

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 20, 1964.

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

PUBLIC FINANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.**TIMBER.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: This morning's *Advertiser* contained an article headed "New Timber Law Will Cut Costs". Apparently this price reduction will be achieved by the use of karri timber from Western Australia. The article referred to a saving of between £50 and £60 on a timber frame or brick-veneer house, and between £15 and £20 on an all-brick house. Certain builders do not agree with this claim because of disabilities concerning karri timber. Will the Premier ask the Chairman of the Housing Trust whether the trust can reduce its prices by using timber from the South-East?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

Mr. HARDING: Knowing that the future of some private saw millers depends solely on sufficient supplies of undressed timber being supplied from State forests, can the Minister of Forests say how many licences have been granted to private saw millers (stating their names) to obtain their timber supplies from the Comaam forest area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will obtain that information for the honourable member.

PUNISHMENT FOR JUVENILES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My attention has been drawn to a report in the *Advertiser* of May 16 last of remarks made by His Honor Mr. Justice Mayo when sentencing three young men aged 18, 17 and 16 for rape and assault. The report reads, in part:

"The circumstances disclosed in the joint charges call for the utmost condemnation," His Honor told the prisoners. "It may be you had been drinking, but that affords no

explanation nor is it any ground for mitigation. Your conduct was despicable. Such behaviour deserves the contempt of all decent people."

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: His Honor further said:

I have no intention of going into further detail of this most deplorable affair.

Later, His Honor said:

The court was prevented by provisions of the Maintenance Act from ordering imprisonment of juveniles in such cases.

I presume he was referring to section 113. The report further stated:

"If those provisions do apply at large, these offences urgently suggest the scope of their application should be considered," he said. "It calls for criticism that the denial of authority to sentence imprisonment is to be applied to circumstances so repulsive and infamous as the present. If any conduct requires gaol, the conduct of all you three certainly does."

I understand that a question was asked in another place on June 10 about this, and the Attorney-General then said that he would consider it. However, as the matter is so serious, will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, inquire whether consideration has been given to His Honor's remarks and, if it has, whether it is proposed to introduce legislation to alter the law in this respect?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Consideration was given to this matter some time before His Honor's remarks. I well remember the Attorney-General initiating a discussion in Cabinet on the matter several months ago. We have had several discussions since then and I know that the Attorney-General has also discussed the matter with the Crown Solicitor and other officers of the Crown Law Department. I have no doubt that he has considered the remarks of His Honour Mr. Justice Mayo. In fact, I am practically certain I read a report in a newspaper that he had done so.

I agree that the matter is of considerable moment. I am somewhat interested in it myself because a large number of offenders are students of various schools, colleges and other educational institutions in which I am interested. I shall be pleased to take up the matter again with my colleague and ask him whether he is yet able to make a statement.

TELEVISED LESSONS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In the *Advertiser* of January 14 last there appeared an article headed "Teaching by T.V. in S.A. Soon". It stated:

The Education Department would begin teaching secondary school subjects by television this year, the Minister of Education (Sir Baden Pattinson) announced yesterday.

The article went on to suggest that the provision of a special television station would be necessary to do this work entirely satisfactorily. Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made in teaching in secondary schools by television and when it will be operating fully in South Australia?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I think that considerable progress has already been made and some rather novel programmes have already been arranged by the Education Department in conjunction with the Australian Broadcasting Commission. Some representatives of the independent schools and colleges are also taking part. Recently, some discussions have taken place between representatives of education (in its widest sphere) and the A.B.C., but no conclusions have been reached for the programme for 1965. Some difficulties have been encountered about the lack of trained personnel. I think they embarked on too ambitious a programme in the beginning, that is, for an entirely new programme originating in Adelaide, and it is considered, without arriving at any definite conclusions, that it may be better to take intermittently a number of already taped programmes from the Eastern States. When the committee arrives at a definite conclusion it will report to me with recommendations which I shall consider. I do not think the programme will be as ambitious as was originally envisaged by the A.B.C., the Education Department and the independent schools and colleges.

PRICES.

Mr. HARDING: In today's *News* appears a statement that all recent price increases of goods and services, whether under price control or not, are being investigated by the South Australian Prices Department. Can the Premier say whether Mr. Murphy has sufficient authority to recontrol any or all of these items, if unjustified increases are found?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Murphy has no authority to recontrol any decontrolled item or any item that is not controlled. If he considers an item should be recontrolled he recommends this to me as Minister in charge of Prices, and I submit it to Cabinet which, in turn, submits it to Executive Council, and an order is made to recontrol the item. Mr. Murphy, as Prices Commissioner, has the power only to recommend the recontrolling of items. If he considers that charges are unreasonable he has the right to make a

recommendation. On many occasions items that have been decontrolled are recontrolled if it is shown that the increases are not in accordance with what is justified by reasonable trading standards and margins.

MEAT INSPECTORS.

Mr. JENNINGS: Meat inspectors are employed at the abattoirs in my district, and for a long time they have considered that a change in legislation is to be made that will take them out of State influence and place them under Commonwealth influence. As a consequence of this, they feel that they are suspended between Heaven and earth, like Mahomet's coffin. They have been unable to get a proper answer to inquiries they have made about the position. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any Commonwealth legislation is impending that is likely to affect these people?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is correct. The Commonwealth and State meat inspection services are to be combined under the Commonwealth, mainly because export requirements must bring the Commonwealth inspectors into our meatworks, and it seems a rather unnecessary duplication to have two services doing the same job. The Commonwealth Government is to take over the offices of meat inspection that formerly belonged to the State, and as far as I know it will be necessary eventually to amend the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act. A Bill is being prepared for this Parliament to consider later. Meanwhile, the association of inspectors has been informed of the proposed changes.

HOARDINGS.

Mrs. STEELE: I have noticed for some time that unsightly structures and advertising hoardings have been erected adjacent to and sometimes on the verges of roads at vantage points in the Adelaide Hills—probably the Premier is aware of them along some of the roads he traverses—and at other well-known beauty spots. These detract considerably from the surrounding beauty. Their presence has been most unfavourably commented upon to me by visitors from other States. Can the Premier say whether there is any way in which the erection of these eyesores can be controlled, because without doubt they detract from the surroundings?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Far-reaching legislation already exists and it is much more restrictive than legislation in any other State. It enables a road to be declared a scenic road and, upon that declaration being

made, the Minister in charge of the Tourist Bureau can order a sign to be removed. The Minister, by the Act, is made the sole judge of whether a sign is not artistic and whether it detracts from the beauty of the surrounding area. If any complaint is received about any hoarding, the Director of the Tourist Bureau inspects it and makes a report to me. If I have any doubt about whether his report is correct I see the sign and make the necessary order. If any honourable member has a particular hoarding in mind that he believes to be spoiling the scenic beauty of the surroundings and makes a complaint, he will find in due course that that procedure will be followed. This provision does not apply in any corporate town or to signs erected to advertise the sale of a commodity on the site. Frequently large placards are attached to hotels advocating the purchase of a particular type of spirit or wine, and the Act does not give me authority to order the removal of any such signs considered to be erected in furtherance of the trade actually carried out by the proprietor of the land.

TEACHERS' LEAVE.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that nowadays arrangements are made by the Education Department to give certain teachers the opportunity to take leave of absence to complete their degrees. I do not criticize this: I am very much in favour of it, especially as the university is not as co-operative as it used to be in enabling teachers to complete their degrees, particularly science degrees, after they have left the environs of the university. Will the Minister of Education obtain details of this scheme and, possibly, of how many teachers are benefiting under it at present?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I understand the honourable member to mean teachers who are receiving full-time leave.

Mr. Clark: I think some get full leave and others get part-time leave.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: A somewhat limited scheme was put into operation a few years ago under which a small number of teachers were given full-time leave and another small number part-time or half-time leave. That is being repeated and enlarged this year. I hope that in each succeeding year it will be greatly enlarged. I am confident that the Education Department particularly, and the State in general, will reap the benefit of this scheme. I shall let the honourable member have the particulars next week. It is not as large a scheme as I had hoped, as the

honourable member will realize when he hears my further reply; but it is a start and it will increase each year.

TANK DAMAGE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Recently the Government renewed the water tanks west of Penong on the Eyre Highway. I understand that vandals have been amusing themselves by shooting at the tanks. What action does the Minister of Works intend to take to prevent this vandalism and, if the vandals are caught, what action will be taken to deal with them?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: A couple of years ago, or a little more, the department renewed and replaced a series of the water supply tanks along the Eyre Highway, at substantial cost. They were designed with a view to preventing vandalism, as far as that was possible. For some time, apparently, the structure of the tanks, thickness, and so on prevented damage from being done. They would be proof against normal small-arms rifle fire, but No. 3 tank recently was holed, apparently by a high-powered rifle, probably a .303. Practically all the water in the tank was lost. Immediately it was discovered we alerted the police authorities, who contacted the police in Western Australia. A road block was set up at Norseman but, unfortunately, the party had apparently passed through the town before the road block was set up. The honourable member will appreciate that the damage was noticed some time after it was done.

Every effort is being made to trace the people, and I think from the description we have they will ultimately be traced. Penalties exist for this sort of thing and I have no doubt that the court would impose a penalty in keeping with the damage done and up to the limit it has the authority to award. I am most anxious that we should keep this sort of activity at an absolute minimum and eliminate it, if possible, particularly in view of the fact that the summer months are approaching when these water supplies will be valuable and could be the means of saving lives.

CEREAL PRODUCTION.

Mr. HUGHES: Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question concerning cereal production and marketing prospects. Is he now in a position to reply to that question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member's question concerned both wheat and barley. The State Superintendent of the Australian Wheat Board has forwarded to me the following letter:

The quantity of wheat delivered to the board for the 1963-64 season amounted to 51,644,957 bushels. Of this total, 37,120,667 bushels represents the chartered shipments effected from December 1, 1963, to July 31, 1964, to the following destinations: United Kingdom, Russia, China, Lebanon, Norway, Germany, Rhodesia, Iraq, Eire, India, Thailand, Iran, Malaysia.

In addition to the foregoing 1,610,388 bushels has been shipped in small parcel lots to Aden, Malaysia, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Zanzibar, British West Indies and Thailand. Estimated usage for the year by local mills and the produce trade will account for approximately 8,500,000 bushels. A further quantity of 1,750,000 bushels is sold but not yet shipped. With regard to the prospects of selling the forthcoming crop, I am not in a position to give any indications at the present time.

I also have a statement from the Australian Barley Board, but it is a long one. Briefly, it states that the total receipts of barley by the board for the 1963-64 season were 23,142,205 bushels, comprising 20,357,726 bushels in South Australia and just under 3,000,000 bushels in Victoria. I ask leave to have the statement incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

BARLEY PRODUCTION.

We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated August 12 advising the text of a question asked in the House of Assembly and note that you require information in order that you can make the necessary reply. Such information is as follows: the total receipt of barley by this board for the 1963-64 season is 23,142,205 bushels, comprising 20,357,726 bushels in South Australia and 2,784,476 bushels in Victoria. Of the total quantity, 10,583,597 bushels have been supplied for use or consumption in Australia. Of the balance, 12,088,205 bushels have been sold and shipped to overseas destinations; 358,403 bushels have been sold and this quantity still remains to be shipped. The balance of 112,000 bushels has not as yet been sold, but it is expected that this quantity will be disposed of within the next few months. The countries to which the barley has been sold, together with the quantities, are as follows:

Destination.	Bushels.
United Kingdom	2,912,000
Continent	3,942,400
Japan	4,390,400
U.S.A.	1,075,200
Sundry	126,705

With regard to export prospects for barley from the 1964-65 season's crop, it is too early to make any comment as sales can only be made in accordance with supply and demand, but we would expect to sell barley to countries that purchased from us last season, in addition to any other countries interested in our barley.

VIRGINIA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HALL: Some time ago I sent to the Minister of Works a petition signed by residents of the Virginia district who desired a

departmental water supply in that town and district. Has the Minister any further news of investigations into the possibility of providing this supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The consumption of water in the Virginia district has increased tremendously in recent years, mainly because of the usage of piped water for market gardening and glasshouse cultivation, and that has absorbed almost all the water available; in fact, it has rendered the supply quite inadequate. The department has been looking carefully into the matter and has prepared a scheme for the reorganization of the whole area. This is a costly and extensive scheme, but it will, I think, provide for all the needs of the area for quite a few years to come, notwithstanding the fact that it is expected that when further supplies are available the market-gardening activity will increase. In order that the water may reach Virginia consumers, it is necessary to reorganize the system from the Sandy Creek trunk main. The Engineer-in-Chief has submitted to me a scheme for this first stage of the programme, which I think, from memory, is to cost about £90,000, and he desires to get the project under way. I have not yet taken the matter to Cabinet, but I propose to do so in the next week or so and after Cabinet has had a look at it I shall probably be able to inform the honourable member further. That part of the scheme has been prepared in detail and is ready for Cabinet's consideration.

MURRAY BRIDGE ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. BYWATERS: About a fortnight ago I asked the Minister of Works a question about the Murray Bridge Adult Education Centre, suggesting that it might be possible for local plumbers to do the work and so expedite the job, which has been held up for some time. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that this work will be carried out next week, using departmental labour.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering

the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1963.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank members for their consideration in permitting the Bill to be proceeded with at this stage. It is designed to empower the Wheat Board to deduct from moneys payable by the board to wheatgrowers certain tolls and charges due to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited and is based on an amendment made in 1955 to section 12 of the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1954. The Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1954-1955, was repealed in 1958 and replaced by the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1958. This in turn was repealed and replaced by the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1963. Neither the 1958 Act nor the 1963 Act contains empowering provisions similar to those contained in the 1955 amendment, but the Wheat Board has continued to make deductions of the tolls and charges due to the company and seeks an amendment to the present legislation to authorize the board to do so. This arrangement has been found to be convenient both to the company and to the wheatgrowers themselves.

Clause 3 adds three new subsections to section 14 of the principal Act. Under these provisions the board is authorized to deduct from the sum otherwise payable under this Act in respect of wheat harvested on and after October 1, 1963, the following amounts:

- (a) Where the payee is a member of S.A. Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, any amounts of money which the payee by writing authorizes the board to deduct and pay to the company in respect of tolls which the payee has agreed to pay to the company; and
- (b) Where the payee is not a member of the company, any amount payable to the company by way of a charge for the receipt, storage or handling of wheat delivered by the payee.

The board is not to deduct any amount pursuant to paragraph (b) referred to above unless the charge in respect of which the deduction is made has been fixed by the company, approved by the Auditor-General, and published in the *Gazette*. The Bill goes on to provide that all amounts deducted by the board

pursuant to the Bill are to be paid to the company and such payment will be a discharge of the board's liability to the payee.

As I have indicated earlier, these provisions will have the same effect as the amendment made in 1955 to section 12 of the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1954. In order to validate deductions made by the board since the 1963 harvest the amendments made by this Bill will be deemed to have come into operation on the day on which the principal Act came into force.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

APIARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Apiaries Act, 1931-1943.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to amend the administrative machinery contained in the Apiaries Act and to strengthen the provisions relating to the control of diseases. Clause 3 amends section 3 of the principal Act by extending the definition of "apiary" so as to include bees, hives, honey, beeswax and appliances used in the apiary. The existing definition refers only to places where bees are kept, but often it happens that the bees have died and the remaining combs and hives are diseased. In order to clarify the provisions of the principal Act, clause 3 also inserts a definition of appliances used in apiaries. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act so that the registration fees for hives may be prescribed by regulation. It is intended to replace the present rate of 2d. a hive (specified in section 5 (4) of the principal Act) with a scale of rates applicable to the total number of hives that a beekeeper owns. The regulations may also provide penalty rates for late registration (clause 9). Clause 4 also changes the date before which registration must be made from January 15 to June 30. This will be more convenient

for the beekeepers and for the department. The clause also inserts new subsection (2a) as a transitional provision to allow current registrations to continue in force until January 30, 1965.

Sections 7 and 8 of the principal Act provide for regulations prescribing the manner of treating or destroying apiaries found to be infected with disease. As different diseases require different treatment and it would not be practicable to make adequate provision for this by regulation, it is considered that any such work should be carried out under the direction of an inspector. Clause 5 (b) and clause 6 (a) provide accordingly. Clause 5 also includes a requirement that a beekeeper shall not move an apiary infected with disease except with the permission of an inspector, so as to prevent infection of clean apiaries. Similarly, paragraph (f) of section 8 (inserted by clause 6 (c)) will give an inspector power to require that an apiary be removed in any such case. The clause also empowers an inspector to destroy apiaries that are abandoned or neglected and likely to spread disease. Clause 7 enlarges the scope of section 9 so that the section will make it an offence to remove, dispose of or expose honey, beeswax and appliances infected with disease, as well as bees and the other articles specified in the section.

Clause 8 repeals and re-enacts section 13a of the principal Act so that a beekeeper will be required to brand at least one hive in every 10 (in lieu of one in each apiary as required under the present section) with a brand allotted by the Chief Inspector of Apiaries. The clause also inserts new section 13b in the principal Act requiring a beekeeper to provide his bees with water in order to prevent pollution of his neighbour's water by the bees. Clause 9 provides for regulations prescribing registration fees, the size of brands and the manner of branding hives. Clause 10 repeals and replaces the schedule of diseases to which the principal Act applies and includes several new diseases therein. I understand that this legislation has the wide support of apiarists in general, and I do not know of any opposition to it in the industry.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its provisions are identical with those of the Bill introduced last year, except of course the formal parts relating to titles, which are now brought up to date. Its object is to increase the number of the Ministers of the Crown from 8 to 9 and to provide that one of the Ministers shall bear the title and fill the Ministerial officer of Premier. The operative clause, as before, is clause 3, which amends section 65 of the Constitution Act. No provision for payment of the additional Minister is made in the Bill, this matter having been already covered by the legislation passed last year relating to salaries of members.

I do not think it necessary to repeat what I said last year concerning the provisions of the Bill. Nothing has happened since last year to diminish the need for the appointment of an additional Minister or the establishment of a separate Premier's Department. On the contrary, the general development of the State and increase in governmental activity have increased.

That is a very brief statement about this Bill, which is in terms identical with those of the Bill that the Leader and his merry men last year defeated so blithely.

Mr. Jennings: And will this year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This year I hope my friends opposite will have another look at the matter. I believe if they do they will certainly realize they made a mistake last year. I do not know who was responsible for the advice they took last year, but I am certain they will realize they made a mistake and that if this State is to go ahead it must have the machinery available to enable it to do so. It was interesting to note last year that while, as a Party, members opposite were moving to defeat the Bill some of the members, in a report published almost at the same time, were advocating that it was necessary in the interests of decentralization that Ministerial increases take place. I suggest that my friends opposite may look at this again with the object of seeing where the interests of the State lie and that they may forget for the moment the particular Party angle from which they considered the matter last year.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

FESTIVAL HALL (CITY OF ADELAIDE) BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable the Council of the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to construct a festival hall within the city with Government assistance. The Bill consists only of three operative clauses. Of these, clause 3 expressly enables the council to construct a festival hall together with ancillary buildings and to furnish and equip the hall. This express power is considered to be necessary as the council probably has no power to expend its funds or to borrow money for such a purpose. Accordingly, subclause (1) empowers the council to build the hall, subclause (4) empowers it to expend its revenue in contributing towards the cost of construction, provision and maintenance of the hall, and subclause (5) enables it to borrow money in accordance with the existing provisions of the Local Government Act relating to the Adelaide City Council for contributing towards the cost of construction and provision of the hall.

Clause 3 (2) provides that the hall shall be deemed to be a permanent work or undertaking for the purposes of the Local Government Act. Various sections of the Local Government Act refer to permanent works and undertakings. For example, section 287 empowers any council to expend its revenue in maintaining premises, works and undertakings. Section 383 empowers the council, for the purpose of a permanent work or undertaking, to purchase or otherwise acquire land or materials and to improve, maintain and operate permanent works and undertakings. Section 407 empowers the compulsory acquisition for the purposes of any work or undertaking authorized by the Local Government Act or any other Act. The council has requested the inclusion of clause 3 (2) of the Bill to ensure that there should be no doubt as to its general powers in respect of construction, provision and maintenance of the hall.

Clause 4 provides that the hall shall remain vested in the council which is to have the care, control and management thereof, a provision which I believe is reasonable. Clause 5 is the clause which especially concerns Parliament, since it deals with the question of financial assistance to the council by the Government, its effect being that the Government may pay to the council an amount not exceeding £100,000 towards the purchase or acquisition of a site for the hall, the amount to be paid so soon after the council has come to a decision as to the site and the Treasurer approves. This amount will be by way of outright grant. With regard to construction and provision of equipment, the Government will contribute up

to an amount of £400,000 by way of outright grant and another £400,000 by way of loan on the basis of a total expenditure of £1,000,000. If the cost of the hall exceeds that sum the council will meet the whole of the excess. On the other hand, if the total cost is less than £1,000,000, the Government contributions will be proportionately reduced. The whole of the sum of £800,000 will be paid by the Government from time to time according to progress, one half of it being repayable after the work is completed, with interest on the capital indebtedness, from the date when such indebtedness accrued, at 4½ per cent per annum over a period of 30 years. Honourable members will observe that clause 5 follows closely the pattern of the corresponding section in the Morphett Street Bridge Act which was passed earlier this year, where a similar plan of grant and loan was provided. The only difference between the two schemes is that the interest in this case is at a fixed rate of 4½ per cent.

I refer lastly to clause 3 (3) of the Bill which provides that the hall is to be constructed in accordance with designs approved by the Treasurer. It seems to be not unreasonable that if the Government is contributing so much financial assistance to the project it should be entitled to see the basic designs. It would not be the Government's intention to require great detail but rather to see what was proposed before any moneys were paid over. This Bill, relating as it does specifically to the Adelaide City Council, will be referred to a Select Committee in accordance with Joint Standing Orders and I shall not therefore go into further detail at this stage. The committee will no doubt investigate all aspects of the matter before reporting to the House.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL AND HISTORICAL OBJECTS PRESERVATION BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It seeks to facilitate the preservation of aboriginal rock carvings and is designed to give effect to recommendations of a committee set up to investigate and advise on the matter. The committee consisted of representatives of the Aboriginal Affairs Board, the Pastoral Board, the South Australian Museum, the Board for Anthropological Research and the Flora and Fauna Committee. The Bill is based upon and generally conforms to the corresponding

Northern Territory Ordinance. Throughout the State are many hundreds of aboriginal cave paintings and rock carvings, some of them being in excellent preservation. Until recent times the isolation of these places prevented tourists and others from having access to them. However, at present there are few places in the State that are not accessible to tourists, and there have been many reports of these examples of aboriginal art being defaced. It is considered that there is a real need for legislation to prevent this wanton desecration so that at least the better examples of this aboriginal art will be preserved for scientific examination, education and the tourist trade.

Clause 2 provides for the Bill to come into operation by proclamation, so that all persons affected by it may have notice thereof before its provisions are enforced. Clause 3 contains definitions of terms used in the Bill, the principal one of which is "prescribed objects". These include, *inter alia*, articles relating to or made by Aborigines and objects of historical or archaeological interest. The provisions of the Bill are thus extended to objects other than rock carvings, because at the site of rock carvings it is often possible to dig up objects of archaeological value. Clause 4 empowers the Minister to exempt certain persons from the requirements of the Bill. In particular, it is intended that exemptions will be conferred upon persons recognized as conducting a legitimate business in the more common articles made by Aborigines (being of lesser archaeological value) so that they will not, in so doing, contravene any of the provisions of the Bill. Clause 5 (1) enables the Minister or an authorized person to purchase prescribed objects in order to preserve them. It is intended that the authorized persons will be officers of the Museum Department. Subclause (2) provides for regulations preventing the acquisition, except by the Minister or an authorized person, of prescribed objects of any type specified in the regulations. Clause 6 prohibits the removal of prescribed objects except with the consent of an authorized person. Clause 7, probably the most important provision in the Bill, makes it an offence to conceal, destroy or damage a prescribed object.

Under clause 8 it is an offence to withhold information as to the locality of a prescribed object from an authorized person or a member of the Police Force. Clause 9 creates offences relating to excavations in caves or other places where ancient remains are to be found, or in places holding sacred associations for Aborigines. Under clause 10 the maximum

penalty for offences against the Act or regulations is £100 or imprisonment for three months. Clauses 11 and 12 make provision for the forfeiture, seizure and detention of prescribed objects; clause 13 provides for the summary trial of offences; clause 14 provides for finance; and clause 15 contains a general regulation-making power.

Mr. CLARK secured the adjournment of the debate.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is necessary because of the impending introduction of decimal currency. It provides for the metric system of weights and measures, and that, in the initial stages at least, both avoirdupois and metric weights shall be included on labels, so that there will be no misunderstanding among people who have not acquired the necessary knowledge of the metric system.

The principal purpose of the Bill is to permit the use of the metric system of weights and measures in the pharmaceutical and drug trades, thereby giving effect to an agreement reached by Ministers of all States following a conference of officers in November of last year. The permissive use of the metric system has been sought by the Pharmacy Board of South Australia, the Australian Pharmaceutical Science Association, the Society of Hospital Pharmaceutical Chemists of Australia and the Director-General of Public Health. The current British Pharmacopoeia and the Australian Pharmaceutical Formulary now use metric terms only. Although the principal object of the Bill is to permit the use of the metric system in the pharmaceutical and drug trades, it was agreed at the conference that those States which had not already done so would take action to permit the use of the system in trade generally, subject to the requirement that the nett avoirdupois weight or normal Imperial measure should also be marked upon any package marked in metric terms.

Clause 5 amends section 19 of the principal Act (which requires all sales by weight to be by avoirdupois weight) by inserting the words "or metric" after the word "avoirdupois" so that section 19 will permit sales by weight to be by either system. Clause 4 inserts new section 18a into the principal Act requiring that packages held for use in trade and marked

in terms of metric weight or measure shall also indicate the corresponding avoirdupois weight or normal measure of capacity. Subsection (2) confers power to make regulations exempting certain goods from this requirement. It is anticipated that goods used in the pharmaceutical and drug trades will be so exempted. Subsection (3) provides for the establishment by regulation of equivalent weights and measures in both metric and avoirdupois or Imperial weights and measures.

Clause 7 extends the scope of section 57b of the principal Act, dealing with departmental verifications of measures and measuring instruments, to weights and weighing instruments. It is intended that the accuracy of chemists' scales, weights, etc., of prime importance to public health, will be brought under departmental supervision. This governmental supervision will bring South Australia into line with practices followed in the other States. Clauses 3 and 6 make consequential amendments. Clause 8 inserts a series of metric weights and measures into the Third Schedule to the principal Act which sets out the standard weights and measures for the State.

If members look at the part of the Bill setting out the series of metric weights and measures I think some may be like me and will want to go back to school to learn their tables. I do not profess to have a complete knowledge of the schedule in the Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DOG FENCE AND VERMIN) BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides an additional solution to certain practices in the pastoral areas associated with variations in the siting of a dog fence. Some of the parties involved are not easily convinced that they are either right or wrong.

Mr. Clark: There is nothing very unusual about that.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Not a bit. They are great people but they can strain the resources of the Dog Fence Board. The Government is acting under this Bill so that it can be relieved of the responsibilities of immediate adjudication when they get into holts. I can see the member for Frome laughing, but he realizes what can happen. The Bill amends the Dog Fence Act and the Vermin Act by providing a means for arbitration where, upon a variation in the site of the dog fence, the

owner of the fence proposed to be made part of the dog fence and the owner of the fence ceasing to be part thereof fail to conclude satisfactory financial arrangements as provided by section 21 of the Dog Fence Act.

Section 21 provides that, on the recommendation of the Dog Fence Board, the site of the dog fence may be varied by proclamation, but the board must not make its recommendation unless it is satisfied that the owner of the fence proposed to be made part of the dog fence and the owner of the fence ceasing to be part thereof have made proper arrangements for payment to the latter owner of a reasonable part of his expenditure on the fence. Honourable members will realize that therein lie all the elements of a first-class argument. Accordingly the board is not competent to make its recommendation for a variation in the site of the dog fence if the owners fail to agree on the sum to be paid under section 21. Of course, they are well aware of that procedure.

The matter is further complicated by section 202 of the Vermin Act which imposes a liability on an owner of land to contribute towards the cost of a verminor dog-proof fence erected by the owner of adjoining land on the boundary of their land to the extent of half the value of the fence. The purpose of this Bill is to provide for these matters to be referred to arbitration in default of agreement by the owners, and for the board to make its recommendation for a variation of the site of the dog fence when satisfactory arrangements have been made between the owners or when the matters in dispute have been referred to arbitration.

Recently when the site of the dog fence was varied, the two parties concerned failed to agree on satisfactory arrangements and the deficiency in the legislation was brought to the notice of the Government. I think the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) may know the contending factions. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal provisions. Clause 3 repeals and re-enacts section 21 of the Dog Fence Act. Subsection (1) of the new section contains the first part of the repealed section without change. Subsection (2) enables the Dog Fence Board to recommend a variation in the site of the dog fence if the owners have concluded satisfactory arrangements or if, upon default of agreement, the matter has been referred to arbitration. Subsection (3) provides that where the owners fail to agree, the Minister may, at the request of both or either of them, refer the matter to arbitration by one or more arbitrators appointed by the Minister. Subsection

(4) is a machinery clause incorporating the Arbitration Act.

Clause 4 is a formal provision dealing with a consequential amendment to the Vermin Act. Clause 5 adds a new subsection to section 202 of the Vermin Act providing that any payment of a sum awarded by arbitration as contribution to the cost of the fence under section 202 shall be a discharge of liability to pay that amount under the section.

Mr. LOVEDAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 495.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): In November last year, His Excellency the Governor issued a proclamation under the Vine, Fruit, and Vegetable Protection Act, 1885-1959, prohibiting persons from removing fresh fruits and the fruits of ornamental shrubs from the municipality of the City of Port Augusta to any other portion of the State because of the outbreak of fruit fly in the Port Augusta area. The Bill before us is purely a machinery measure enabling the Government to compensate any person for loss caused by being prohibited from removing fruit from any land within the proclaimed area of Port Augusta. This requirement is covered by clause 3 (1) of the Bill, and subclause (2) of the same clause provides that the loss may have been occasioned before or after this Bill is passed. However, clause 4 limits the time by which claims may be lodged to November 1, 1964.

I understand that the Government has spent more than £1,000,000 on fruit fly eradication and compensation since the principal legislation was passed by Parliament in 1947. I also understand that the alternative to intensive fruit fly eradication is to accept that there must be some infestation throughout all orchards, vineyards, and domestic gardens. The loss caused to the domestic gardeners would be serious enough but in many cases these enterprises are carried on as hobbies and for recreation by the occupants. Nevertheless, fruit fly infestation still causes considerable inconvenience and loss to these people. Over the past years, however, household occupants have been co-operative with the Government inspectors and strippers and I sincerely trust that this co-operation will continue.

On the financial side, of course, we must realize that a fruit fly infestation strikes at the very basis of the output from the commercial orchards and vineyards as well as the

processing of the primary production such as the output from the fruit canning industry. Other States and countries would, naturally, be wary about purchasing our products if we had to admit that we had serious fruit fly infestation throughout the State. The area under cultivation as orchards and vineyards totals nearly 100,000 acres, and during 1962-63 the gross value of production was about £8,000,000 for orchard and berry fruits and nearly £5,000,000 for vine fruit. A primary production of this value is worthy of the utmost protection from ruination by the infestation of fruit fly.

I strongly believe that most of our re-infestations occur because fruit and plants brought into this State from other States contain maggots or eggs from one or more of the varieties of the fruit fly in those States. Therefore, I urge the Government to rigidly enforce the provisions of the legislation because, once the fly becomes established in South Australia, even though in relatively small pockets, it still causes us considerable expense to free our orchards and vineyards from the infestation each time. I am convinced that we must continue with stringent eradication as soon as any infestation is discovered. I support the second reading of the Bill, which will enable the Government to pay the appropriate compensation in individual cases.

I am concerned about the fruit fly road block between Western Australia and South Australia. Port Augusta has been the victim of infested fruit and plants from Western Australia. I understand that the Minister will need to introduce other legislation to deal with any future outbreaks of fruit fly in the metropolitan area. Greater consideration must be given to commercial growers compared with those people who do not have to rely on this means of production for their livelihood, because the commercial grower derives his income solely from this industry.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): Similar legislation has been considered several times since 1947, when the first Bill dealing with this matter was introduced. Past legislation obtained the support of all members of this House, and I am sure the present legislation will be welcomed. When one realizes the quantity of fresh fruit produced in this State, it is necessary to take steps to eradicate fruit fly. At present there are about 38,000 acres of commercial fruit and about 58,000 acres of vineyards in this State. The income from the commercial orchards is about £7,500,000 and from the vineyards about £6,000,000 a year—a combined income of over £13,000,000 a year.

If steps to eradicate fruit fly that have been taken in the past (and are still being taken) had not been taken, perhaps many, if not most, of our commercial orchards and vineyards would have been at the mercy of this pest and South Australia (and indeed Australia) would have suffered considerable financial loss.

The Minister and his department are to be congratulated on the measures that have been taken, and, about two years ago, no less an authority than Dr. Steiner, a world-wide authority, complimented the Minister and his department on South Australian measures and precautions, which he said were particularly effective. If legislation to deal with fruit fly was imperative in 1947, when it was first introduced, it is even more imperative at present because, in the decade ended 1962-63, the orchard acreage in South Australia has increased from 10,000 acres to 23,279 acres in those parts of the State described as the Murray Mallee in our Statistical Register. That is an increase of over 13,000 acres of orchards in one part of the State. Bearing that in mind, and in view of the increased production from that increased acreage, it is even more imperative that we take every step possible to keep the fruit fly at bay and eradicate it. Outbreaks have occurred in the metropolitan area, and everything that can be done to eradicate it here and make certain that it does not spread to our rural areas will be welcomed by primary producers engaged in the fruitgrowing industry. We must also take into account the value of vegetable production. I understand that last year this was worth about £5,000,000; so it can be seen that it is necessary for vegetable growing also that the fruit fly be kept at bay.

I should like the Minister to say whether any research or investigation has taken place on a national basis, for the fly is, as members know, rampant in practically every State, and particularly in Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia. As thousands of acres of land comprising orchards in this State and in other States of Australia are occupied by soldier settlers, I think the Commonwealth Government has a vital interest in this matter to make sure that these settlements are kept free from this pest. I think any moneys the Commonwealth can make available for research, perhaps through the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, will be an investment well made.

I was pleased to read recently in that well-known publication of the Murray Valley Development League entitled *The Riverlander*

that a research officer of the South Australian Agriculture Department, Mr. Noel Richardson, had gone to New South Wales for 12 months to work on investigations conducted by the University of Adelaide into the behaviour and destruction of the Queensland fruit fly. The publication of April, 1964, stated that the studies involved the release into New South Wales country centres of male fruit flies sterilized by radiation and their effect on the build-up or otherwise of fruit fly numbers. Anything done in this matter is well merited. I think an intensive research programme is well warranted in view of the importance of our horticultural industry. If the Minister will indicate what research work is being done in this State and perhaps in other States, I think it will be appreciated by members who represent horticultural districts. I commend the Minister for introducing this measure, as I think that unless we take these steps from time to time when they become necessary we may sound the death-knell of our horticultural industry. I therefore have great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I naturally support this Bill, which is very short. It has nothing whatever to do with fruit fly eradication as such, as it does not alter the law in that respect at all. It is merely a Bill to enable the Minister to pay compensation for fruit taken from householders at Port Augusta last November. I think that anybody who would not be prepared to support such a Bill would be guilty of inconsistency, because in the past the principle has been accepted that where householders' fruit has been taken, in order to protect industries throughout the State, some measure of compensation should be provided. This Bill merely provides for a piece of machinery that should be written into the parent Act and become permanent. I mentioned this in the Address in Reply debate. Surely this House over the years has accepted the principle that when an outbreak of fruit fly occurs, and eradication measures are deemed necessary, compensation should be payable to the grower. Why do we have to pass a separate Bill every time an outbreak occurs? I was tempted to move an amendment to this Bill to provide that it should apply not only to the outbreak at Port Augusta, covering the measures that were taken as a result of a proclamation last November, but whenever an outbreak occurred anywhere. I ask the Minister to consider this point, because the necessity to introduce a Bill every time an outbreak occurs inflicts undue hardship in some cases upon people living in the affected area.

The outbreak covered by this Bill took place at Port Augusta last November, and so far residents have received no compensation whatever. I do not know even now when they will receive compensation, although I know that some people will have difficulty in finding records of fruit that was taken nine months ago. The parent Bill provided that, where fruit was taken in other areas, claims had to be submitted to a committee within three months of the outbreak. Here we have the position where nine months has elapsed but no legislation exists authorizing the Minister to pay compensation to the people concerned. This Bill extends the date for claiming compensation to November 1. It requires only a simple alteration to provide that a committee have power to pay compensation whenever an outbreak occurs, and that action be taken pursuant to a proclamation issued in the *Government Gazette*. It is not fair that people whose fruit has been taken should have to wait for such long periods before being granted compensation, and, of course, unless this Bill is passed no compensation will be provided for them at all.

An outbreak occurred in Adelaide at about the same time as the one connected with this Bill. I do not know whether any other Bill will have to be introduced to provide compensation for Adelaide residents who were affected, or whether the present Act gives sufficient power to compensate them. The fact that this is the only Bill at present before honourable members would seem to indicate the necessity for a new Bill, each time an outbreak occurs, only for country districts. It may seem trivial to the House that this Bill should apply only to Port Augusta but I remind members that fruit-growing in Port Augusta is much more widespread than they may realize. I believe that if the departmental records were made available to this House members would be surprised at the quantity of fruit taken. The purchase in Port Augusta of fruit grown in other parts of the State is costly. In fact, it costs much more to transport fruit from the metropolitan area to Port Augusta than it does to grow it.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: In addition, you grow very good fruit up there.

Mr. RICHES: Yes. The people are to be commended for their decision to attempt to grow fruit wherever possible. I cannot think of any kind of fruit that cannot be grown successfully at Port Augusta. When members realize that, at the time Riverland oranges

were selling at 3s. 6d. a dozen on the river and in Adelaide, we were paying 7s. a dozen for them in Port Augusta, they will see how important it is for people in that town to grow their own fruit, and how serious it is for them when, having grown the fruit, it is all taken by the department. Those people are not allowed to sell the fruit or even give it away: it is not to be removed from the property on which it is grown, and the people have to wait nine months before a special Bill is introduced into the House to enable compensation to be payable and a further three months before it can actually be paid. Although I do not intend to move an amendment, I have decided to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether, in the event of any further outbreak, he will consider my representations and provide for the early payment of compensation, which I believe would be the general desire of this House. Each claim has to be assessed by a committee, and there is no reason why the payment of compensation should not be automatic whenever the Minister decides in the interests of the State that an area should be proclaimed and that the operations of this legislation should apply.

I pay a tribute to the officers of the department who conducted the eradication campaign at Port Augusta. We were amazed at the blanks that had occurred in the period intervening between the first outbreak and the last outbreak in our area. During the last outbreak the infestation was discovered fairly early; the area of complete stripping of fruit was confined, and they were able not only to contain the outbreak in a limited area but in a comparatively short time to completely eradicate the infestation. The baits and sprays that have recently become known to the department, even though expensive, certainly proved their worth during this last outbreak. The officers showed full appreciation of the feelings and the needs of the householders, and I believe they in turn received the full co-operation of the householders throughout the campaign. It is a pity to find that spirit of co-operation somewhat dampened because a special Act of Parliament has to be passed in order to pay the compensation which everybody believes is justified and which nobody doubts will be paid in the long run. Will the Minister seriously consider my suggestion that the Act at some time in the future be amended in order to make payment of compensation automatic without the necessity to introduce a separate Bill every time an outbreak occurs in the country?

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): As I live in a fruit and grapegrowing area and in this House represent many fruitgrowers, I am mindful of the vital importance of the legislation concerning fruit fly prevention in South Australia. The fact that we are free of fruit fly is directly attributable to the measures taken by the Agriculture Department since 1947. We have found time and again that fruit fly would have been brought into this State from Western Australia and the Eastern States had it not been for road blocks placed at strategic points. Had affected fruit not been taken from travellers at these road blocks South Australia would have had numerous outbreaks of fruit fly infestation, with the gravest results to the fruit and grapegrowing industries.

At present the citrus industry is in a rather parlous condition and were the fruit fly to strike in our citrus-growing areas, thus affecting our exports to the New Zealand market, the situation of orange, grapefruit and lemon growers would indeed be serious. The amount paid by our Government as compensation to people who have had their fruit taken because of an outbreak of fruit fly has been a low insurance premium to maintain a healthy and progressive fruit producing industry. A feature of the campaign to keep the fruit fly at bay has been the splendid co-operation of householders when strikes have occurred. I agree with the desires of the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches), who seeks to have compensation payments made as expeditiously as possible. Because of this ready co-operation, the safety of the industry has been assured from attacks by this horrible pest. Compensation should be paid as quickly as possible after an outbreak.

I pay a tribute to the Minister of Agriculture and his department for their assiduity in assuring that this scourge of the fruit industry has not taken a hold in South Australia, and I hope that the care and attention given to this matter, without which I can see no future for our fruit and grapegrowing industries, will continue. I support the measure.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): As the representative of possibly the largest fruitgrowing district in South Australia, I wish to add my support to this Bill. Practically everything that could be said in favour of it has already been said by other members this afternoon. I should like to add my commendation of the officers of the Agriculture Department, particularly those operating at the Yamba fruit block on the Sturt Highway. They have

shown great vigilance and have found fruit affected with fruit fly which would have been brought into South Australian fruitgrowing districts but for their activities. The vigilance of these officers has protected the fruitgrowing districts of the Upper Murray, in particular. The officers are to be highly commended.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I thank members for their consideration of the Bill. There is no division of opinion on the need for fruit fly eradication measures, and the House has always supported Bills of this nature. Many points made during the debate require comment. The member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) spoke about the advisability of having legislation giving a standing authority to pay compensation to people who had lost fruit. I sympathize with this view. Mr. Riches' suggestion contains a few difficulties, but, nevertheless, it might be possible to devise a system whereby compensation payment can be speeded up. Now, when an outbreak occurs we try to eradicate the fruit fly but compensation is paid only at the end of the campaign. I am not sure of the implications of compensating people for fruit as it is taken. It would be convenient for the householder, but it would create many anomalies for the committee, which would have to sit for most of the year in the event of outbreaks occurring. I shall study the matter to see whether something can be done to speed up compensation payments, but I do not think we could have legislation that automatically provided for the payment of compensation. There would need to be further consideration by Parliament. The whole tenor of Parliamentary life is to ensure that Parliament retains control of the State's financial affairs. It is possible (although I think it is unlikely) that the fruit fly disease could swamp the State to such an extent that the entire aspect of compensation would have to be reconsidered. The basis of compensation has never been worked out to help commercial fruitgrowing areas; it has been devised to compensate only householders for the part they play in protecting the fruitgrowing industry. However, Parliament would have to examine the position (and I believe members will agree with this) if a wide infestation occurred throughout our fruitgrowing areas. I hope the member for Stuart will accept my assurance that I shall examine the matter to see whether something more can be done to clear up the matter of compensation for individual householders and I shall inform him of the position.

The member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) asked about research on fruit fly control and eradication. Some years ago I took up strongly in the Australian Agricultural Council the question of the Commonwealth Government assisting financially in the establishment and maintenance of road blocks, which cost between £8,000 and £10,000 a year each. It is only too clear that road blocks are the most important means of protection because fruit entering by other avenues is more easily examined at the point of arrival, such as a railway station, than is fruit arriving by road in motor cars. Large loads of fruit can be examined at depots: it is the individual car that we fear most. The blocks are situated on the worst and most dangerous roads but, naturally, everybody will realize that there are many ways of entering the State, not all of which can be watched.

I had in mind some years ago a line of road blocks that would protect South Australia, parts of New South Wales, and Victoria in a national scheme, but the Commonwealth Government declined to contribute and the scheme never got going. The Commonwealth's reply was that it thought its duty was to assist in the matter of research and leave the question of practical protection to the States concerned. That may or may not be a good argument—I do not know. I shall not argue that now, but South Australia has spent more than any other State in the Commonwealth on road blocks. Probably the amounts spent by the rest of the Commonwealth would only match South Australia's expenditure over the last 12 to 14 years. Our £2,500,000 to £3,000,000 has undoubtedly been well spent, but it has been a considerable burden. The Commonwealth Government has, however, provided increasing amounts for research; it is undertaking research through the C.S.I.R.O. and other projects. Not much research can be carried out in South Australia, for the obvious reason that we have not enough fruit fly upon which to do research. As far as we know, we have eradicated the fruit fly each time it has appeared. It is not possible to prove that, but it appears reasonably certain that re-infestation is the cause of a subsequent outbreak rather than carry-overs from a previous outbreak. Perhaps our research can be centred only on such matters as effective lures for fruit flies, and so on.

But there are two major lines of research that at the moment must be carried out in places where fruit fly is always present. As

the honourable member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) has stated, an officer of the Agriculture Department is now working in New South Wales studying the problems of radiation, with the idea of sterilizing the male flies, thus rendering the whole fly population extinct. That has been done successfully and dramatically in some parts of the world. I think the screw worm in either Florida or an island near the United States was a successful example of the use of radiation, but it is enormously expensive and embraces some problems that only a mathematician can explain. It was explained to me that however frequently radiation was applied to each generation of an insect, some insects would in some way escape it.

Problems are still apparent, so that radiation has not been undertaken on any large scale at present, but it is possible that before long it will be a significant factor. If fruit fly can be controlled until a break-through occurs, every penny we have spent will be well spent. Another line of research has been biological control, and two or three parasites from places such as Hawaii have been tried at Coffs Harbour and elsewhere in New South Wales with encouraging results. However, no break-through has occurred to indicate the end of the fruit fly problem. An officer of my department is studying this research and, incidentally, his information will be valuable in combating other horticultural insect pests.

Mr. Riches: Has aerial spraying prevented fruit fly anywhere?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It has been tried in parts of the United States, but it has problems. We would have received widespread protests if it had been used in the metropolitan area. By injudicious use of the spray plant, several motor cars have been sprayed, and incidents like this cause trouble. However, these incidents are kept to a minimum and the gangs are extremely careful. If aerial spraying were used motor cars and other equipment might be damaged and, in addition, the department, no doubt, would be blamed for every budgerigar, goldfinch and pet that died within 12 months of the spraying. It has been decided not to use aerial spraying at present, although it could be used in certain conditions. I thank honourable members for supporting this Bill.

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

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1962.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal purpose is to legalize the practice adopted by certain firms, purchasing cattle without an agent, of deducting cattle duty from the price payable to the owner. Section 12 of the principal Act provides that, on the sale of cattle, the owner or agent must, under penalty, take certain steps one of which is the deduction of cattle duty from the proceeds of the sale. However, several firms purchase cattle direct from the owners, without the intervention of any agent in the transaction. In order that they will be entitled to compensation if the animal is later condemned, they have been deducting the duty payable from the purchase price, and either affixing duty stamps to the account sales or subsequently submitting a return to the Agriculture Department. There is, however, no legal justification for the deduction; it is the owner or his agent and not the purchaser who is required to pay the duty. Where an owner sells directly to a purchaser, however, it is convenient for the purchaser to pay the duty and deduct the amount from the purchase price.

Clause 4 inserts a new section 12a into the principal Act to legalize this practice in the case of a purchaser who is granted a permit for the purpose. (This corresponds with the necessity for an agent, if there is one, to obtain a permit under the provisions of section 12.) Subsections (3) and (4) of the new section require the purchaser to pay the cattle duty by choosing one of two alternatives. He may affix cattle duty stamps to the account sales and send them to the owner within seven days. This is the practice adopted by purchasers carrying on business in a small way. The alternative procedure, appropriate to large businesses, is for the purchaser to specify the duty payable in the account sales and submit a return to the Minister within the time fixed by the Minister when granting the permit.

Subsection (5) is a machinery provision. Subsection (6) provides for the purchase price to be reduced by the amount of the duty and subsection (7) provides for an offence if the purchaser neglects to pay the duty or does not comply with the conditions of his permit. Generally, these new provisions are on similar lines to the amendments made in 1962. The amendments contained in clause 3 are clerical corrections to amendments made in 1962. Honourable members will see that this non-controversial Bill, far from being a hindrance, will be a convenience.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Swine Compensation Act, 1936-1962.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has a similar purpose to that of the Cattle Compensation Act Amendment Bill which has been introduced. Clause 4 inserts new section 13a into the principal Act providing for the payment of swine duty by a purchaser, in the same terms as the corresponding provision in the Cattle Compensation Act Amendment Bill. Clause 3 makes certain corrections of a drafting nature to amendments made in 1962.

Mr. BYWATERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Order of the Day No. 10: The Treasurer to move:

That he have leave to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australian Gas Company's Act, 1861-1952.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): As this Bill has been introduced in the Legislative Council, I move that this Order of the Day be now read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.14 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 25, at 2 p.m.