next column on page 1226 (and this would have occurred five or 10 minutes later) reference was made by the Minister to the person concerned. I understand that today the Minister has stated that there was in fact no such letter.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is correct.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If that is the case, there are two alternatives open to the Minister and this Council. First (and this is the course I would prefer to see taken), the Minister could make to the Council a complete and frank explanation on a personal basis on why he made mistakes on that occasion.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I did that when I spoke on the third reading of the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My impression from what the Minister has said today is that he is quite defiant in defending the issue on this point. I do not believe that is proper, and I heartily agree with the honourable member who said that the Minister's credibility was coming seriously in doubt.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Now you're playing politics. I didn't think you'd get that low. Fair go!

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask the honourable Minister to read those two pages of *Hansard* to which I have just referred. If the Minister is not willing to give a completely open and frank explanation—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I have already done that. I explained the situation when I spoke to the third reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Does the Minister regret that he made statements to the effect that he had sent "the letter" to Mr. Saint?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: If I said "the" instead of "a", I made a mistake.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It was a very serious mistake indeed. The Minister now admits that he made a mistake, but it should have been disclosed forthwith with a full explanation.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I won't be cross-examined.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Ministers have important responsibilities under the Westminster system; the Minister knows that. When Ministers make mistakes of this kind I expect them to disclose their position immediately and put the situation right. I do not think the Minister acted in that way on this occasion.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Southern): I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate. The first point I want to make is, again, that this Bill does not depart from the original concept of the wheat quota legislation. This point has been fully developed by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, and I shall not repeat it. Further, I categorically state that the dispossessed Monarto landholders were not paid for their quotas; there was no document which said that, and there was no document from any department prior to acquisition which said that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Was there any document from the Minister saying that they could take their quotas with them?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: We are trying to establish that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You are just playing with words.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: These people did not sign any document which said that they had been paid for their quotas and they did not directly or officially receive anything from the Government or a Minister saying that they were paid for their quotas. The Government cannot establish that they were paid for their quotas. I am maintaining this point from what people have told me.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is a good phrase which politicians of your calibre often use.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: In what other way could I know about this matter? The Minister will probably get letters from the people. They read a report of the debate in the local press. I do not know whether the letters will be personal letters, but the Minister will get them.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No doubt you have sent the people copies.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: No. I have been told by them that they will send the letters. I did not ask for the letters to be sent. The Minister will be told specifically that the people were under the impression that they were going to be allowed to take their quotas with them. As a result, they were not paid for their quotas. The Minister has said that there will be various provisions whereby the people can be satisfied, but the only provisions for transferring and granting quotas in the mythical Bill, which we have not seen, are for quotas on an annual basis. These people want the security of knowing that they and their assignees can have the benefit of a quota. The Minister referred to a proposed new advisory committee which will be set up under the mythical Bill. He says that it has been requested by the industry, but I believe that that is not correct. On my present understanding, I will vote against the Bill, if it is to set up a three-man committee on which there is to be only one grower representative. Nevertheless, we must come back to the question of the letter. I want to make it quite clear that I did not ask any question about any personal letter. At *Hansard,* page 1225, I asked:

Will the Minister of Agriculture table the letter that he wrote earlier this year to Mr. Max Saint, Chairman of the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation and Treasurer of United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated concerning the transferability of wheat quotas in respect of land acquired by the Government where the owner intends to buy land elsewhere?

Can anyone say that I was referring to a personal letter or was trying to pry into the Minister's personal affairs?

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You were dealing with one specific question.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Exactly. In reply to my question, the Minister said:

The answer is "No".

I then asked the Minister:

Will the Minister give the Council the reasons why he will not table the letter?

The Minister replied:

As Minister, I wrote the letter to Mr. Max Saint, of the United Farmers and Graziers, and I do not see that it has anything to do with making it public. It was purely a personal letter from me to Mr. Saint, and it is high time that some honourable members realised that everything a Minister writes to people does not have to be tabled. I know what the honourable member is driving at.

I interjected:

What?

However, nothing came out of my interjection. The only sort of answer the Minister has given today is that he apparently says he did not say, "As Minister, I wrote the letter." Instead, the Minister asserts that he said, "As Minister, I wrote a letter." If we read the rest of the words, it does not matter very much whether the Minister said, "I wrote the letter" or "I wrote a letter." He was referring back to the question I asked, which related to a letter to Mr. Max Saint about the transferability of wheat quotas. The Minister is saying that no letter was written. Why did he not say that then? In answering the question in the way he did, he was misleading the Council. At page 1226 of *Hansard,* the Hon. Mr. DeGaris asked:

Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the letter that he admits having written to Mr. Saint referred to wheat quotas for landholders whose land was being acquired by the Government at Monarto?

The Minister's answer was not, "No; I did not write a letter." Actually, the Minister's answer was:

I do not think I am entitled to divulge any information that I gave Mr. Saint, because it is of a personal nature and it would not be in order for me to discuss the contents of that letter.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: What is wrong with that?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I repeat what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris asked:

Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the letter that he admits having written to Mr. Saint . . .

In reply, the Minister said:

It would not be in order for me to discuss the contents of that letter.

Now, he says that he did not write a letter. To me, it is very clear that what he was saying on October 2 was that he did write a letter, and it was about those matters and, because it was of a personal nature, he did not want to disclose it.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is a lot of supposition and rot.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am referring to the *Hansard* report.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You are trying to twist things around.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not: I am referring to the *Hansard* report.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You are just crooked because you did not get what you wanted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I am not twisting anything, and I have not misquoted. I have not even transposed an "a" or a "the". I have quoted them as they were. Every member in this Chamber can read them, and everyone who reads *Hansard* can read them.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: The Minister has the chance to correct the *Hansard* pulls before they are printed.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: However, that is enough about that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: The *Hansard* report can stay as it is. I have got nothing to hide.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Regarding the statement about Mr. Roocke, the Minister said, as I understand it, that he did not make any statement to Mr. Roocke that the dispossessed farmers at Monarto could take their quotas with them. In my second reading explanation, I read an excerpt from the *Farmer and Grazier* of Thursday, April 11, 1974, quoting Mr. Roocke. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of this, but I quoted from a reputable journal which in turn quoted Mr. Roocke as saying:

Of Monarto's displaced farmers, Mr. Roocke said the Minister had been approached on this matter and the Government indicated their entitlement to the quotas on the land concerned, in order that they could lease this back to the growers. However, at a recent meeting the Minister indicated he wanted to alter the Act to allow farmers to take quotas away with them, without question. I feel this could create a lot of anomalies and that discretionary powers should be given to the quota committee in this regard for this conference.

That is what I read previously, and it is what I have read again today. Finally, I turn to the point made in the second reading debate, and made again today, that no-one will be disadvantaged by this Bill. The quotas which this Bill seeks to allow the landowners to take with them are quotas already granted. It is not taking anything away from anyone, but giving some measure of satisfactory compensation to people whose land has been compulsorily acquired to enable them to continue to carry on the only avocation they know.

The Council divided on the third reading:

Ayes (12)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett (teller), Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, C. M. Hill, F. J. Potter, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (6)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey (teller), B. A. Chatterton, C. W. Creedon, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. C. R. Story:

That, in the opinion of this Council, the Government should, as a matter of urgency, introduce a Bill to amend the Succession Duties Act, 1929-1971, to provide for—

I. Increased proportional rebates of duty, so that the value of the rebates relates more accurately to the present value of money.

II. The right to claim rural rebate on land held in joint tenancy or tenancy in common.

III. Clarification of the daughter-housekeeper provisions.

IV. A new provision to alleviate the financial burden of widows with dependent children,

which the Hon. F. J. Potter had moved to amend by adding a new paragraph v as follows:

v. The same general statutory amount for rebate purposes for both widows and widowers.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1648).

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I oppose the motion, but in so doing I commend the Hon. Mr. Story for the concern which obviously motivated him in moving it. This is a concern which is shared by all members of the Government and my reason for opposing the motion is not that I find very much objectionable in its major provisions but rather that I do not think the Government can do justice to the complexities involved in this issue in a short space of time. In other words, it is not possible for the Government to introduce an amending Bill "as a matter of urgency" without running the grave risk of creating more anomalies than it removes. Instead, I am inclined to pay heed to the advice which the Hon. Mr. Story gave in moving his motion and to "have another thorough investigation of the legislation."

Most honourable members who have spoken in the debate have referred to the effects of inflation on the value of the matrimonial home in particular, and the manner in which rising prices have eroded the value of the statutory amounts included in the legislation for the purpose of calculating rebates. This matter was the subject of a recent approach to the Government by representatives of the Taxpayers Association, as a result of which the Treasurer instigated an investigation into values that might be more appropriate to present-day conditions. The results of this investigation should be available within the next few weeks. If the results of the investigation are such as to suggest that increased rebates of duty are appropriate the Government will then have to decide whether it is possible in the current circumstances simply to relax the provisions of the legislation or whether it will be necessary to examine means of compensating for the resultant loss of revenue. Honourable members will by now be well aware of the Government's budgetary position.

I must emphasise that it will probably be some time before the Government is in a position to announce a decision, even on this limited aspect of the problem, and if we are to consider the matters raised by honourable members in this debate, most of which are worthy of close examination, it is unlikely that amending legislation will be ready in the near future. It would be possible, of course, to introduce amendments in stages, but this would almost certainly give rise to inequities in the treatment of similar estates, and cause confusion and dissatisfaction amongst those trying to provide for their future successors.

One aspect of the motion towards which I have rather less sympathy is that which refers to the right to claim rural rebate on land held in joint tenancy or tenancy m common. I see no reason to depart from the attitude taken by the Government on this matter when the 1970 legislation was being debated. On page 3456 of *Hansard* for that year the Treasurer said:

The Legislative Council has moved to delete the reference to joint tenancy, tenancy in common and partnership. This would so widen the availability of the concession as to be unacceptable. A beneficiary who is already a joint tenant is in any case receiving considerable benefit in that his joint share does not attract any duty. In those circumstances the removal of these words runs entirely contrary to a provision that was urged by Sir Thomas Playford in Parliament and insisted on time and time again; that is, that where devices of joint ownership are used in order to reduce taxation liabilities there is not a separate and further taxation rebate in respect of it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: You changed all that with the 1970 amendment. That argument was sustainable then, but it is not now.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: This Bill sustains it.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It can't do that. One cannot get that rebate now.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That is what I am informed. By way of further explanation—

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I understand now that no honourable member is allowed to interject on a Minister.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Not really. It was my honourable ex-Leader (Hon. A. J. Shard) who said that no-one was allowed to interject on a Minister.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It is a new one to me.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think that has gone by the board, in practice. I would rely on Standing Orders in regard to that.

The Hon. C. R. Story: It must have been a ruling given on a wet day when not many honourable members were present.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: By way of further explanation, I point out that the fundamental purpose of the rural rebate is, as mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Burdett, to recognise the fact that the primary producer must have a large amount of capital to earn a living and that much of his capital is not of a kind that can readily be converted into cash to meet succession duties and then built up again by his successors from earnings on the remaining capital. It is generally accepted that, in these circumstances, it would be inequitable to impose full duty on the transfer of wealth from a primary producer to his successors. However, where the primary producer holds his property as a joint tenant, he effectively halves the capital that he must have to earn a living and it becomes much more difficult to justify a special rebate.

Several speakers, and the Hon. Mr. Potter in particular, have dealt with the vexed question of the daughter-housekeeper. It must be conceded that the legislation as it stands sometimes operates most unjustly and penalises women who are obliged to work to support an aged parent. The difficulty is not to identify the problem but rather to suggest a solution that will deal with the wide variety of special circumstances that arise without providing unintended concessions to successors who, in the interests of equity, should be required to pay duty. It is undesirable that the Commissioner of Succession Duties be left with the responsibility of making Solomon-like judgments because of loosely worded legislation, as there may be considerable difficulty in drafting specific legislation of reasonably general application.

The Hon. Mr. Story has proposed that special recognition be given in succession duties legislation to the problems of a widow with dependent children. I have no quarrel at all with his motives in bringing forward the problems of women unfortunate enough to be placed, by an untimely death, in the position of having to raise a young family by themselves with limited means. However, I am not at all sure that their plight is any worse than that of older women with no dependants but the same limited means. In particular, it is far more likely in the former case that the widow will be able to find at least part-time employment to support herself and her family, and, I would think, far more likely that she will remarry. It can be said that under existing legislation there is inequity between the cases of two young widows of the same means, one with dependants and one without. The type of amendment the Hon. Mr. Story is proposing would remove this inequity but substitute a different sort of inequity between widows of different ages.

My own preference is for raising the rebates for all widows to the maximum possible level, so dealing directly with the problem of limited means rather than giving special recognition to cases involving dependants and so dealing with part of the problem only. I point out that special provisions for widows with dependants would benefit some women with quite considerable means while doing nothing for others in genuine need but with no dependants. Furthermore, it is possible under existing legislation for the husband to provide for his dependants directly in his will and so avoid many of the problems that can otherwise arise.

I shall deal briefly with the proposition put by the Hon. Mr. Potter that the same general statutory amount for rebate purposes should be used for both widows and widowers. I agree with him that this is probably a relic of the past and especially a relic of a time when most of the property in a family was in the husband's name. It is probably also a reflection of the higher average earnings which men received in the past and which, although to a significantly lesser degree, they still receive today. A survey of estates assessed in 1972-73 suggests that the average estate left to a widower is now of much the same value as the average estate left to a widow, except in the very high ranges where there is considerable incentive for a man to transfer property to his wife before death, in the belief that he will be the first to die, and where the average widower's succession is therefore actually larger than the average widow's succession. I suspect also that today, with the spread of superannuation benefits and the abolition of the means test on age pensions, widows are as able to provide for themselves as are widowers. There will be situations where this is not in fact the case and it will be for the Government to examine whether the incidence of these situations is sufficient to warrant continuation of the discriminatory rebate.

Another matter to which the Government will no doubt be giving some attention is the age at which children receive the benefit of the higher general statutory amount. Now that 18 years is generally accepted in this State as the age of majority, it seems appropriate that, if there is to be differentiation between children on the basis of age, the dividing line should be at this age rather than at 21 years. In concluding my remarks, I must emphasise that nothing I have said should be interpreted as an undertaking by the Government to amend the Act. I am not in a position to give such an undertaking and that is why I am opposing the motion. In taking this line, however, I did wish to express my own and the Government's sympathies towards most of the sentiments expressed by honourable members in the debate and to indicate that we have the matter under consideration.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I have listened to this debate with much interest, as its subject matter is of interest to everyone. We are now, of course, in the situation where even the most humble estate is brought into this field of taxation. It is conceivable that even a surviving member of a pensioner's family could be caught by succession duties. I did not intend to speak, but I should like to comment upon one or two points made by the Chief Secretary in his speech. I refer particularly to the rural rebate on joint tenancies or tenancies in common. I do not think the Chief Secretary quite caught an interjection from this side of the Council. Prior to the current legislation coming into effect, under the old legislation land held in joint tenancy was assessed separately from the rest of the estate and therefore enjoyed an advantage over and above the ordinary inheritance of land in respect of rural rebate. I could never quite understand why tenancy in common was even in the old Act as being barred from rural rebate, because it was a disposable share. As far as I can see, in practice it is no different from two people owning separate parcels of land and working together.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: As a matter of fact, valuers value such land at a lower rate than joint tenancies, which is rather strange.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Certainly, but I hope the Government will keep in mind, when it is considering any relief in this legislation, that it is not only in these instances that the rural rebate is not allowable on the land itself: it is also not allowable on the stock and plant which, in ordinary circumstances, are eligible for rebate as primary-producing property. It seems to me that this was overlooked when the legislation was passed. Not only were tenants in common and joint tenants denied the rebate, at the Government's insistence, but also they were denied any rebate in relation to stock and plant.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): First, I thank most sincerely all members who participated in the debate. I am extremely pleased that they were able to contribute to what I believe was a worthwhile debate on the motion. I also thank the Chief Secretary for his contribution. I am heartened to know that the Government is taking due cognizance of the sentiments that have been expressed in the debate, which has been of a high calibre. Although I do not expect miracles from it, certainly the Government has indicated that the matter is receiving at least some attention. The Chief Secretary said that the Treasurer had appointed a working committee to inquire into all aspects of succession duties legislation and that the committee's report should be ready within a few weeks.

He went on to refer to the present financial climate. I think succession duties seem to be a little like Parliamentary salaries: the time is never opportune for any action to be taken, and they are something that should not be mentioned in public. I cannot for the life of me see why succession duties should be influenced by the inflationary trends that we are at present experiencing. Succession duties affect people when they can least cope with the situation: when the breadwinner dies and the grief-stricken widow has the job of trying to pick up the threads, look after a family and see them through the difficult period of adolescence until they are able to fend for themselves.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It is just as bad for the widower.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is so, and in some cases it is even worse, because he has added responsibilities. Often, a widower has to give up a good job and take only part-time work to be able to look after the younger members of his family. Not only is he disadvantaged financially but also he is reduced to an undesirable psychological state. This should not be allowed to continue.

Succession duties contribute about $12 000 000 a year to the Treasury and, although that sum in a Budget of about $770 000 000 a year is only a small one, the pain that can be inflicted on ordinary, good, thrifty citizens in this respect is incalculable. I have never been in favour of succession duties, which have been with us from the turn of the century and which have certainly been a part of our way of life since 1922.

In closing the debate I should like briefly to illustrate an instance that has been brought to my attention. It was examples like this one that actuated my moving the motion. I refer to a letter written to the Secretary of the Australian Bank Officials Association by a person who has settled two estates in the last year, one being his mother's estate and the other that of his mother-in-law. He wrote to this organisation requesting it to take up with the Government the anomalous situation brought about, first, by the 1970 amendment to the Act and, secondly, by inflation. The letter states:

I wish to bring to the notice of our association generally the matter of South Australian succession duties, and the effect of its application—particularly within the inflationary spiral we live in today. On December 9, 1970, a new scale of duties payable on chargeable property was introduced. ... At that time, the Premier of South Australia made a statement to the effect that the ordinary man—and his family home—was still virtually unaffected, which was true.

In view of the effect of inflation, it is increasingly apparent that the ordinary man—and the family home—is now very much affected, and the lives of bank officers—and their wives—and, in fact, all workers will be increasingly affected, as succession duties will eventually be applicable to all family homes exceeding about $25 000 in value. By way of explanation, a home which at the time of the present changes (that is, 1970) was valued at $14 000 would not have been subject to succession duties because of statutory rebates. Today, that same home, valued at $30 000, is very much subject to succession duties, as later examples will indicate.

The problem has arisen because, whilst home values have escalated to the extent that the home has more than doubled in value over four years, the rebates applying to the family home have not changed. Surely if a family home previously exempt has changed in value because of inflation, then the rebate originally intended to exempt that home should have inflated, too. May I offer just a few examples, using as a means of calculation a home valued at say $30 000, and for the examples disregard any other probable assets such as bank accounts, etc.

N.B.—All estates subject to legal fees, valuation fees, etc., and funeral expenses.

The person concerned then set out the following tables comparing the situation in 1970 with that in 1974:

1970

Home value $14 000 (disregarding other assets)

Widow	Widower	Family
Estate $14 000	$14 000	$14 000
½ value	½ value	
$7 000	$7 000	Stat. rebate
Stat. rebate	Stat, rebate	
$12 000	$6 000	$6 000
	+Marital home rebate	Estate for duty purposes $8 000
No duty	No duty	Duty $1 200

1974

Same home, value now $30 000

Widow	Widower	Family
Estate $30 000	$30 000	$30 000
½ value	½ value	
$15 000	$15 000	
Stat. rebate $12 000	Stat. rebate $6 000	Stat. rebate $6 000
Marital Home rebate $6 000	+Marital home rebate $2 000	Estate for duty purposes $24 000
No duty but leaving a "buffer" of only $3 000 for other assets.	Estate $7 000 Duty $1 050	Duty $3 700

In summary, in 1970 the wife paid no duty, and in 1974 she still paid no duty, but she was allowed only $3 000 to cover the rest of the estate, and she immediately became dutiable once the estate amounted to more than that sum. In 1970 the widower paid no duty, but in 1974 his duty was $1 050. In 1970 the duty in respect of the family was $1 200, and in 1974 it had increased to $3 700. These figures clearly indicate why we believe the present legislation should be amended by the Government to clear up this situation. The Chief Secretary said that it was unlikely that anything could be done in the near future. He also said that he understood that the Treasurer believed that something could be done in stages. I believe the situation warrants such action. Each of the matters referred to in the motion are worthy of close consideration and, if there is to be any choice, it should be in relation to the matrimonial home, because this is the one area involving everyone. I link this to the matter raised by the Hon. Mr. Burdett concerning primary producers who may be disadvantaged if the property they run is held, through force of circumstances, in joint names rather than as tenants in common.

I thank all honourable members who have participated in this debate, and I plead once again with the Government not to delay action on this matter but to act on the report of the special committee that has been established to examine this matter. I believe it is possible for the Government to reduce by about half the $12 000 000 extracted from succession duties. Savings could be made to enable it to do this, and the lifting of this $6 000 000 impost would make a tremendous difference to the sleeping ability of people over the age of 50 years.

The Hon. F. J. Potter's amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1648.)

Clause 4—"Share of widow or widower."

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Chief Secretary): I thank the Committee for giving me the opportunity to examine the Bill and consider the matter at hand. After discussions with the Attorney-General, I have been informed that a report of the Law Committee of September 27, 1974, on the subject of the distribution of estates on intestacy is now being printed. The recommendation in the report is that the sum of $20 000 be increased to $30 000. The Attorney-General believes that the Government should accept the recommendation of the Law Reform Committee. Therefore, I move:

In new subsection (3) to strike out "twenty thousand" and insert "thirty thousand".

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am pleased to have the Minister's support for the measure, and I am happy to accept his amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Midland): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It repeals section 7 of the principal Act. Section 7 allows the hunting or coursing of hares to continue, despite the other strictures of the Act. The whole question of cruelty to animals involves extremely difficult judgments. There are obviously extreme positions: some regard animals, in their feelings and anxieties, as being essentially like human

beings, while others claim that animals are mere insensitive automata. It is relatively easy to avoid these two extreme pitfalls, but it is extremely difficult to know what path to choose between them. I believe that no justification exists today for the continuation of live hare coursing, which inflicts unnecessary pain and suffering on animals merely for the gratification of society; in this case, a very small minority of our society.

I also find it repugnant that people keep animals, whether they be hares for coursing or bulls for bull fighting, with the sole expectation of making the animals victims of a so-called sporting event. I do not think there is any doubt about the pain involved in live hare coursing. I have here two photographs from the *Advertiser* that were taken at a coursing meeting; the photographs clearly show a hare being torn between dogs. Unfortunately, the photographs cannot be incorporated in *Hansard.* I should also like to quote from a report to the Secretary of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. The report was made by a staff inspector following a coursing meeting held on June 22 at Murray Bridge. The report states:

I used my own private conveyance and wore plain clothes. On arrival at about 10.45 a.m. I gained admittance to the grounds upon the payment of $1. After parking my vehicle, I obtained a printed programme of events from Mr. Colin Viney, an official of the National Coursing Association, and at about 11 a.m. the first course was run. During the course of the day, I observed the running of each elimination heat of the two events listed on the programme, namely, the S.A. Oaks and No Flag Stake, with the aid of binoculars. Each elimination heat was contested by two greyhounds chasing a live hare released into the coursing area. Points were awarded to the dog leading in the run to the hare and for turning it, etc., until the hare escaped under the fence at the end of the coursing arena or was killed by the dogs.

During the running of the S.A. Oaks, the dogs caught the hare in the fourth heat, the second round, and the final. During the running of the No Flag Stakes the hare was caught in the first heat, first round, second round, and final, making a total of seven catches for the day from a total of 36 heats. I observed the running of the heats from the mound near the bookmakers' stand, and each time the hare was caught during the elimination heats it seemed to have been killed within a matter of a few seconds after it had been caught. The dead hares had been carried from the coursing area and placed on the ground near a gate leading from the arena.

A few minutes before the running of the final heat of the S.A. Oaks, I decided to walk across to the gateway leading from the coursing area, through which the dogs were brought back and near where the dead hares had been placed, in order to examine the bodies of the hares. I was about a metre from the gateway when the final heat of the S.A. Oaks was run. The dogs quickly caught the hare during the final heat. I could hear the hare squealing as both dogs held it. The handlers of the dogs ran out on to the area and caught the dogs, and retrieved the hare from the dogs. One of the handlers carried the hare from the arena and placed it on the ground outside the gate, at the same time informing me that it was still alive.

The injured animal was breathing, and it was obviously conscious, although immobile. I drew my pistol and destroyed it immediately. I then made an inspection of the near vicinity, and found the bodies of four hares, making a total of five, including the one I had destroyed. The bodies of the dead hares did not seem to be severely mutilated. Whilst I was examining the dead bodies, I was approached by a spectator who told me that he had seen a hare, which had earlier been caught by the dogs, apparently recover sufficiently to get up and run off into open country. It would be impossible to assess this animal's injuries or chance of survival. As the meeting was then concluded I walked straight back to my car and left.

I had, at the start of the meeting, been approached by Mr. P. Alsop, President of the National Coursing Association, who welcomed me to the meeting, and treated me with the utmost courtesy. During the course of my conversation with him he naturally supported the sport of live hare coursing, asserting that the hares had a reasonably good chance of escaping the dogs, and, if by chance they were caught, were usually killed very quickly with a minimum of suffering. Because of the lack of evidence to the contrary, I had previously been inclined to agree with him, but, after witnessing at reasonably close quarters the last heat of the meeting at Murray Bridge, it would seem that not every hare is killed instantly by the dogs and that, on occasions, unnecessary pain and suffering is inflicted on the unfortunate quarry.

I have stated that live hare coursing inflicts unnecessary pain and suffering on animals. I have dealt with the question of pain, but suffering is more often considered a purely human experience associated with prolonged anxiety and the imaginative anticipation of further pain, both of which are incomparably less well developed in most animals, as far as we can see. There is no doubt that many species of animal live in the present to an extent which it is hard for a human to conceive. But we cannot dismiss the suffering that is caused by coursing, as many animals not only remember the past but also fear the future, at least to some degree. Much scientific work has been done in the past 10 or 20 years that has shown a much greater degree of social development among animals in nature than was previously conceived possible. I believe that we must have regard for the hares that survive the coursing by dogs—only to be coursed another day. It is inconceivable to me that these animals can enjoy such stress, as has been suggested by some people, when all the evidence indicates considerable suffering.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of debate.

PYAP IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It may help honourable members if I briefly outline some of the history of the Pyap Irrigation Trust. In 1921, the Pyap Proprietary Company was registered in Victoria to carry on the business of fruitgrowing and packing at Pyap. The company presumably got into financial difficulties during 1921 and mortgaged Crown Lease P/L 8669 to the Bank of Victoria Limited. In August, 1921, it subdivided the subject land into 15 blocks and offered them for sale by public auction. Of the blocks sold, nine were sold at the sale and the others were sold privately by private treaty but under the same terms and conditions of sale.

Because it seemed that the company would have to go into liquidation in order to protect the settlers and to enable them to carry on the irrigation of their blocks, it was decided to vest the whole of the irrigation plant, channels, implements, and equipment in a trust consisting of the settlers. By doing this the vendor was released from its undertaking to regulate and distribute water to the settlers and, in so doing, the long-term interests of the settlers were protected. By setting up such a trust the settlers believed they were protected in perpetuity.

The original private Bill introduced to establish this trust was presented to Parliament on September 4, 1923, was drafted along similar lines to that of the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act, and was designed to enable the trust to be formed to take over the regulation and distribution of the water supply. In 1926 a further Act enabled the trust to borrow money on long term against the rate income of the trust. The trust continued to operate for 50 years, but changing circumstances, such as the change in ownership of properties and perhaps, in particular, the metering of water pumped from the Murray River, caused dissension to creep in. This dissension was principally brought about by the poor condition of the distribution channels, most of which were earthen and unlined. This meant that the volume of water

delivered against a fixed pumping allocation into the channels was reduced greatly because of seepage losses by the time the water reached members of the trust on the ends of those channels.

As a result, some people preferred to take a water allotment from the trust's licence and to install their own pumps, rather than take a supply from the trust's system. However, when they sought to do this, they discovered that the Act would not permit them to withdraw from the trust and act independently, and this is the reason behind the introduction of the amending Bill. These people, who were dissatisfied with the distribution of water under the trust's distribution system, decided that they wanted to cease being members of the trust, and to operate independently, but they were prevented from doing so by the Act.

The Chairman of the trust reaffirmed that it was still the unanimous wish of all members of the trust to have their private Act amended in the form agreed to at a meeting held on Friday, June 29, 1973, to discuss the question. Following that meeting, a letter was received from the Secretary of the trust setting out the form that the amendments should take and asking to have them properly drafted. The form of the amendments they wish to be made to the Act is as follows:

(1) That the trust shall consist of ratepayers only and not lessees of all land within the area.

(2) That ratepayers shall be defined as those persons whether owners, lessees or occupiers of land within the area to which water is supplied by the trust's system.

(3) That only ratepayers, as above defined, shall be assessed for rates by the trust, and the trust shall not be obliged to supply water to any owner, lessee or occupier of any land within the area if the owner, lessee or occupier shall have ceased to be a member of the trust or if at any time the trust has ceased to supply the land with water for a continuous period of one year.

(4)That a ratepayer shall cease to be a member of the trust if he shall give to the trust six calendar months notice of his intention to supply his land with water by means other than the trust's system, provided that if a ratepayer shall fail to give six months notice as aforesaid he shall be regarded as a ratepayer and liable to payment of rates for a period of six months after the receipt by the trust of a notice of intention to use another supply or of having done so.

I am grateful to Mr. Hackett-Jones (Parliamentary Counsel) for helping with the drafting of the Bill: in fact, it would be fair to say that he drafted the Bill. A copy of the draft amendments was sent to the Minister of Lands for his information and comment. The Minister obviously had the proposals fully investigated because, on January 29, 1974, he wrote to the trust drawing attention to what appeared to be restrictive provisions in the proposed amendments and asking for the comments and assurance of the trust that it did not wish to amend the Bill any further. In due course, the members of the trust held another meeting, and I am told that they agreed unanimously not to change the form of the Bill but to proceed with the draft legislation without any changes.

It is the approved draft that I am now presenting to the Chamber in the form of a Bill. The intention of the Bill is to permit any member who wishes to cease to be a member of the trust to have the right to do so by giving in writing to the trust six calendar months notice of his intention to supply his land with water by means other than the trust's system. Clause 1 simply consolidates two previous Acts. Clause 2 provides for such land to be exempted from rating—that is, land occupied by people who have opted out of the trust. Clause 3, the major amendment, provides for a new definition of membership of the trust by repealing clause 7 of the principal Act and replacing it with the new sections contained in clause 3. Clauses 4 and 5 are consequential amendments.

The Bill was referred to a Select Committee of the House of Assembly and, because of its urgency, it was passed through the Lower House expeditiously.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Is that a promise or a threat?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was passed expeditiously in the House of Assembly.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I thought you were preparing the way.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I was, too, slightly. This being a private member's Bill, and as the previous arrangements terminate on October 30, I ask for the co-operation of all members in permitting the speedy passage of the Bill so that it may come into operation as promised.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Lands): I listened with interest to the Hon. Mr. Story's explanation of this Bill. True, the honourable member who introduced the Bill in another place gave me a copy to peruse before he introduced it. I discussed the matter with officers in the Lands Department and, as the Hon. Mr. Story said, the effects of the Bill were pointed out to the trust. Certain restrictions were apparent, but I am pleased to see that, as a result of having the Select Committee in another place, a suggestion made by my officers to make the Bill infinitely better has been included. I support the Bill.

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

APIARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Apiaries Act, 1931-1964. Read a first time.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (HOURS)

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEES)

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

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

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

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.55 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 31, at 2.15 p.m.