

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, October 25, 1962.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability),
 Food and Drugs Act Amendment,
 Hospitals Act Amendment,
 Institute of Medical and Veterinary
 Science Act Amendment,
 Local Courts Act Amendment,
 Metropolitan Drainage Works (Investigation),
 Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 1),
 Registration of Deeds Act Amendment,
 Sale of Human Blood,
 Unclaimed Moneys Act Amendment,
 Mines and Works Inspection Act Amendment,
 Education Act Amendment,
 Explosives Act Amendment,
 Homes Act Amendment,
 Housing Loans Redemption Fund,
 Impounding Act Amendment,
 Loans to Producers Act Amendment,
 Mental Health Act Amendment (No. 1),
 Mental Health Act Amendment (No. 2).

QUESTIONS.

ABATTOIRS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Does the Minister of Agriculture intend, when granting licences for slaughterhouses, to set a standard for hygienic purposes not lower than that at the Gepps Cross and Noarlunga meatworks, and will he consider permitting the Secretary of the Meat Industry Employees' Union or his nominee to inspect the premises with respect to hygienic standards before a licence is granted?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Leader's question contains two points, the first being whether I should set standards not lower than those at Gepps Cross and Noarlunga. Those standards are particularly high and I do not doubt that the Leader is right in seeking to have them set for any abattoirs that may be licensed. The state of a slaughterhouse will undoubtedly be considered before a licence is issued. Although I cannot guarantee the exact conditions, the Leader can rest assured that hygiene will be carefully considered. Fairly rigid standards of inspection must be

passed quite apart from the hygiene of a slaughterhouse. The two works mentioned are both licensed for export slaughtering. Although it is possible that some works that will be licensed will not hold export licences, I shall look for good standards of hygiene before issuing licences. I cannot guarantee that a representative of the Meat Industry Employees' Union will be allowed to approve the hygienic standard of any works. Probably this union is not the only union involved and, in any case, with the various statutory limitations on the slaughter of livestock, I think it is unnecessary to impose further supervision over actual conditions. Nevertheless, I am prepared to consider the request; what I have said has been my quick reaction to the question.

TOWN PLANNING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday the report on the metropolitan area made pursuant to section 27 of the Town Planning Act was laid on the table of this House, and it is a monumental work that will require detailed study. Section 27 of the Town Planning Act provides that the plan may be referred back to the Town Planning Committee for reconsideration by resolution of the House, notice of which must be given within 28 sitting days. Chapter 23, "Implementation", contains the statement that the effectiveness of the development plan will depend on the legislation needed to implement it. Can the Premier say what plans the Government has for putting into effect the specific recommendations made in chapter 23 and also for giving Parliament an opportunity to consider the report and plan generally? As we seem to be nearing the end of the present Parliamentary session, will the Government consider an early session next year so that we may get on with this matter as quickly as possible?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In answer to a question asked some time ago, I said the Government did not intend to try to introduce legislation this session to cover any matters arising from the report. Honourable members will all have a copy of the document, which will need much studying before anyone can appreciate the significance of the recommendations. In those circumstances I can only say that the document will be studied by the appropriate Government departments interested in it.

One or two matters clearly come within the realm of local government, and I would hesitate to introduce legislation on local government matters until the local government

authorities, too, had had an opportunity to examine this report. To that end, the Government has decided that each of the councils affected by this report shall receive copies of it so that they may examine it as individual councils, and then probably make some collective representations to the Government on it. Councils are keen to exercise their authority under the Act without interference from outside authorities, so I think it would be necessary to get their co-operation in any suggested changes. These things will take some time. I do not think it would be advisable or possible at this stage to promise an early session next year. I think that would be impracticable, if only from the point of view of preparing the necessary legislation for an early session. This matter will be examined in order that it may be dealt with next session.

AIR POLLUTION.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I had some letters from the Minister of Health some time ago informing me that the Department of Public Health was investigating the soot fall-out in various parts of the metropolitan area. His Excellency's Speech opening this session foreshadowed legislation to deal with air pollution. As we are nearing the end of the session, has the Premier anything to report on the investigations made and could we reasonably expect consideration of appropriate legislation next session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government has had in mind setting up a control authority to take steps in this matter. Preliminary reports we have had on fall-out in the atmosphere do not indicate any serious problem at the moment although some problem may arise near one or two individual areas. The matter is a little complicated. After much discussion Cabinet decided that it would examine the matter further before actually recommending legislation to honourable members. I believe that legislation will be ready for next session.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on September 27 about the progress of testing by the Mines Department to determine the arsenic content and lead fall-out over Port Pirie? If he has not obtained a reply, will he do so before Parliament prorogues?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not yet received a report, but I shall see if I can get it as requested.

SUGAR GUM PRESERVATION.

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to a question I asked him on October 16 about the method of treating small radiata pine growth to make it suitable for posts, and whether that treatment would be suitable for sugar gum timber used as posts?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Conservator of Forests reports:

Generally speaking, it can be said that sapwood on the outside of round hardwood posts and poles, etc., can be impregnated with preservative material by way of the standard methods. Heart wood in eucalypts, however, is a very different proposition, and would require very high pressure treatment for satisfactory results.

Whether that completely answers the question I am not sure. I think the honourable member wanted to know about the treatment of round sugar gum. If that is so I think it is clear from this report that it could be so treated, but with split sugar gum the treatment would probably not be so satisfactory. I will check that because I do not think this answer covers the whole question.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that the Premier this morning gave evidence before the Public Works Committee about the Government's proposal to standardize the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line, which is important to my district. Can he at this stage report to the House on his meeting with the committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I welcomed the opportunity of speaking to the Public Works Committee to place before it what the Government believes is a balanced view on the development of this railway system. I believe that, after my meeting with the committee, the Chairman released a brief report on the matters dealt with. I presume he would have no objection to my taking it as far as I believe the release went: that South Australia's development depends largely, for its secondary industries, upon the effectiveness of its transportation system. If our industries are to be successful in South Australia, they must have the best transportation system available to connect them with other States. I gave it as the considered view of the Government that the standardization of the Port Pirie to Broken Hill line and connections therefrom to Adelaide were a prime necessity in the State's future development. I said we could not examine it strictly from the point of view of the immediate effect upon railway revenue because of the intangibles that did not show immediately upon a railway balance

sheet. That summarizes the ground covered. In view of the nature of the reports of the committee and the fact that its inquiries are not held in public, I feel I should not go farther than that.

NAVAN WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Minister of Works indicate the completion date for the water reticulation scheme for Navan?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Without reference to the departmental docket, I cannot say precisely when this work will be completed. If the honourable member will ask me his question again on Tuesday, I shall endeavour to give him some more precise information.

SCHOOL SPORTS GROUNDS.

Mr. LAWN: I have been questioned by parents of some schoolchildren about the position arising from the Minister of Education's reply to a question asked by the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) on August 28 (page 699 of *Hansard*). In regard to the use of ovals by schools, the Minister instanced one case where the owner of a property wanted more than £100,000 for his land. The Minister also said that was why he was anxious to have the support of outside bodies in determining whether the department could join forces in the joint use of such grounds. I should like to know whether, if a school is using an oval belonging to the local council, the Government would finance the upkeep of such oval?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Where we use an oval owned by a council, an incorporated body or any other institution, we enter into an agreement to pay the rent or some other remuneration and on other occasions we enter into either a joint scheme or an agreement with them in the nature of a joint scheme. At any time I shall be pleased to consider any particular case. I am anxious to broaden the scope with the idea of local government bodies and sporting bodies joining forces with the Education Department for the joint and economic use of sporting grounds.

TANUNDA WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works considered the petition I recently forwarded to him requesting an improvement of the water supply, particularly as to pressure, at Tanunda South in the area known as Crayford?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have examined the matter and addressed a letter to the honourable member regarding it. To give effect to the request of petitioners a substantial length of main would be required and it is not

possible, because of the department's commitments this year, to provide the necessary finance for laying the main. However, the matter will be carefully watched. There has been an improvement effected to the Warren trunk main and to the feeder mains leading from the Warren trunk main in the 8-in. and 6-in. section in the adjacent area. The department considers that the area to which the honourable member's question refers will receive substantial improvement in pressures this summer as a result of these improvements. I believe it is safe to say that pressures will be substantially better this year than in earlier years. The department concluded its report to me by saying that the position would be carefully watched with a view to including the proposed extended main in next year's Estimates if experience this year showed that this was urgently required.

GAWLER BY-PASS ROAD.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question regarding the opening of the new Gawler by-pass road?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Highways reports that it is not possible to open the Gawler by-pass road for through traffic until the bridges at present under construction are completed. Two of the three bridges are over the railway line, being constructed by contract, and are well in hand. The third bridge is being widened and reconstructed departmentally and is also well in hand. It is expected that all work on this by-pass will be completed by March or April, 1963.

WAGES CLAIM.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Premier heard of a log of claims that was recently served on fruit-growers demanding among other things a 35-hour week, three weeks' annual leave, two weeks' sick leave and a minimum margin over the Commonwealth basic wage of £3 12s. a week? If so, will he ask the Prices Commissioner to calculate the extra cost a ton that would be involved in producing wine grapes and express an opinion whether, under existing conditions, the industry could afford the log?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I believe that this is the subject of an application to the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission by the Australian Workers Union. I have seen notices served in connection with it. I point out that the Government would probably not be acting in the best interests if it attempted to undertake the functions of

the commission, because no doubt the commission will consider the cost to the industry in connection with the application, whereas that is not the Government's function. I am not an authority on that commission as it has not come particularly under my notice, but I believe that the commission would consider that in dealing with the claim. Obviously, such a wide claim, must make a considerable difference to the economics of the industry. So, under those circumstances I should think that the commission would be the normal authority. I should not think that it would be in the best interests for the Prices Commissioner to try to determine costs in such circumstances.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE.

Mr. CASEY: Several weeks ago I introduced to the Premier a deputation consisting of several pastoralists from the Far North who were very much concerned with the drought conditions that had existed in that area for several years. The deputation asked the Premier whether rail concessions could be granted to producers in the drought-stricken areas the same as those granted by the Commonwealth Government to producers in drought-stricken areas in the Northern Territory. As a result of that deputation, two members of the Pastoral Board travelled to the Far North and I believe recently returned to Adelaide after collecting information in those areas. I understand that the Premier has received a report from the board on that information. Can he say whether or not he has examined the report and, if so, indicate his decision concerning the granting of rail and other concessions to these drought-stricken areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: To the best of my belief the report is not yet to hand. I cleared up all my papers as late as yesterday afternoon so if the report has come to hand it has arrived since then, so I have not had a chance to see it. I should expect the report to arrive soon because I know that in accordance with my undertaking the officers have been to the area, have made a thorough inspection and have contacted a considerable number of people in the district. I will inform the honourable member as soon as a decision is made.

WILD HORSES.

Mrs. STEELE: I have had placed in my Parliamentary letterbox—and I presume other members have, too—a circular headed "Let us stop the cruelty to horses". I must admit that I was disgusted, shocked and sickened by

the revelations contained in this document. It seems incredible to me that such inhumane and gross cruelty could be meted out to dumb animals as is obviously the case mentioned and substantiated in the document. I am concerned because it mentions that most of the wild horses being imported into Victoria in large numbers are moved from the northern parts of South Australia and the Northern Territory to Adelaide and are being transhipped to road and railway transport at Dry Creek. This, therefore, greatly concerns South Australia. Will the Premier undertake to have investigations made to see whether the conditions that have already been the subject of many letters to the press do, in fact, exist at Dry Creek and whether steps can be taken immediately to prevent this inhumane treatment of dumb animals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The legislation for the prevention of cruelty to dumb animals is wide in its application, and it permits not only the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, which has appointed inspectors under the legislation, but any person to lay a complaint regarding any maltreatment of any animal. Legislation covers these matters. I have not seen the document the honourable member referred to, but if she will give me a copy I will submit it to the Commissioner of Police to see that appropriate action is taken if the law is being broken.

HUNCHEE AND RAL RAL CREEKS.

Mr. CURREN: I understand that the Acting Minister of Irrigation has a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday about the Hunchee and Ral Ral Creeks.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member asked about the proposed desnagging and dredging of the Hunchee and Ral Ral creeks just above Renmark. He said that he had seen no sign of activity, and he wanted to know when the work would be done. Actually, the Engineering and Water Supply Department was asked to do the work and it set out to do so, but certain operational difficulties that had not been foreseen arose and they were more complicated than at first anticipated. A quote has been sought from a private person to do the work and it has now been received. That is the latest information I have.

NAVAL VISIT.

Mr. JENKINS: The Apex Club at Victor Harbour will be organizing the Australian Motor Cycle Championships at the Bluff, Victor Harbour, on November 10. I understand that on the same day some Australian naval

units will be in South Australian waters. I telegraphed Dr. Forbes, M.H.R., this morning asking him to approach the Minister for the Navy to see whether these units could steam past the Bluff on that day. If that can be arranged it will be of great interest to visitors and residents. Will the Premier support Dr. Forbes's application to the Minister for the Navy?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

GOVERNMENT SUBCONTRACTORS.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Last week, at a meeting of the Trades and Labor Council a report was submitted by one of the affiliated bodies to the effect that on August 10 last the affairs of the plastering firm of Laney and Lindberg were placed in the hands of the Bankruptcy Court. A company was then formed in the name of Mrs. Lindberg and it continued operations with the same employees on work for the same contractors and for new contractors. Laney and Lindberg did contracting work for the State Government. The Trades and Labor Council is particularly concerned at the Government's policy in permitting work to be performed for it by a firm of subcontractors of questionable financial standing or with no assets whatsoever. In the case of Laney and Lindberg some plasterers and labourers have never been paid holiday entitlements, and in some cases, wages were never received. At least one cheque for wages was not honoured by the bank. Will the Premier obtain a report in connection with the letting of Government work to firms of subcontractors of questionable financial standing or with no assets at all, and will he also obtain a report concerning the situation created by Mrs. Lindberg's being permitted to take over the operations of the bankrupt company without being liable for debts incurred by that company?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

HIGHWAYS BUILDING.

Mr. COUMBE: Some time ago the Public Works Committee recommended the building of a multi-storey administration block for the Highways Department at Walkerville, and subsequently I read in the press that tenders were being called for this work. As this matter is creating some interest in my district, can the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, say what progress is being made, especially as it is desired that this work be proceeded with quickly?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This work was delayed because the outside architect

whom we employed to perform the work was not conversant with the Government's method of purchasing furnishings and so forth, and he had included them in the original tender, whereas the Government always purchases furnishings through the Supply and Tender Board. Some delay occurred while that was being straightened out. A tender has been let for the work to Civil and Civic Pty. Ltd., a big firm from another State, at an approximate cost of £700,000.

PENNINGTON PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RYAN: On several occasions since the debate on the Loan Estimates I have asked the Minister of Education questions regarding the building of a new primary school at Pennington. I was informed that a priority list for new schools was being drawn up by the department. Before this session ends will the Minister say what that priority list will be?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall not be able to do so because the list is only at this stage being drawn up by the Director of Education and myself. It will then be submitted to the Minister of Works and to the all-important Treasurer. I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member privately of my expectations before the House rises. I am hopeful that we will be able to do something for him.

CROWN LAND DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On October 4 I asked the Acting Minister of Lands whether he would submit to the Parliamentary Land Settlement Committee the question of whether or not it would be advisable to open up for development an area not of 3,000 or 4,000 acres as recorded in *Hansard* but of 300,000 or 400,000 acres of Crown land in the counties of Chandos and Buckingham. The Minister said that he would be pleased to examine the question. Has he further considered this matter and, if so, can he indicate what decision may have been reached?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am glad of the honourable member's clarification. The honourable member was reported as having referred to an area of 3,000 or 4,000 acres, and consequently I was somewhat at a loss to obtain a full reply to the question, as some development had taken place and the whole area was investigated earlier by the Land Settlement Committee. I propose submitting to Cabinet the suggestion that the committee should again examine this area.

CHEST X-RAYS.

Mr. HUGHES: I understand the Premier has a reply to my recent question concerning action taken against people who neglect or deliberately ignore the compulsory chest X-ray requirements.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Director-General of Public Health reports that the possibility of obtaining 100 per cent attendance for compulsory X-rays is very remote without a very complicated and expensive form of policing. In order to gain an estimate of non-attendance, sampling methods are employed and when a particular survey is selected for such sampling, the attendance is carefully checked against the electoral rolls. Those people who did not attend are notified by letter and requested to present themselves at the chest X-ray unit situated in Ruthven Mansions, Pulteney Street, Adelaide. A further follow-up letter is sent to those people who do not comply with the requirements of the first letter. If the explanations received regarding non-attendance are unsatisfactory, consideration is given to action under the Health Act.

PHOSPHATE ROCK.

Mr. HARDING: Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question about the supply of phosphate rock from Nauru and also about a possible supply from the mainland near Rum Jungle. I believe the Minister has written to the Minister for Primary Industry in this matter.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wrote to the Minister for Primary Industry and in turn I received a full reply from the Minister for Territories. That reply is too lengthy to give the House, but it states that the present reserves of phosphate rock at Nauru are considered to be about 63,000,000 tons, which at the present rate of extraction is expected to last about 27 years. He went on to say that it was not possible to forecast whether the rate of extraction would always be the same. He also referred to the phosphate rock deposits at Rum Jungle, but I deduce from his statement that it is too early to say definitely whether or not this will be of commercial value. The correspondence is available for the honourable member to peruse.

MISREPRESENTATION.

Mr. LOVEDAY: A constituent of mine was recently sold a car in the city which the seller claimed was a 1957 model. The car gave considerable trouble and the seller did not

honour the guarantee. It now transpires that it is a 1954 model. A 1957 model car of this type is valued at £430 and a 1954 model at £240. The car was registered by two previous owners as a 1954 model, the assessor of the Motor Vehicles Department assesses it as a 1954 model, and the engine number shows that it is a 1954 model car. If I supply the Premier with all relevant details, will he ask the Prices Commissioner to investigate?

The Hon Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

MANNUM FERRY.

Mr. BYWATERS: I believe the Premier has a reply to my question relating to the possibility of an additional ferry at Mannum.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Highways reports that the traffic branch of the department is currently conducting traffic counts and in future at holiday periods will be making traffic delay studies at various River Murray ferry crossings to ascertain at which crossing, if any, a second ferry is necessary when the two ferries at present in use at Blanchetown are no longer required at that crossing.

MEDIAN STRIP.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the median strip at the intersection of South Road and Daw Road?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Highways reports that the median strip was constructed of a temporary nature to enable the department to make slight adjustments after traffic movements had been observed. It is not intended to remove it, however, until it is replaced by a permanent median strip. The construction of medians on roads, particularly at intersections, is standard practice for safety reasons. It is appreciated that some inconvenience to a minority must result from any traffic plan, but it is of overall benefit to the majority of the public.

CORNSACKS.

Mr. JENKINS: I believe the Premier has a reply to my recent question concerning the price of cornsacks at Port Elliot?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Prices Commissioner reports that new cornsacks are sold in country towns at prices ex Port Adelaide which for the current season are £51 5s. a bale (41s. a dozen) for credit sales and £50 12s. 6d. a bale (40s. 6d. a dozen) for cash sales plus freight. In the case of Port Elliot, freight is quoted at 18s. 3d. a bale or about 9d. a dozen, there being 25 dozen to the bale.

REFRIGERATOR REPAIRS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: On September 26 I asked the Premier a question relating to charges made for ineffective work carried out on a refrigerator, and I believe the Prices Commissioner investigated the matter. Has the Premier a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received a report from the Prices Commissioner, who advises that, following on inquiries, the charge will be reduced from £14 16s. 9d. to £4 5s. This charge will cover repairs to the motor and electrical wiring only, the company having agreed to accept responsibility and to bear the cost of other work carried out. If the owners have any doubt about safe working of the unit, it is suggested that they contact the Electricity Trust and arrange for a safety check.

SEACOMBE HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Minister of Education anything further to report in reply to my recent question about whether the Education Department intends to purchase land for the Seacombe High School for recreation purposes?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As the Leader is aware, the Seacombe High School is constructed on about 20 acres of land, a large portion of which has been developed as an oval. The total cost of the oval and its development has been about £25,000, and this has been borne by the Government. By the end of this month a tender will be let for the construction of seven or eight tennis courts for this school, and I am at present negotiating with the Corporation of the City of Marion regarding a joint scheme for the development of a reserve adjoining the school at Calum Grove for further tennis courts which will also be used as basketball courts. This will be for joint use by students and the public. I have been approached to purchase the nine acres adjoining the school and have been advised that the cost of the land and its development would be about £40,000. As such tremendous demands are made on me for new schools, additions to existing schools and extra land for schools where the grounds are inadequate, I cannot comply with this request, and do not intend to make the purchase.

CHAIR OF MENTAL HEALTH.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked several weeks ago about filling the Chair of Mental Health at the University of Adelaide?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I regret that I have not received any finality in this matter. At my invitation, the Vice-Chancellor of the University came to see me on Tuesday to discuss proposed new matriculation standards. I had also listed for discussion the question raised by the honourable member but unfortunately I was called back to my duties in the House by the ringing of the bells and did not get around to it. As soon as possible after the House prorogues I intend to take up discussions on this matter, and I shall advise the honourable member in due course.

RAILWAY REFRESHMENT SERVICES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on October 16 about the payment of workmen's compensation in the event of accident to the wives of managers of railway refreshment rooms?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Railways Commissioner has no legal obligation to the wives of refreshment room managers with regard to workmen's compensation. However, in view of the peculiar circumstances relating to the appointment of refreshment room managers, which entail the assistance of wives in running refreshment rooms, he intends to investigate some form of insurance cover for wives while assisting their husbands. As the Railways Commissioner is not empowered to extend the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act to other than workmen, any proposals relating to wives of refreshment room managers would necessitate the approval of the Government. The Commissioner intends to submit a recommendation in respect of insurance cover for wives of refreshment room managers. He points out that since 1925, when the practice of appointing managers to refreshment rooms with the assistance of wives came into force, there has not been an accident to a wife while working in a railway refreshment room.

WOOLCLASSERS' BRANDS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on October 9 about the use of distinguishing brands on bales of wool by woolclassers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The use of registered brands by woolclassers is operative only in South Australia. I have obtained a report prepared by an officer of the Agriculture Department which report sets out the conditions under which woolclassers may be voluntarily registered in this State with the Woolclassers' Registration Board. Only about

120 woolclassers are so registered, which would represent only a small proportion of this State's clip. The registered brands of woolclassers are recognized by woolgrowers and woolbuyers, who are parties to the registration board. The report is available for the honourable member to peruse.

SALT INDUSTRY.

Mr. RICHES: The Premier has taken a personal interest in the possibility of extending the salt industry at Port Augusta. Will he say whether there have been any recent developments in this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: There have been continued negotiations regarding this industry. No finality has been reached but in a general way, without disclosing any confidential information at this stage, I can say that the negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily.

NANGWARRY ROAD.

Mr. HARDING: Has the Minister of Works a reply to a question I asked just before the Minister of Roads left on his overseas trip about the programme for the reconstruction of the Nangwarry to Mount Gambier main road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I saw the docket relating to this matter this morning. Briefly, it indicates that subject to funds being available consideration will be given to this work in the year 1963-64.

NARRUNG ROAD.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In view of the difficulty of maintaining the approach road from Narrung township to the ferry, will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, ascertain from the Commissioner of Highways whether consideration can be given not only to improving the construction of the road and raising it further above the water level but of bituminizing it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

GOOLWA FORESHORE.

Mr. JENKINS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the control of the foreshore of the River Murray in the Goolwa area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I discussed this matter this morning with the General Manager of the Harbors Board. It seems that some further information is required about what is the precise area of the foreshore under consideration. I have asked the General Manager to discuss the matter by telephone with the District Clerk at Goolwa to get the information he needs and then to submit the matter to the

Harbors Board for consideration. I believe the board will consider the possibility of handing over to the care and control of the district council of that area these areas of land so that there shall not be divided control and so that the council may make its own arrangements for surveillance of the area.

DRIED FRUITS.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question asked recently by the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) about dried fruits?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have a letter from the General Secretary of the Australian Dried Fruits Association which reads:

Despite the Turkish action in reducing prices in Britain the Australian system of marketing in that country will continue and supplies of dried fruits will be shipped according to market demand and requirements. The effects of the unnecessary and unfortunate action by Turkish dried fruits interests are, as yet, unknown, and both the Australian Dried Fruits Control Board and this association have registered protests with the Minister of Commerce in Ankara. It may be accepted that, if through the Turkish action the Australian industry is adversely affected, an approach will most certainly be made to the Commonwealth Government for financial assistance.

FLY MENACE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the control of the fly menace?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Dr. McQueen reports:

During recent months, investigations by officers of this department indicated that the fly problem was increasing in the metropolitan area and the Central Board of Health decided to call a meeting of representatives of metropolitan local boards to discuss a common plan to deal with the house fly problem. This meeting was held on July 4, 1962, and it was agreed between representatives to report back to their local boards and recommend:—

- (a) Supporting a plan to reduce the fly population.
- (b) Measures be taken to employ uniform procedures.
- (c) The Central Board of Health be the co-ordinating authority.

Legislation to control fly breeding is contained in regulations under the Health Act. Regulation 51 provides, among other things, that the occupier of premises whereon any horses, cattle or swine may be kept, shall provide in connection thereof a suitable receptacle for manure, filth or other offensive matter which may be from time to time produced in the keeping of such animals on the premises. The receptacle shall be watertight and entirely above the level of the ground, and the occupier of the premises shall at least once each day cause all such manure or other

offensive matter to be collected and placed in the receptacle, and the contents of the receptacle to be removed at least once in every week and disposed of so as to prevent offensiveness and the access to and the breeding of flies in such contents.

Regulation 52 provides that the occupier of any premises shall prevent the access to and breeding of flies in any noxious organic matter which may be on his premises. It is obvious that methods necessary to prevent fly breeding will vary from place to place. In order to assist local boards and the occupiers of premises where animals are kept so that they may comply with the legislation, this department is experimenting with a view to determining a simple, cheap and effective means of controlling fly breeding in manure. In the meantime, local boards are being urged to recommend the normal control methods which include tight packing, light spreading and the storage of organic refuse and manure in fly-proof receptacles.

VERY LIGHT PISTOLS.

Mr. JENKINS: I understand that the Premier has a reply to my recent question about Very light pistols being used as danger signals at sea?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commissioner of Police reports:

Applications from persons desirous of using Very pistols are considered by this department from the point of view of the suitability of the applicants themselves, the use to which the weapons are to be put and the safety angle. They are treated no differently from any other applications for pistol licences received at this office. Mr. Jenkins, M.P. has referred to boat owners but from our inquiries only two applications in respect of Very licences have been refused in recent months.

The general consensus of opinion of members of this department concerned (and this received support at a recent conference of police experts and technicians of all States) was that licences should not be issued to permit the use of this type of pistol. The pistol is not considered either a desirable or an essential item of a boat's equipment by authorities of the South Australian Sea Rescue Squadrons, the Commonwealth Marine Services Division or the S.A. Harbours Board despite the desirability for owners of small boats to provide some signalling device for use in an emergency. They recommend that small boats carry flares or rockets, both of which are readily available from ships' chandlers and are much safer. Even the manufacturers of the Very pistols produce and recommend flares or rockets.

We consider the Very pistol a lethal weapon at close range. The cartridges used in such pistols can be reloaded with shot to give them the power of a small shotgun and are also explosive and incendiary and could become a bush fire hazard if used in the appropriate areas. There is no authority to compel a person issued with a licence to use Very pistols only at sea or in special circumstances. From the point of view of public safety, possible

danger to property, the availability of alternative means of signalling and the use to which Very pistols can be put, it is not considered that the department should depart from its present practice as far as the licensing of them is concerned.

RISDON PARK SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: I have brought this matter of the proposed two new classrooms for the Risdon Park Primary School to the notice of the Minister of Education. I understand that the go-ahead signal has not been given to the Public Buildings Department. Can the Minister say why not and whether there are to be indefinite delays? Because of overcrowding at the school, will the Minister seriously consider this matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATINSON: Yes, I shall be pleased to do so.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: HON. SIR CECIL HINCKS.

Mr. LAUCKE moved:

That a further month's leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Yorke Peninsula (Hon. Sir Cecil Hincks) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That for the remainder of the session Government business take precedence of all other business except questions.

Motion carried.

THE ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Stirling and Crafers Water Supply.

Ordered that report be printed.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Sir Cecil Hincks. No—Mr. Ralston.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes, and so it passes in the affirmative.

Third reading thus carried.

The House divided on the motion "That the Bill do now pass":

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Sir Cecil Hincks. No—Mr. Ralston.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my casting vote for the Ayes, and so it passes in the affirmative.

Bill thus passed.

RED SCALE CONTROL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1598.)

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill which, as members will recognize, is identical with the Bill passed recently by this House relating to the control of the oriental fruit moth. The need to control red scale is responsible for this Bill's introduction. I have consulted the Murray Citrus Growers' Co-operative Association (Australia) Limited, the main body concerned with citrus growing in South Australia, and it agrees fully with this Bill. The association wrote the following letter to the Minister of Agriculture:

As you are aware, while we have a red scale problem in South Australia, our position is infinitely happier in regard to the incidence of this pest than are most other Australian citrus producing areas. There is no doubt that the active and efficient functioning of properly organized M.C.G.C.A. district red scale committees, in close co-operation with the Department of Agriculture officers, has been a most

important factor in that regard. The desire that this work should continue is the fundamental reason for these representations, with which we believe your departmental officers will be in complete accord. We reiterate the view that the position can be held only with appropriate legislative backing.

Further down the Secretary states:

In view of these representations it would be regarded as extremely disappointing and anomalous if legislation relating to the control of any orchard pest did not make provision for adequate statutory authority in connection with the control of red scale. The suggested statutory control measures were approved by growers at the annual meetings of the various branches of the M.C.G.C.A. this year, and were unanimously endorsed at the annual general meeting of growers held at Renmark last March. In view of these representations and the views expressed, the Bill meets with the full approval of the citrus growing industry and I, as an active grower, fully support it also. Red scale has been prevalent in our citrus groves for a number of years; it is carried from tree to tree and from orchard to orchard in various ways, one being by birds. The small scales attach themselves to the birds' legs and it is transmitted in that way. The scale is sometimes present in boxes from infected orchards, and when these boxes are shifted from orchard to orchard the scale can spread in that way. There are various host trees apart from the citrus trees themselves. Some of our native plants are hosts for the red scale, and it will be rather difficult to control in that respect.

The Bill contains only one clause that I question, and it relates to the declaration of a district. I have spoken to the executive of the Murray Citrus Growers Association, which I think desires that the districts as we know them at present and which are controlled by district executives should be the districts under this legislation, and not that the whole of the State's citrus growing areas should be defined as one district. The executive would prefer separate districts, such as Renmark, Berri, Loxton, Waikerie, or that style of grouping. The officers of the association are of that opinion, and I am sure that growers fully support that attitude. As a grower, I realize that the most effective way to control it will be on an individual district basis. I have grown citrus for about 12 years and I know from personal experience what it is to have this pest in the orchards. Spraying and fumigating are very expensive when all the trees are infected, and it is only by the ability of the

committees to enforce the spraying and fumigating programmes that we shall be able to control the pest on an industry basis. I support the Bill.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the measure, which I consider is essential. We know that the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) has had much experience in this problem, being a fruitgrower himself, and I agree that red scale has caused concern to fruitgrowers throughout the river districts. Although the pest extends to other areas, those areas along the River Murray are the most affected. Prior to coming into this House I had much experience of red scale, having sprayed orchards at Mypolonga under a contract system. We used to go from orchard to orchard during the summer spraying for this very serious pest. It is most essential that we have correct control over this pest. From time to time some growers are a little careless, and as a result they not only run the risk of having their own orchards infected but make it difficult for orchardists in neighbouring areas, because red scale travels. It can be picked up on the feet of birds and blown by wind, and it will increase unless eradication measures are taken. It is almost impossible at present to completely eradicate red scale. We have from time to time come close to eradicating it by fumigation, but this affects the trees to some extent and causes problems. White oil was previously used as a spray but since then malathion has come in, and the combined spray of white oil and malathion, although not a complete cure, is proving effective.

No matter how careful and efficient sprayers are, it is difficult to cover everything. Spray plants used today are very efficient. Boom sprays are being used, and there are all sorts of methods of spraying right through the centre and up to the top of trees. However, red scale will continue to flourish even if only a few are left on each tree. If one orchardist does not spray for a year it is soon apparent that others around him are suffering as well. It is necessary that every precaution is taken to see that this pest does not increase in South Australia. Once red scale attacks a tree and is on the fruit, it can no longer be sold on the market, but can only be disposed of to be made into fruit drinks, and this, of course, reduces its price. Growers naturally wish to get as much for their fruit as possible.

I believe that the provision for the appointment of committees is a good one. A poll of

fruitgrowers is provided for, and as this will be done by means of a postal vote it will be democratically carried out. This will be a considerable help to the industry; it has gone through a bad time this year, and therefore any losses incurred through red scale will be serious. Citrus prices this year have been very low, and this has been a constant worry to the growers, one of whom told me recently that his return from 28 packed cases of oranges—good fruit that went to an eastern market—was 1s. 1d. That is something that causes much concern. Although that is not general, many other growers have also received small returns. I think one of the reasons for this is that they must meet a high cost before their product reaches the consumer. It is estimated that it costs about 11s. a case to pack and market oranges. The low prices received by growers this year were more than swallowed by the many costs incurred in maintaining an orchard. As the member for Chaffey (Mr. Curren) pointed out, spraying for red scale is expensive. Oil companies charge high prices for white oil and other insecticides and, apart from the rising cost of these items, growers must buy fertilizers and everything else needed in an orchard.

Early in the session I mentioned to the Premier the need for control over the importation of citrus juices into this State. The Government will have to watch this matter closely to protect our own fruitgrowing industry, which is important to this State. I support this Bill, which I think is warranted. It is one of three Bills dealing with pests and diseases of fruit trees, one of which has already been passed by both Houses. I am sure this measure will have the support of both Houses and that it will be welcomed by fruitgrowers, who are endeavouring to protect their industry as much as possible.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I express my pleasure at the introduction of this measure and my complete support. The Bill will enable growers to help themselves in a matter of vital importance to them and to the economy of this State. I compliment the Minister for what he has done to make the introduction of the Bill possible, and I warmly support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—'Poll for dissolution of committee.'

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister indicate how long a committee must be in operation before a poll can be held for its dissolution?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): Provided that a petition is lodged correctly, the Minister shall direct a poll on its receipt. I do not think there is any limit between the time when the committee is set up and when the petition is presented.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SAN JOSE SCALE CONTROL BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1598.)

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support this Bill, the object of which is identical with that of the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Bill. There have been only three known outbreaks of San José scale in South Australia. Nevertheless, it is regarded by fruitgrowers and departmental officers as a severe menace if allowed to get out of hand. The present outbreaks are at Renmark, Waikerie and Mypolonga, but they are well under control through action already taken.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I, too, support the Bill, which is similar to the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Bill and important for the fruit-growing industry. I can assure the Minister that the outbreak at Mypolonga was completely wiped out because of a terrific effort by the department and the orchardists. This success was a tribute to Mr. Miller and other members of the department who co-operated with the orchardists. It is understood that the outbreak had been there for some time before it was discovered. San José scale is a rather unusual pest for it can attack without its presence being obvious. In that respect it differs from red scale and the oriental fruit moth. It is not easy to detect and for that reason it is essential that areas be examined frequently to see whether there is any evidence of it. The department, having discovered the nature of this scale in its encounter with it at Mypolonga, has gained much experience; it undertook much research to eradicate it. That experience will stand it in good stead in the future. It is evident that it is fully conscious of the need to control this real menace, which not only attacks but kills trees in a short time. It attacks the limbs of peach trees that hitherto have given no evidence of being attacked, and

they die almost overnight. An eternal vigilance has to be kept to see that San José scale does not attack or that, at the first signs of attack, appropriate measures are taken to combat it.

I was sorry to hear that there had been an outbreak further up-river, but the department did not let any grass grow under its feet, and was right up with it at the first signs of attack. This pest attacks and does much damage before being detected. I am glad that this Bill has been introduced. If the growers up-river co-operate as well as the growers down-river, there will be no need for the committee suggested by the Bill. The growers themselves stood wholeheartedly behind the department. I do not know of any grower who did not pull his weight. In some cases there was no evidence of San José scale being present but, nevertheless, they got together with a will and worked closely with the department to see that the pest did not spread throughout the whole district. The success of the measures taken was outstanding. Some growers lost or sacrificed their trees in the cause. Many may have thought that such drastic treatment was not warranted but, nevertheless, they took those steps in the cause so that the pest should be eradicated from the settlement. If everyone did that, there would be no need for this kind of legislation. If growers up-river co-operate in that way, there will be no need for fear by the department.

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

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1604.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): The Minister of Agriculture has been busy in the last week introducing Bills of a similar type. This Bill is very similar to the next matter on the Notice Paper—the Swine Compensation Act Amendment Bill—on which I shall speak presently. The Bill provides that the Governor may, by proclamation, add other diseases to the Act. This will obviate the need of introducing amending legislation each year. Clause 5 is a sensible provision. It will enable stock agents to lodge block returns instead of individual returns in respect of sales. I can appreciate the wisdom of this. It will save much clerical work. However, they will have to obtain permits, and this procedure will safeguard the Minister and ensure that there is no cheating of the fund. The Minister has complete

authority and must satisfy himself with the arrangements. He has power to inspect books if he so desires. The Bill contains nothing contentious, and I support it.

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

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1605.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the second reading. Last evening, when I was talking on another matter, I wondered for a moment whether I was speaking to this Bill. The Minister has introduced three somewhat similar Bills all of which mention swine or swine fever. However, this is the Swine Compensation Act Amendment Bill. Its provisions are similar to those of the Cattle Compensation Act Amendment Bill. The important provision of this Bill is contained in clause 4, which will enable £2,500 to be expended annually on research. A fund was created to protect pig raisers and it has grown considerably. It has been a good insurance against losses suffered from disease. However, it is now proposed to undertake research in an attempt to combat the disease before it infects the animals. I think that £2,500 is perhaps too small a sum, but possibly it is being provided this year on an experimental basis. It may be thought better to be cautious for a start. Many stock breeders would prefer money being spent on research for the prevention of disease rather than having money paid to them after their stock has been infected. The more we do in the cause of science the better. I do not think any department is more conscious of the need for research than the Agriculture Department, all branches of which are extremely keen and render wonderful service to the farming fraternity. The pig industry is important to South Australia and to Australia as a whole, because I understand that pigmeats are imported from overseas, and the more we can do to build up our home industry the better it will be for us.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—'Amendment of principal Act, section 12.'

Mr. BYWATERS: Can the Minister say why an amount of £2,500 has been fixed? Is it an experimental sum and will it be increased?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I could obtain full details if I referred to the consideration that was given to this proposal some time ago, but from memory I think that £2,500 will cover the activities of one officer and his ancillary expenses. I appreciate the Committee's attitude on this proposal. When a fund like this has been built up is the time to move out and attack the diseases rather than wait for them to come to us. I believe a move like this will be welcomed by the growers. In deciding the amount of money required, one has to bear in mind that the producers may reasonably object if it is too high; on the other hand if we set it too low it would not result in significant benefit. We have tried to fix what we consider a reasonable starting point for research work.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1602.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. Members are well aware that discussions have taken place between the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the local government bodies. No doubt they are also aware that the Marion Corporation was responsible for initiating a test case to determine certain matters connected with this legislation. After discussions had taken place, certain arrangements were made, and as a result there is not much one can do but support the Bill. However, one aspect in relation to water and sewerage installations concerns me and, I think, many others. The department is using modern and mobile equipment in its excavation works, and the back-filling is done by mechanical aids. However, problems have arisen after the first filling-in has taken place, because that filling subsidises and the roads deteriorate. I do not know whether it would be practicable to use a type of roller with a narrow base.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: A vibrator compactor is satisfactory.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: After the first filling in has been done, would it not be better for the councils themselves to then fill in with metal and top dress, rather than leaving that work to the department? I do not know

whether all councils could work efficiently in this regard. I do not condemn the department's efforts, but I question who should be the authority responsible to re-metal and re-surface the road where necessary.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is a matter of arrangement in each case between the department and the local government body concerned as to who does it, and it varies from place to place, depending on the arrangement made.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: That may be so. I understand that certain work at Ascot Park was carried out by the department, and I believe that the Marion Corporation was better organized and better able to carry out that work than was the department. However, I support the Bill in principle.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I think this Bill calls for a little pat on the back for the Minister. When the original Bill was introduced there was an immediate outcry from many councils, and the Minister very quickly and in a very realistic and practical manner took note of the protests made to him and the plea to defer consideration of the Bill until he had a closer look at the fears expressed by councils. The original proposals would have called for the employment of engineers and draftsmen far beyond what councils could reasonably afford. When these things were referred to the Minister, he agreed to look at the matter again, and as a result we have before us an excellent Bill that regularizes practices which have been carried out by gentlemen's agreements between the department and councils for many years and which, I think, have been a very happy feature of governmental and local government relations. To see this good tenor continuing, with a background of legislation in accordance with the agreement and desires of the local government authorities, is very good indeed. It is encouraging to see the Government co-operating so readily and so realistically with other interests. In supporting the Bill I pay my tribute to the Minister for his praiseworthy action in acceding to reasonable requests. The reception he gave to those requests was worthy of the man who gave them.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): Now that the Bill has been changed I will support it, but it has been suggested to me that I bring one matter to the Minister's attention. I understand that some years ago, when pipes were laid at Murray Bridge, they were placed in shallow trenches and some trouble arose from

time to time when roads were regraded. However, the department has arrived at a satisfactory conclusion. When the other Bill was introduced, this matter caused the council some concern because it felt that it could be asked to pay the total cost of repairing the damage. However, it has studied this Bill, which it thinks is an improvement. I have drawn the Minister's attention to this because when roads are re-graded or reconstructed in future pipes will be damaged and costs will be incurred. As new section 51 (6), inserted by clause 4, provides that the Minister may make some suitable arrangement in such matters, I have no objection to the Bill.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the Bill and the remarks of my colleagues. Members know the reasons that led to the introduction of the previous Bill and the need for a new Bill to be introduced because of the objections raised by councils. I, like other members of the House, have received correspondence from municipalities in my district about this matter. This is an instance of what can be done by negotiation, and I pay a tribute to the Public Utilities Co-ordination Committee (which I think it is called) for the work it has done. It seems to me that the presence of such a committee is necessary; it has worked most effectively since inception. The fact that through the committee local government authorities have been able to approach the Minister and discuss problems inherent in the original Bill shows, I think, what a good service it is rendering the community.

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

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1604.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading and, as it contains some provisions similar to the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill, I shall not repeat what I said on that measure. Some concern has been expressed about acquisition and I understand that a meeting took place as a result of which the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) submitted an amendment with the approval of the Labor Party. I have ascertained from the Minister of Works and the member for Norwood that the Minister intends to move to amend the amendment, as the result of an agreement between them. I

believe the Bill will provide for the smooth working of the department and, although I do not advocate retrospectivity, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—“Amendment of principal Act, section 5.”

Mr. DUNSTAN: Clause 3 validates any notice to treat that has already been given pursuant to the power that the Minister apparently thought he had to take land under the original section, and provides that the new section be written into the principal Act as if it had been incorporated in the principal Act of 1946. Generally speaking, I am not at all happy about giving retrospective validity to legal documents. To give retrospective validity can have adverse effects upon people whose rights are affected by those documents. At the outset, I proposed to remove the effect of subclause (2) so that notices to treat already given would not be validated except in the cases where the acquisition of land had been completed. However, after consultation with the Parliamentary Draftsman, I am informed that there are a number of cases where notice to treat has been given and where the land has been partially acquired (money has been paid) but the remaining amount of compensation in dispute is *sub judice*. To fail to validate the notices to treat in those particular cases would mean that the whole process would have to be gone through again, which would be of considerable detriment to the persons concerned from whom land was being acquired, which would be undesirable. So, whilst I do not like the general provision of this section, I am prepared to go along with it apart from the case in which already an individual has established in the court that the land could not be acquired from him.

The position was that, as far as that person was concerned, a notice to treat for acquisition of the land at Bolivar was given on December 2, 1959, and in a recent case in the Supreme Court it was held that the Minister of Works had no power compulsorily to acquire the land under the Sewerage Act. The notice to treat purports to have been given under the Sewerage Act and, as a result of the court's findings that the Minister has no power compulsorily to acquire land, that person will retain his land until steps are taken compulsorily to acquire it under the amendment. If that

should happen, of course, a new notice to treat would have to be given in place of the one of December 2, 1959, and it is very probable that at the present date under a new notice to treat the assessed value of the land would be higher than the value in 1959. It would seem that that particular individual would be deprived of the rights he had established in the case in the court by validating a provision that the court had held to be invalid; rather should the Minister commence *de novo* and a new notice to treat be given.

The effect of my amendment, therefore, is to provide that, in the case where a notice to treat has been held to be invalid and had no effect in a court in any action to determine compensation, then the notice to treat in that case should not be held to be valid. I understand from the Minister that in fact there is only this one case.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes, that is so.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I understand, too, that he has an amendment that he proposes to move in a somewhat more simple form than my own, which will refer to the particular case in question. I should be quite satisfied with the Minister's amending the clause in that way.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): As I see it, the honourable member has stated the position fairly, and I agree with him that it would be improper, in effect, to reverse a decision of the court or the effect of a decision of the court. Therefore, his approach to it in so far as it applies to that particular decision is proper. I can confirm what has already been said in regard to general retrospectivity. I, too, am not happy about retrospectivity where it introduces a factor for consideration that has not been extant previously. However, I think the honourable member agrees that this does not introduce a new factor: it remedies a defect in the law, which was a misconception of the legal position. Therefore, what has been done in the past has been done in good faith; so, in my view, there is no proper reason why that decision should not stand except in a case before the court. There are many cases involving substantial amounts of money where some owners have, for instance, on payment of a consideration, passed over their titles to the Crown pending a final exercise of the court's jurisdiction as to the ultimate amount of compensation to be paid. Those people have given up their titles and given the department access to their land, and the amounts paid to them

are much below their assessment of the value of the land. Therefore, they and their rights must be protected in any way possible.

There is another group of people upon whom notices to treat have been served but who have not agreed to give title to their land for a consideration. They have required that, in order to gain access, the department shall pay into court the amount of compensation they have claimed. We have done that and have therefore been able to gain access. There are others as well who have had notices to treat served upon them but their cases have not yet been taken beyond the initial stages. There is a proper case here for the action proposed to be taken. I accept the honourable member's suggestion. I move:

After "was given" in subclause (2) to add the following proviso:

Provided that nothing in this subsection contained shall validate or make effectual the notice to treat which was the subject of proceedings in the Supreme Court No. 1464 of 1960.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1674.)

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I support the Bill, which is highly desirable. In fact, I have advocated it for some time. The proposal was first introduced in 1955 and it has taken seven years to reach this stage. I do not know who is to blame. It may be that the Commonwealth is at fault, since the Commonwealth is not always expeditious in its activities. Seven years is a long time for negotiations to continue. I realize that the original proposal needs amending because the Crown Law authorities have expressed doubt as to the Harbors Board's ability to acquire land for transfer purposes. The land mentioned in the Bill, when transferred to the State, will be of inestimable value to the district, which is a rapidly expanding area. It can be put to many good uses. I hope, however, that the negotiations soon conclude so that the land can be transferred to the Harbors Board because it is urgently needed for developmental purposes.

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

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1677.)

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support this Bill, which extends the operations of the Barley Board until the 1967-68 season. Apparently the Victorian and South Australian Ministers of Agriculture have agreed on a more effective method of barley marketing pending the formation of an Australian-wide marketing organization. The Bill will enable Victoria to have better representation on the board, which will be representative of those directly concerned with the industry. That is as it should be. This industry has developed rapidly, both in production and in marketing, and the growers and the board are to be commended for their efforts which have materially improved the economy of the State and of the Commonwealth. The Bill is designed to give assistance, and it has our full support.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I support the Bill. I compliment the Ministers of Agriculture of South Australia and Victoria for getting together and bringing about the continuation of the Barley Board, which is made up of Victorian and South Australian growers. The Bill extends the life of the board for another five years. I think that growers generally would like to see an Australian Barley Board. South Australia is the main barley growing State, and because Victoria adjoins it the board is workable. Western Australia also grows a quantity of barley, but because of its remoteness it is not so essential that it should be represented. However, the Ministers of Agriculture here and in Victoria hope that at some future date we shall see an Australian Barley Board, with all States represented.

The Bill amends section 4 of the principal Act regarding the appointment of the Chairman, and in this respect is instituting a procedure that has not been quite regular in the past. The Chairman of the board has always been appointed from South Australia, and therefore the Bill regularizes the position. Frankly, I do not know whether the increase in members of the board is a good thing.

Mr. Frank Walsh: If you don't know, how do you expect us to?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know whether anybody knows. However, it is the desire of Victorian growers that they get another representative, and apparently the South Australian growers also desire another representative.

My experience has been that, within reason, a small board is often more efficient and gets better results than a large one. However, those desires have been expressed, and as a result the membership of the board will be increased from five to seven. Clause 4 provides that "Australia" be deleted and "South Australia and Victoria" inserted. I think that is quite important, because in the past the Victorian and South Australian growers have been carrying the baby of supplying all the requirements for Australian consumption. Being the Australian Barley Board, it was responsible for the requirements of the whole of Australia, and other States were able to capitalize on the fact that if overseas prices were higher than the Australian prices they were at liberty to export all their barley and get the benefit, whereas South Australia and Victoria were paying for their responsibilities. I congratulate the Minister for introducing the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I, too, support this Bill and add to the remarks of the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) by saying that although this extra representative may have been requested by Victoria this member has also been requested by South Australian growers, particularly those in the eastern division (or Mallee area) in which I live. The present arrangement, as I recall it, is that a member covers the central and the Yorke Peninsula district and one other member, who is resident on Eyre Peninsula, represents the remainder of the State, which means that very seldom do we receive attention from our member when we have problems that need immediate attention. We have had such problems in the last few years, during which time we have been confronted with the problem of border trading that has been going on extensively along the eastern side of this State.

I should like to mention the management of the Barley Board. I consider that we have been very fortunate in having such a capable manager as Mr. Martin, through whose activities and interest we have had such successful marketing of this commodity, which is and has been a very important crop in the rehabilitation of the Murray lands and the Pinnaroo country in which I live. When this country was growing wheat on a wheat-fallow rotation it presented considerable problems but, since we have been able to grow profitable crops of barley on a short rotation of barley and grass and back to barley, this country has improved out of all knowledge. Therefore, I consider that it is very important that this board be maintained

and that it function efficiently. I hope similar legislation will, as the Minister suggested, be passed concurrently in Victoria. The Minister hopes that it will and I, too, hope that it will, because if it is not it could mean that the problems of this board with border trading could be greatly accentuated.

The change of the name to the South Australian and Victorian Barley Board is a good one, because it sets out the position clearly. The all-Australian Barley Board was a misnomer; there is no question about that. However, like the member for Rocky River, I hope that we shall soon see the other States coming into line, and that we shall have a marketing authority to handle all the barley for Australia, because until we do so we cannot expect to get a guaranteed first payment for our barley such as we have for wheat. At present the Barley Board has to deal with the Commonwealth Bank as an ordinary customer; it can obtain advances from that bank only if it can prove that it has forward sales and can show that it has a certain income in sight. It gets an advance on those grounds, and until that money is in hand in the bank and additional money is accumulating to make other payments, no further payments are made. It is to the credit of the board that it has been able to complete those payments within the 12 months in which the pool runs, but it has been rather embarrassing for growers to receive such a small portion of their return in the first payment. Although it is a major portion, most growers would like to see it increased further in order to give them some profit on the first payment instead of merely enough to cover their cost of production. Those who have been growing over a period of years are not so badly off as those starting off, because those established growers have these pool payments coming in cyclically. Those new growers who receive their first payment have to wait for months for the additional payments and are sometimes embarrassed accordingly.

Until we have a better arrangement with the bank, through an all-Australian board, not only do we suffer regarding the first payment but we are also confronted with the position that we have to pay $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest on the money borrowed compared with 4 per cent in the case of the Wheat Board. I support the Bill and hope that not only will it be passed here but the scheme will be ratified concurrently in Victoria by complementary legislation.

Mr. LAUCKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

**SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(No. 1).**

Order of the Day No. 16: The Hon. G. G. Pearson to move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That Order of the Day No. 16 be read and discharged.

Motion carried.

**WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(No. 1).**

Order of the Day No. 17: Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1034.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That Order of the Day No. 17 be read and discharged.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 30, at 2 p.m.