

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 7, 1964.

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

NEW MEMBER FOR SEMAPHORE.

Mr. REGINALD EDWIN HURST, to whom the Oath of Allegiance was administered by the Speaker, took his seat in the House as member for the district of Semaphore, in place of Mr. Harold Leslie Tapping (deceased).

QUESTIONS.

KARRI.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier's attention been drawn to a circular from the South Australian section of the Western Australian Timber Promotional Committee concerning the reduction of the sizes of Western Australian karri used for building. As this could result in reductions in the sizes of timber provided in the Building Act, will the Premier submit this matter to the Building Act Advisory Committee for investigation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have seen the document referred to by the Leader, and it is being examined. As a matter of interest, South Australia was the first State in the Commonwealth to develop the use of karri for such purposes as roofing. Its use has always been permissible under Housing Trust contracts, although some builders prefer to use oregon because it is easier to handle. While oregon is dearer, some savings can be made by using it. I notice from the document that the association claims that karri can be used in thinner sections than can oregon, but I believe that that claim would have to be examined because karri is always used in an undried condition; therefore, so that it will not shift or warp, substantial sections have to be used.

BALING TWINE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A few days ago the Commonwealth member for Wakefield (Mr. Kelly) alleged in the House of Representatives that the Australian Rope, Cordage and Twine Association was conducting a restrictive trade practice to force up costs of baling twine to farmers. The member for Wakefield stated that in his district a trader (who incidentally is in my district) had built up a large business and could sell 40 or 50 tons of baling twine a year. This trader was prepared to give generous discounts to purchasers of twine, but,

if he did, the Australian Rope, Cordage and Twine Association would withhold supplies of twine from him. Will the Premier take up this matter with the Prices Commissioner to see whether the Australian Rope, Cordage, and Twine Association is maintaining the retail price of baling twine at an excessively high level, and whether a price reduction is justified?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will refer this matter to the Prices Commissioner for a report, and take any action that is considered necessary.

DANGEROUS DRUG.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In the *Advertiser* on Monday last a letter to the Editor appeared which, in part, stated:

Sir Lorimer Dods, honorary director of the Children's Medical Research Foundation, is reported (1/10/64) as saying that certain drugs readily available to pregnant women could cause blindness in their babies.

The article goes on to express concern at the fact that the learned lecturer did not state the name of that drug. I understand that in South Australia the utmost care is taken by the Health Department to see that no such drugs are made available to the public. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, give an assurance to that effect to relieve the minds of the general public, particularly those of our womenfolk?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A competent committee makes recommendations to Cabinet on the control of all drugs that might be in any way dangerous, and I assure the honourable member that no recommendation from it has ever been held up by Cabinet for one minute. So that this matter can be given wide publicity I shall obtain a report on the letter to which the honourable member referred and try to ascertain the name of the drug concerned. I shall also endeavour to give a specific assurance on the control of that drug. This will probably take until some time next week but as soon as I have the information I shall inform the honourable member.

BAROSSA VALLEY TOURS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: On November 14 last year I asked the Premier whether he would take up with the Transport Control Board the granting of licences to enable all-road bus tours to operate from the metropolitan area to the Barossa Valley, in the interests of tourists wishing to visit that delectable part

of the State. On February 18 this year the Premier informed me, in answer to a question, that the board had intimated that it would consider the granting of such licences as from October 1 this year. Can the Premier say whether the Transport Control Board has granted any such licences and, if it has, what are the particulars of those licences?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In reply to the first question, the board has granted licences; secondly, the licences were effective from October 1 last; thirdly, the licences were issued to Ansett-Pioneer, Barossa Line Coach Services, Bonds Aust. Scenic Tours

Proprietary Limited, Government Tourist Bureau, Langs Motor Service, Nuriootpa Community Services Proprietary Limited, and Wright's Tourist Services. The board received seven applications. It was considered that the number of tourists offering would be insufficient for each applicant to be granted unlimited authority, as public inconvenience could thereby be caused, due to several operators each having insufficient to make a tour. In an endeavour to assist each applicant, it was decided to approve seven licences being issued but with specific days of operation as set out below:

Licencee.	Days of operation.
Ansett-Pioneer	Sundays and Tuesdays.
Barossa Line Coach Services	Saturdays and Sundays.
Bonds Aust. Scenic Tours Pty. Ltd.	Saturdays and Thursdays.
Government Tourist Bureau	Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays.
Langs Motor Service	Wednesdays.
Nuriootpa Community Services Pty. Ltd.	Mondays to Saturdays.
Wright's Tourist Services	Fridays.

Barossa Valley tours have in the past been co-ordinated with rail at Nuriootpa. The sole booking office has been the Government Tourist Bureau, with Nuriootpa Community Services Ltd. performing the road tours in the valley.

MOUNT GAMBIER RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, a reply to my recent question regarding the Adelaide to Mount Gambier rail service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the question of providing air-conditioned carriages for the night passenger train between Adelaide and Mount Gambier has been considered from time to time. However, as the cost of providing such equipment is very heavy and the patronage of the train small, it has been concluded that the expenditure could not be justified. The department will, however, continue to review the position from time to time.

MATRICULATION COURSES.

Mr. LAUCKE: In the past all high schools in South Australia, both large and small, have provided facilities for students to matriculation level. It is now intended, as from 1966, to have a five-year matriculation course in our secondary school system. Concern has been expressed to me that some of the smaller country high schools, under the five-year matriculation plan, may not qualify to provide fifth year

studies. Can the Minister of Education say whether those fears which are now being entertained by such high schools as Birdwood are justified? High schools such as that, since their establishment, have provided their students with facilities to pursue studies to university matriculation level. Can the Minister say whether a minimum number of students will be necessary in the fifth year to qualify any given high school for provision of the five-year matriculation course?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The whole question of establishing the fifth year or matriculation classes in our secondary schools in 1966 is at present being closely examined by the Director of Education and the Superintendents of High Schools and Technical High Schools, but it will not be possible for me to announce any firm decision for some time yet. It will be necessary to impose some minimum number in country schools, but I cannot say how large or small the minimum number will be. I am most anxious for as many country high schools to be included as possible, but one or two factors are involved in this. One of those factors is the supply of qualified secondary teachers in 1966. Although many of our students, both men and women, will graduate from the university and from our three teachers colleges at the end of 1964 and 1965, there will still not be an ample supply of qualified secondary teachers in 1966, and matriculation classes are rather extravagant in their use of highly

qualified teachers because the classes split up into subclasses with a very small number (in some cases only one, two or three) studying one particular subject. Secondly, the Director of Education and his senior officers have to consider whether it is in the best educational interests of the children if they are in a very small class, as the question arises then whether they can receive the most effective teaching and proper competition. There are advantages and disadvantages of having these classes established in the small country high schools. I would much prefer to run the risk of that and establish as many as possible. I cannot come to any firm decision at present.

CITY TRAFFIC.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier seen a report in yesterday's *Advertiser* to the effect that the Adelaide City Council is considering eliminating some parking meters, fruit barrows and news-stands from Rundle Street as a result of a request from traders (big businesses) in Rundle Street? These barrows have satisfied a public demand for years and have served the people well. First, in the event of the City Council's agreeing to these suggestions, which are bound up with one-way or two-way traffic in Rundle Street, will the by-laws be considered in Parliament or can the City Council make its own by-laws in this regard without their being considered by Parliament? Secondly, in the event of the fruit barrows and news-stands being banned in Rundle Street, will compensation be payable to their owners, either by the traders or the Adelaide City Council? Thirdly, can a report be obtained from the Police Commissioner on one-way or two-way traffic in Rundle Street?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member has included a number of associated matters in his question. I believe that the by-law would have to be considered by Parliament for ratification. The Government has given the Adelaide City Council permission to do one or two things by resolution. I believe that the City Council can regulate its one-armed bandits by resolution and that this matter does not have to come before Parliament for approval. However, the City Council's normal by-laws would have to come before Parliament for approval and the by-law in question would probably come under this heading. I will check that, and see whether I am correct. I have not seen any proposals for compensation and I do not think the Adelaide

City Council intends to pay it. However, I am going on the report referred to by the honourable member; I have no special information on the matter. It appears to me that the recommendation being considered by the council was made by Rundle Street traders who were attempting to remove some obstructions from the street so that more people would be able to visit their stores. I did not see any suggestion of compensation for the barrow owners if the barrows are removed. With regard to the honourable member's third question, I shall be pleased to get him a report from the Police Commissioner.

UPPER STURT PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns new lavatories for the Upper Sturt Primary School. I have a letter dated September 14, which bears the signatures of 28 parents, pointing out that the present lavatories have been condemned by the Central Board of Health, but that the department has been loath to authorize or request new lavatories because of the possible move of the school to another site. The letter says, in part:

The parents of the Upper Sturt school view the matter with grave concern, and they have, I feel, put forward a very good suggestion to the Education Department that as there is no reticulated water system here to operate a septic system the parents have asked for a 2,000 gallon storage tank to be filled with catchment water during the winter months. Should this be insufficient to last through the summer, the parents have guaranteed to cart and supply water free of charge.

I also have a letter dated September 25 signed by Mr. Campbell, whose signature appears on the letter from which I have just quoted. The letter states:

Since writing the enclosed letter, I have been informed that the Education Department has called for tenders to build new toilets at the Upper Sturt school. I believe that these toilets are to be of the same old pit type system as we already have. This decision to me and the undersigned parents is most distressing.

He goes on to point out the danger of disease. His letter concludes:

I have been informed that the school committee has given the Education Department their assurance that they will, with the help of the local E.F.S. keep the water supply up free of charge should they decide on the more hygienic septic system.

Can the Minister of Education say whether the information contained in the second letter is correct: that the old pit-system lavatories are

to be installed at the school? If it is correct, would it be possible to have the decision to install those lavatories reviewed with a view to accepting the suggestion of the parents and installing a more hygienic up-to-date septic system?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As I am at present informed, I would say that the honourable member's assumption was correct. The Director of the Public Buildings Department has reported that it is proposed to improve the existing toilets by the provision of a 3in. concrete floor and new toilet seats. It is also proposed to erect a new toilet for the female assistant teacher. A contract was let for the above work on September 18, 1964, and this work is to commence soon. As there is no reticulated water supply at the school it is not practicable to install a septic disposal system at present. I shall be pleased to have the whole matter referred back to the Public Buildings Department to see whether the offer of the parents can be accepted.

ANDAMOOKA HOSPITAL.

Mr. LOVEDAY: This morning I received a telephone call from the contractor building the hospital at Andamooka, Mr. Drayton. He informs me that he managed to get through from Andamooka with a four-wheel drive vehicle at the weekend, but that lagoons on the track, which are half a mile wide, will take a considerable time to drain away. He is anxious to get about 50 tons of material through to Andamooka. He has approached the Engineering and Water Supply Department and officers from the department say that they are going to extricate their equipment from Andamooka, but do not intend to do anything else. I understand that the track on the other side of Andamooka station, which runs along the edge of the creek, and in the creek bed in places, has been severely washed away. Will the Minister of Works take steps to help the contractor get the materials through so that he may proceed with the building of the hospital?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will discuss this matter with the Engineer-in-Chief at the first opportunity, either this afternoon or tomorrow morning, to see whether there is any solution to the problem. I do not suppose that the best will in the world on the part of the road gang can drain the water away from low-lying places. If the necessity to repair washed-out creeks is delaying the contractor, perhaps that can be attended to.

JUSTICES.

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that it is not the practice or policy of the Attorney-General's Department to appoint retired police officers to the commission of the peace. The present shortage of magistrates has meant extra work for justices in many local courts, and such officers as I have mentioned would possess excellent knowledge of the procedure of court work, would be an asset to the administration of justice, and would add to the number of justices now available. Will the Minister of Education ask the Attorney-General whether it is the policy of the Attorney-General's Department not to appoint retired senior police officers to the commission of the peace? If it is the policy, what is the reason for such non-appointment, and will the Attorney-General consider the appointment of such persons in future?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to refer the three questions to the Attorney-General and obtain a reply soon.

UPPER MURRAY BRIDGE.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked during the debate on the Estimates about the planning for a second bridge across the upper reaches of the Murray River?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the planning of a second bridge crossing in the Upper Murray area is proceeding. However, its progress is being governed by the limited number of experienced staff available for this type of major investigation work. It appears that detailed topographical surveys, including borings, etc., will be required at several sites before a final decision can be made. As soon as practicable, recommendations will be made for the interim planning schemes to be discussed with representatives of the various councils concerned. At the present rate of progress such meetings will be at least six months hence, unless other works which are considered to be more urgent, are deferred in preference to this project.

VEHICLE NUMBER PLATES.

Mr. HARDING: An article in yesterday's *News* stated:

Reflective number plates show their value: an impressive demonstration of the advantages of the new type of reflective number plate for motor vehicles was attended by the police, the Road Traffic Board, representatives of the

Motor Vehicles Department and press in the Hackney area last week. The plates were shown to be effective in five different important spheres, and the Commissioner of Police, Mr. J. G. McKinna, who attended the demonstration, said he would like to see the reflective plates introduced immediately.

Has the Premier any information on this matter, and if he has not, will he obtain a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, attended a demonstration of these plates. He has reported to Cabinet that the plates are extremely good, that the number could be seen at night at a great distance and at an acute angle. The plates are distinctly better than anything being used at present. Indeed, he has considered recommending to Cabinet that it should supply the plates to certain categories of vehicles at Government expense where the Government is supplying plates for certain types of transport. That suggestion is being considered, although I do not know whether it will be approved. The cost is not excessive but the new plates are not as cheap as those now in use. The Government would not contemplate compelling vehicle owners to change over to the new plates at this stage.

Mr. Loveday: Are they legal now?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The Minister of Roads was most impressed by the demonstration. The matter will be considered so that action can be taken when future amendments are being made to the Road Traffic Act, in which case, the new plates would be introduced gradually. The plates have been examined by the Government and it favours their use on certain types of transportation, particularly on heavy vehicles. Numerous accidents have occurred where these vehicles are stationary, and these new plates are so well illuminated that they would provide protection for both the stationary and the oncoming vehicle.

PORT RIVER CAUSEWAY.

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question about when the causeway linking LeFevre Peninsula to the mainland will be opened and available for public use?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the Highways Department is at present waiting for lighter material to place on the bridge on the causeway. Up to date the contractor has been

unable to supply this material. It is anticipated that the Bower Road causeway will be opened for traffic at the end of this month or early November.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Premier further information in reply to my recent question about the suggested construction of the Merriton to Crystal Brook railway line?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A report from the Railways Commissioner states:

The question of diverting the railway between Merriton and Port Pirie to a new route via Crystal Brook is bound up with the proposal to provide a standard gauge connection to Adelaide. The Commonwealth Railways Commissioner, in collaboration with the South Australian Railways Commissioner, is to prepare a report, but it is understood that as yet little progress has been made. Consequently, it is not possible, at this juncture, to comment on the likelihood of the line being diverted through Crystal Brook. The Premier, in his reply to Mr. Heaslip, also referred to the possibility of the adoption of a route between Cockburn and Broken Hill alternative to that of the Silverton Tramway Company. The South Australian Railways has been authorized to undertake surveys on behalf of the Commonwealth. While this work is in hand, investigations are not advanced sufficiently to indicate whether a new route will be worth while.

TEACHING APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. BYWATERS: On February 20 this year I drew the attention of the Minister of Education to school teachers' new appointments and to certain chaotic conditions that arose when teachers received notice of their appointments late in the school vacation, and were subsequently rushed at the final stages of the vacation to move into new dwellings before school resumed. In fact, I believe that this year some teachers were not able to move in before school actually started. Has this position been corrected?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am assured that the position has been corrected and that it will not arise next year.

CEMENT.

Mr. HALL: Recently a reseller of cement contacted me and expressed concern over certain aspects of the present shortage of cement. He had heard that cement was still being exported from some South Australian works to Victoria and that we, in turn, were importing cement from Victoria. He asked whether the quotas, which apparently have been established for the supply of cement to resellers, were fixed on the lowest usage basis of the past

year. In addition, he asked whether Government and local government works were receiving priority over the normal users of cement. Has the Premier information on the basis of the quota and the Victorian sales, and can he say whether the Government and councils receive priority?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: South Australia has been exporting large quantities of cement to Victoria over the last four or five years. This has been a regular trade because the productive capacity of this State has been much greater than the quantity required by the local consumer. Because of repairs to certain plant here, supplies were affected but it was impossible for the companies concerned to break their obligations with Victoria. A list of those obligations was shown to me and, although quite small, they were nevertheless obligations which the companies thought should not be broken. The price was increased in Victoria by £1 a ton, I believe. As far as I know, no cement is coming into this State from Victoria. I believe that a shortage of cement exists in all Australian States at present; I do not know the position in Western Australia, but a grave shortage exists in New South Wales and also in Queensland, whence much cement has been going into New South Wales. We have been helping make up the shortage in Victoria. All plants in South Australia are now working and the position here has improved radically, I understand. I have received no complaints from anyone concerning supplies in the last 10 days. Quotas were fixed by the companies, I believe, on the basis of usage. As far as I know, the Government has enjoyed no preference in the supply of cement. In fact, it did make a small quantity of cement (which was on hand at one of its undertakings) available to a user whose position was desperate. If the honourable member will give me the name of the person concerned I shall be pleased to see whether I can in any way help him with his requirements.

PETROL.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier any information in reply to the question I asked yesterday concerning a statement by the Commonwealth Minister for Trade and Industry (Mr. McEwen) that the price of petrol in rural areas would be reduced to within 4d. of capital city prices?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have examined this matter and, since the honourable member asked his question, I have

received a letter from the Commonwealth authorities concerning it. The matter arose at the time of the last Commonwealth elections when the Government stated that, as one of its election policies, petrol in outback areas would be reduced to within 4d. of capital city prices. However, the Commonwealth Government has been faced with considerable difficulty in implementing this plank of its policy, because, in the first place, it has no constitutional power in this matter. However, I have been asked to attend a conference in Canberra and I understand that the proposal will be that the States be reimbursed for implementing this policy. In other words, the States would disburse the necessary subsidy to enable petrol to be sold in outback areas at a reduced price, and the Commonwealth would reimburse the States. I presume this would be in accordance with section 96 of the Commonwealth Constitution, which seems to be the "common carrier" for all sorts of policy matters. Actually, this matter will not greatly concern South Australia, because the number of places where the margin would be more than 4d. above city prices would be few or, rather, only a small quantity would be involved where the margin was more than 4d. above the city price. I think the honourable member's district, and possibly that of the member for Whyalla, may take in areas that would be involved, but most of the State does not come within the scope of the Commonwealth Government's plan. However, I have agreed to go to Canberra to discuss the matter when the conference is called.

BARLEY.

Mr. McANANEY: Last week the Barley Board announced a second advance of 1s. 6d. for malting grade and 1s. 3d. for other types. It has been the board's custom in the past to pay a flat rate for the second and succeeding advances. Could the Minister of Agriculture ascertain the reason for the differential on this occasion?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Barley Board for a statement on this matter.

PORT PIRIE CHANNEL.

Mr. McKEE: During the Budget debate I again raised the question of the necessity to deepen the approach channel at Port Pirie. In view of the recent expansion of the wheat silos and the proposed development at the Broken Hill Associated Smelters, and, bearing

in mind that standardization is on the way, can the Minister of Marine say whether his department has considered the problem confronting Port Pirie regarding this channel? If it has, can he say what the department has in mind?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member states, it is not very long since he asked me about this matter, and I think I told him then what the position was. I can report nothing further at this stage. We have just recently concluded a most extensive deepening programme at Port Pirie. The approach channel, as the honourable member knows better than I, is very long, and the cost of deepening the channel still further through its entire length, which would be necessary if it were to be deepened so as to make it efficacious, would be enormous. On the last occasion we spent £1,500,000 in deepening there. The Port Pirie problem, therefore, in common with the problem at several of our other ports, is causing the Harbors Board and the Government much concern. At present we are busy at Wallaroo and we have commitments in the Port Adelaide River which are urgent and which have been approved by the Public Works Committee as a three-year programme of work. Those works are necessary to bring these ports, in their turn, up to a reasonable standard, although not the standard we would desire and certainly not the ultimate requirement. In fact, nobody knows what the ultimate requirements will be, because we are faced with the problem of having vessels of up to 40,000 tons—bulk carriers—operating in our ports, and their requirements of water depth and width of channel will be stringent. I assure the honourable member that this matter is receiving constant attention. I am constantly discussing with the Harbors Board ways and means of providing the best possible facilities for shipping at a cost which the State can support and which it can afford in terms of the industry through our various ports. However, at present I am not able to tell the honourable member that any programme for Port Pirie (beyond what we have achieved in the channel and beyond, of course, the work that has been going on for some time and is still going on in reorganizing the Port Pirie wharves) will be undertaken.

KEITH-PADTHAWAY POWERLINE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works an answer to my question of September 29 regarding the Keith-Padthaway powerline extension?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Electricity Trust reports that the contract for the transmission line from Keith to Padthaway has not been let, as the trust has not been able to obtain all of the required easements from land-owners. It is hoped that this matter can be satisfactorily solved and that the line can be completed within six months.

ELIZABETH WEST SCHOOL.

Mr. CLARK: On Saturday last I had the honour of officially opening a fete at the Elizabeth West school, and I noticed that the grounds were very muddy indeed. However, the headmaster told me that if they had a couple of fine days the dust would be blowing fairly freely there. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons the fete was held was to raise money for grassing. I was reminded of a conversation I had about 12 months ago with the late Mr. Jack Whitburn, a personal friend of mine and the former Superintendent of Primary Schools. Mr. Whitburn told me then that he was thinking of a scheme by which a sum, say £500, could be advanced to the school as a loan to effect this grassing of grounds and repaid to the department over a term of years. Can the Minister of Education say whether this scheme was ever considered? If it was not, could some thought be given to a scheme of that type to assist in the grassing of school grounds?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The scheme has been considered but I am advised on the best authority that I have not the power to implement such a scheme.

COMMONWEALTH SCHOLARSHIPS.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I have been approached by the parent of a young man who has a teaching scholarship at one of our major high schools in South Australia. It appears that under the terms of this scholarship the boy is, in effect, bound to the Education Department for a period of nine years, as he will do two years in school, four years at the Teachers College, and three years at teaching. The amount which he is granted at present during his Leaving year is, I understand, £55. That, Sir, precludes him, under the terms which have now been announced for the Commonwealth secondary scholarships, from participating in the Commonwealth secondary scholarships scheme. The statement issued by the Department of Social Services on this score says specifically that students may hold Commonwealth secondary scholarships concurrently

with other awards provided the other awards do not involve a bond of any kind to an authority or individual. These students under the teaching scholarship scheme are bound to the department and, therefore, are precluded from the scheme. What is more, the amount which is paid in respect of the student precludes his parents from child endowment in relation to him; they must show the amount in their taxation return, so the taxation deduction, which would otherwise be available, is not available to them; and in this particular case, as they are members of a lodge, they have to pay an extra £18 a year in order to be able to cover him for lodge benefits in view of the fact that he is in receipt of some payment. In fact, they are down the drain on the teaching scholarship. I understand that this is the only State in the Commonwealth where a bonding system of this kind applies and preclusion of students in this category from the Commonwealth secondary scholarship scheme occurs. Can the Minister of Education say whether this is so? If it is, can he say whether the scheme can be reviewed to bring us into line with the benefits in other States?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As at present advised, this is not the only State where this occurs. However, the whole position is being reviewed at present, and some amendments to our State system are involved. If the honourable member will let me have the particulars of the case he mentions I will have the matter investigated. The whole matter is being closely investigated at present, because there is no doubt that the Commonwealth scholarships, good as they may be, have cut across our system of training for teachers.

INTRASTATE AIR SERVICES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The New South Wales Government intends testing in the High Court the validity of the Commonwealth Government's action to license intrastate air services, and the Tasmanian Government also intends to take the fullest legal steps to prevent infringement of the Sovereign rights of that State. It was reported in the press in this State that the Premier had said that the Government was opposed to the principle of the Commonwealth assuming a power that had not been ceded to it by the States. In view of the decision of the Commonwealth Government to take control of intrastate air services, can the Premier say what action the Government intends taking to protect the Sovereign rights of the people of South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday I received a letter from the Prime Minister, a copy of the regulations that the Commonwealth has promulgated, and the suggestion of the Prime Minister that the State Attorney-General be authorized to discuss the matter with the Commonwealth Attorney-General. I am not sure what grounds the discussion will cover and I have not yet had time to examine the regulations to see whether they are open to challenge or not. South Australia has never had legislation concerning intrastate air services. It has only ever had one company operating and although I have twice signified to the Commonwealth our desire to have other services, another service would have to be provided by Trans-Australia Airlines and the Commonwealth Government has not approved T.A.A.'s operating in this State.

Mr. Dunstan: They want to keep Ansett-A.N.A. a monopoly.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not actually raised this matter for Cabinet discussion about what steps would be taken, but I believe that this would not be done by a Bill in Parliament. The action has been taken by regulation and I assume that the regulation is open to challenge in Parliament. I have not checked with the Commonwealth Parliament's Standing Orders, but I assume that Commonwealth regulations are subject to disallowance by Parliament, as are regulations in this State. I believe that it could be unwise for the States to take action in the High Court before the period for the disallowance of the regulation had expired. It could be held that, as this matter was before the court, any debate on the regulation would be inadmissible at that time. I express that view firmly because, in this matter, we have to face up to realities. As I have said, it is desired to have additional services in South Australia. I am not complaining about the standard of service given by Airlines of S.A. Pty. Ltd. to those places where services have been provided. However, the member for Stuart has long desired that a service be established to Port Augusta; the member for Victoria is trying to get a service to Naracoorte; and I know that similar aspirations exist concerning Millicent and Upper Murray towns. While the Commonwealth Government controls T.A.A., it automatically controls the entry of a second service into South Australia. The second factor about this matter that I have noticed is that the regulation

applies particularly regarding the use of aerodromes, which still belong to the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: And the air corridors.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Exactly. The members for Norwood and Mitcham would realize the implications of the control of the aerodromes as a means of effectively controlling air transport within the States. Therefore, obviously the regulations are not subject to easy disallowance. The answer to the honourable member's question is that the Government has not yet considered the matter and my Cabinet would not normally consider it until the Commonwealth Parliament had had an opportunity to express its views on the acceptance or disallowance of the regulations. Then it would be considered by the State Government. As I have pointed out, we have not been successful, even without the new regulations, in getting more than one service in South Australia. Therefore, from the point of view of this State it is a matter of State rights rather than of another air service.

HIGHWAYS BUILDING.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my question concerning car parking in the new Highways Department building at Walkerville?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the work is not yet completed with respect to ground work around the building and costs are not available. In any case it would be difficult to assess, as separate debit orders were not raised for the various items which include drainage, other road works, kerbing, car parks and other installations. The car park adjoining Walkerville Terrace accommodates 125 cars. In addition, between this car park and the back of the building provision has been made for the parking of an additional 70 cars and at the front of the building there is accommodation for 50 cars, making a total of 245. It is interesting to note that the majority of bays are full nearly every day. The department's policy of keeping its vehicles from parking on the streets has been followed at Northfield and various other depots throughout the State, also.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have no objection to the parking area provided at the Highways Department's Walkerville premises, but I should like to know what is a reasonable cost

for car parking, and whether the money is being spent in this instance with no consideration of cost.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I can ask my colleague, the Minister of Roads, to supply the information, but I think the Leader has misinterpreted my previous answer. The Minister said that separate debit orders for the various sections of the work were not issued. If that is the position, how is the Minister or his Accountant to separate precisely what is involved in each part of the work? The Leader asked for the specific cost of the car parking provision. However, I am happy to see whether my colleague can segregate the actual cost. For my part, I thought the answer which the Minister had given me, and which I in turn gave the Leader, was reasonable. I have had a little to do with the administration of departments and I think I understand what the Minister meant when he gave the reply. However, I will seek the necessary information.

JURY NOTICE.

Mr. LAUCKE: My question concerns the period of notice to men called upon to serve on juries. Concern has been expressed to me by an employer that on last Friday evening notice was served on one of his key men to present himself for one month's jury service as from yesterday morning. It is only the shortness of notice that concerns the employer and the prospective jurymen. In the short time available difficulty was experienced by both parties in reorganizing the duty schedule within the industry in which the jurymen is engaged and by the jurymen in organizing his own personal affairs. Can the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, say whether consideration can be given to serving longer notice on those called upon to serve on juries?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the Attorney-General.

KEITH MAIN.

Mr. BYWATERS: As the Minister of Works knows, the member for Albert and I are interested in the progress of the Taillem Bend to Keith water main, and we have noticed pipes along the proposed route. I have been informed that these pipes are being taken by rail to Taillem Bend and then by road on departmental trucks to the points at which they are dropped. This means travelling more than half way

between the two sidings to the point of dropping. This practice is causing concern to the councils because of the heavy use of the roads, some of which are not well made. These pipes could be dropped closer to the sidings at Cooke Plains and then at Coomandook and so on, as work on the main progresses. Will the Minister ascertain from the Engineering and Water Supply Department whether the sidings could be used rather than making long road hauls that may cause damage on country roads? Also, what progress is expected this year, on the pumping station at Taillem Bend, and how much main will be completed this financial year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Referring to the last part of the question, I will get a report from the Engineer-in-Chief on the expected progress of the pumping station and main during this financial year. I know that good progress is expected, and I presume that that programme will be implemented. Referring to the first point, I assure the honourable member that the Engineer-in-Chief is careful to consider the factors of cost and road use. I am sure that the arrangements he will make will be the most economical possible. That does not mean that he will disregard the use or damage to council roads, because in the past where a council has sought some reimbursement for damage done by heavy vehicles, the department has compensated the council. The Engineer-in-Chief knows that he is not liable for this but he is morally obliged to meet such extraordinary costs incurred by councils. He would have considered all factors in determining the cartage programme. I am sure he will consider the remarks made by the honourable member and if anything has been missed in arranging the programme he will remedy it. With the experience I have had in my dealings with the organization of this department, I should think that all factors have been considered.

TORRENS RIVER COMMITTEE.

Mr. CUMBE: Some time ago I suggested that an expert and representative committee be appointed to investigate improvements to the Torrens River. Can the Minister of Works say whether that committee has been formed and has met? If it has, on what lines is it conducting its inquiry, and is it taking advantage of the present high river levels, because of the plentiful rains, to observe the effect of floodwaters on the river?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot answer the latter part of the question precisely, but the honourable member knows, as I do,

that a committee consisting of the Engineer for Drainage (Mr. Ligertwood), who is probably the most experienced officer regarding the Torrens River from an engineering point of view, and senior officers of other departments, has commenced work. I have no doubt that those men will take every opportunity to observe the behaviour of the river. The answer is "Yes" to the first part of the question. I know the committee has met and has made certain investigations. It has given me a preliminary report on the first immediate objective. As yet I have not given close attention to it; but I know that the committee is working. I have asked it to inform me and the Minister of Roads, whose department is heavily involved in this matter, as to the line on which the committee is working, so that we will be fully informed.

HAWKER ROAD.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question about the Quorn-Hawker Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, informs me that the Quorn to Hawker district road is included in departmental forward planning. It is possible that the construction of this section can be commenced within a year or so. The road between Wilmington and Quorn is not yet included for early reconstruction.

FRUIT FLY.

Mr. RICHES: Has the Minister a report from his officers about the desirability and practicability of aerial spraying at Port Augusta as a preventive measure against the outbreak of fruit fly?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Agriculture Department has given serious thought to the possibility of aerial spraying with insecticide over the City of Port Augusta both during eradication campaigns and as a routine preventive measure against further outbreaks of Mediterranean fruit fly. For several reasons, aerial spraying has not been attempted.

Blanket spraying of insecticide from the air would cover all roofs and lead to some contamination of rainwater tanks. In addition, problems would arise from spray residues on cars and laundry on clothes lines. Similarly, the possible danger to poultry, birds and fish and other pets would have to be taken into account. With adequate precautions all of these difficulties could be minimized but responsibility would have to be accepted for claims for damages likely to arise from aerial spraying.

The main limitations are those of flying hazards. First, the aircraft would need to fly as close to the ground as possible. In the case of Port Augusta, television aeriads are in most cases 40ft. to 60ft. high. At this height there appears considerable doubt as to whether the spray will reach the trees in droplet form but will dry out before reaching the ground and drift away from the flight path, thereby rendering the application ineffective.

Secondly, the Department of Civil Aviation has laid down maximum heights at which an aircraft can fly over town areas. This distance is at present much too high to be effective. At the present height laid down a twin-engined aircraft is stipulated. As far as is known no twin-engined crop dusters are operating in Australia.

Thirdly, in the case of a crash in which private property is damaged an authority to assume responsibility is required. This would have to be accepted by the Agriculture Department. The department is attempting to implement this procedure.

BARLEY SILOS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Agriculture information concerning the 1964 programme of building bulk barley silos by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have received a letter from the General Manager of the Barley Board, which states:

The estimated completion dates of the under-mentioned silos as advised to us by the S.A. Co-op. Bulk Handling Limited today are:

Eyre Peninsula—Lock, October 15, 1964; Rudall, November 10, 1964; Yeelanna, December 1, 1964.

Mainland—Owen, October 31, 1964; Bute, November 15, 1964; Lameroo, November 15, 1964; Karoonda, December 1, 1964. It is not anticipated that completion of the silos will extend beyond the dates mentioned.

PARA WIRRA RESERVE.

Mr. LAUCKE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning the condition of the access road from Modbury to the Para Wirra National Reserve?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, states:

The volume of traffic on the Smithfield-Modbury main road has increased since the Para Wirra National Reserve has been opened up. As the Snake Gully section of the road is very steep and substandard, a new route has been selected to improve the grading. A survey is necessary before acquisition plans can be prepared for the purchase of land required

for the new road, and in the meantime funds are provided to the District Council of Tea Tree Gully to keep the existing road surface in as good condition as possible. It is not practicable to carry out major improvements on the existing road, as the expenditure would be heavy. Plans are also being prepared for the reconstruction of the road from the Main North Road to the Para Wirra reserve, which will help to relieve the traffic on the Smithfield-Modbury road to Para Wirra.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works information on the progress of plans for a water supply for the township of Watervale?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer for Water Supply has submitted the following report to the Engineer-in-Chief:

Investigations into a proposed water supply for Watervale from underground sources have been carried out by the Mines Department which has previously drilled two unsuccessful bores at a total cost of £5,500. In your report of April 21, 1964, you considered one more attempt should be made to obtain a successful bore and the matter was referred to the Director of Mines who has advised in the enclosed letter dated September 21, 1964, that one site has been selected on section 331, hundred of Upper Wakefield, and an alternative site on section 752. The preferred site is section 331 and the Director of Mines has estimated that the cost of drilling a bore here would be £2,200. He has also suggested drilling three observation bores at an estimated cost of £1,500. However, I think that a decision regarding observation bores could be deferred until the main bore is completed. Accordingly, at this stage, I recommend approval for an expenditure of £2,200 for the purpose of drilling a bore on section 331.

I have received the docket on this matter and have approved the expenditure of £2,200 required to sink the bore.

SALT LEASES.

Mr. RICHES: The House will remember that negotiations took place over a considerable time to develop salt leases immediately south of Port Augusta, in order to meet the requirements of the Japanese market. Can the Premier say whether a market still exists in Japan for salt? Secondly, can he make a statement regarding negotiations for production on the leases concerned? Thirdly, has work on the surveying and development of harbour facilities progressed, or has it been terminated?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Negotiations with the Leslie Salt Company of the United States of America broke down, and that company withdrew from the original proposal (which had come before the House for consideration and had been approved). In

the meantime, negotiations have been opened with another American company. If the second company comes in it will require deeper water than was provided for in the first proposal, for it operates ships of very large capacity. I do not know how far negotiations between the Hooker interests and that company have progressed.

The answer to the honourable member's first question is that the salt market of Japan is very big and permanent, for Japan imports more than 2,000,000 tons of salt every year. However, it is also a very competitive market and one of the problems regarding the Leslie Salt Company was that it felt that, with freer conditions becoming available, mainland China might again supply the Japanese market. As the honourable member realizes, that is a much nearer source of supply than is Port Augusta. Negotiations are proceeding with a large American company, and we have told that company that we will supply it with a deep berth if it is interested in proceeding with the undertaking. However, I am not sure to just what extent the Hooker interests and the American company have agreed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STAMP
DUTIES AND MOTOR VEHICLES)
BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE:
HUNDREDS OF FISHER AND RIDLEY.

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

That the resumption of those portions of the travelling stock reserve in the hundreds of Fisher and Ridley, in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1960, and shown on the plan laid before Parliament on June 10, 1964, be approved.

The stock reserve in question is the only remaining portion, between Morgan and Murray Bridge, of a stock reserve which formerly extended from the north of the State to the South-East, although there is also a portion of it left between Morgan and Burra. The reserve extends from the northern boundary of the hundred of Fisher to the northern boundary of section 345, hundred of Ridley—that is, a distance of about 15½ miles in a southerly direction. An aboriginal reserve (section 112, hundred of Fisher) breaks the contiguity of this travelling stock reserve. The area of the stock reserve involved in the proposal is about 2,272 acres. The reserve varies in width from

35 chains to about 15 chains and abuts the western bank of the River Murray for a distance of about 95 chains. It is a considerable time since the reserve was used for travelling stock, and it does not appear that any good purpose is being served by retaining this remaining land as a travelling stock reserve. The District Councils of Marne and Sedan and the Stockowners' Association of South Australia all support the proposal. In the light of these circumstances, therefore, I ask members to approve of the motion for closing the whole area.

Motion carried.

BRANDING OF PIGS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 914.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support this Bill. I point out that what the Bill provides for is a departure from normal procedure. There is another Act dealing with the branding of stock, but that Act makes it purely optional for the stock-owner to have his stock branded. The present Bill makes branding compulsory and, of course, there is a reason for this. The present proposal has been asked for by the pig breeders themselves, who are most anxious for this legislation to operate. The Minister, in explaining the Bill, told us that the main reason for this Bill is that if a pig is found to be diseased it can be traced to its owner. For a long time the Swine Compensation Act has provided that owners and breeders of pigs can pay into a fund for the purpose of being compensated when they find that their pigs have contracted diseases, and that is something that has been a protection for pig breeders and something which they value.

It is apparent that there are times when it is difficult to trace the origin of diseases in pigs, and this Bill will simplify matters in that respect. The operative clause is clause 5, which states:

On and after a day to be fixed by proclamation a person shall not sell or offer for sale a pig unless within seven days before the sale or offer the pig has been branded in the prescribed manner and in the prescribed position with the registered pig brand of which that person is the proprietor.

A penalty of £100 is prescribed for non-compliance with that provision. The purpose behind the Bill is a good one, and I consider that it will be accepted by most pig breeders. I have spoken to some people who are in only a small way, with perhaps just a small number of pigs as a sideline, and I think that mainly they accept this provision and agree that it

is necessary. However, some people are a little concerned about what fee will be charged. Clause 12 states that regulations may be made regarding fees and other matters relating to the administration of the legislation. I support the second reading, but in Committee I shall move the amendment that is on the file in my name.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I, too, support the second reading. The branding of pigs is a twofold protection. First, as the Bill states conclusively, it is a protection with regard to the finding of disease. As pigs are readily prone to disease, the branding of pigs will make it easy for the owner of a diseased pig to be detected. The Bill will also facilitate the selling of pigs by owners. I have been on the wrong end of the stick in selling pigs at the Metropolitan Abattoirs. I received an incorrect price for pigs that I had sold. My pigs had not been sold under my name and I received the sum paid for another owner's pigs. This could easily happen then because there were antiquated means of pig-marking such as the clipping of hair on the back, sides or rump of a pig. Of course, pigs rubbed against the sides of trucks and this obliterated the mark made on them. I believe that the tattoo brand will be acceptable to everyone concerned in the pig industry.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I join with other members in supporting the second reading. I have a personal interest in the branding of pigs and I believe that it will be to the advantage of the pig industry for pigs to be branded. I understand that the Minister has been approached on this matter by the Pig Producers of Australia. This body also felt that pigs should be marked. Many producers and breeders will, perhaps, not accept this provision kindly because they will have to do another job. However, I am convinced that it will be in the producers' interests to have the branding of pigs made compulsory. It has been explained that the main reason for introducing the Bill is to enable the departmental officer to trace disease in the pig industry. Diseases in many animals cannot be detected until the animal has been slaughtered and the carcass hung. In the past, disease has been difficult to detect in a pig until the pig has been slaughtered. From experience I know that pigs have been sold to a curer and, after they have been slaughtered, disease has been detected in one of them. However, as the pig had no brand on it the disease could not be traced.

I believe that the branding of pigs could be a means of bringing piggeries to a better standard. If the departmental officers were able to trace certain diseases in pigs this would mean that owners of piggeries would be able to operate them under better conditions and standards. Clause 5 deals with the branding of pigs and outlines what should be done in respect to the duties of pig owners. It also relates to the brands. The second part of the clause states that if a pig is branded when it is purchased and if the purchaser sells it again within seven days he does not have to re-brand the pig. Perhaps this time could be extended to 14 days. I presume that this clause is inserted in the Bill with regard to a person who wants to deal in the pig industry. I say that because I believe that if clause 11 were put into operation it would be an easy matter to trace a disease detected in a pig. If this measure becomes effective every pig will have a brand. A breeder of pigs is not able to sell a pig until it is at least six weeks old because, until then, it has to be on its mother. Therefore, all pigs from the initial breeders' point of view, will have a brand on them.

If clause 11 operates, disease in pigs will be able to be traced. It may not be as easy as if all pigs were branded, but I believe that the initial branding will enable the disease to be detected. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) referred to the fact that the Swine Compensation Act was in force, that a charge was made for every pig sold, and that this went into a fund. If the incidence of the disease in pigs can be reduced by the implementation of this Bill by branding pigs it could be of great advantage with regard to the Swine Compensation Act and, perhaps, the sum paid on each pig could even eventually be reduced. I believe the Bill will be of great advantage to the pig industry and, therefore, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Duty to brand pigs before sale."

Mr. BYWATERS: I move to insert the following subclause:

(3) Notwithstanding subsection (1) of this section, a person may sell or offer for sale a pig which is not branded in accordance with that subsection if he is the holder of a permit issued in that behalf by the Chief Inspector of Stock appointed under the Stock Diseases Act, 1934-1962. The Chief Inspector may, upon application therefor, issue a permit under this subsection if he is satisfied that the applicant owns not more than three pigs.

Frequently, people who are not generally in the industry keep a pig or two. These people send the pig to the butcher or the factory and receive back portion of the treated and cured carcass for their use and the other portion is retained for the cost of treatment. In these circumstances there will be a direct knowledge of the owner of the pig and it will be easy to ascertain whence the pig came should it be diseased. I am sure there is adequate protection for the people concerned as they will need a permit from the Chief Inspector of Stock who, if in doubt, can refuse the permit. The amendment gives him power to exempt this type of person should he think it necessary.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): This is a good amendment and I support it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—“Regulations.”

Mr. BYWATERS: What are the prescribed registration fees?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot say, as this matter has not been discussed up to the present, but I am sure that it will be a modest fee. The regulations can be discussed in Parliament, and there will be no difficulty over this matter.

Clause passed.

Clause 13 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT. BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 29. Page 1107.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill and have little need to detain the House in so doing. This legislation, to become effective, is dependent on complementary legislation being passed by the Commonwealth Parliament, but I understand that arrangements have been made between the State and Commonwealth Governments for this. I sincerely hope that the complementary legislation will pass the Commonwealth Parliament this session. A month or six weeks ago the President and Secretary of the Meat Inspectors Association saw me, and on the same day or the day after I asked a question of the Minister of Agriculture about this matter. He told me that legislation would be introduced, and subsequently I relayed that information to the

association. I have spoken with these men since and they inform me that this legislation is precisely what they have been seeking for a long time and, accordingly, it suits them.

I believe that no less a person than the Leader of the Opposition recommended the introduction of legislation of this nature a considerable time ago, and it is good to see that the Government has given consideration to his views. The principal reason for this legislation, and the need for it, is that Commonwealth inspectors are required to inspect meat for export, and rather than have two sets of inspectors it is provided that the Commonwealth will take over the inspectors employed by the Abattoirs Board and by the State Government. These men will become Commonwealth public servants, and the inspections that have to be done for State purposes will be performed by the Commonwealth inspectors. The State will reimburse the Commonwealth for that part of the work done when inspectors are working on purely State inspections. I am glad to see that matters such as seniority and proper protection are being provided for those inspectors who will be taken over by the Commonwealth. I commend the Bill and hope that the Commonwealth legislation will be introduced and passed soon.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the Bill for two reasons. For many years primary-producer organizations have been asking for it because they believe there has been an overlapping and a duplication of the service by having two sets of inspectors. They consider that this will represent a considerable saving. The other reason is that uniform grading has not existed between States in connection with the export market and lambs from Western Australia, South Australia and the various other States have been graded differently. With the Commonwealth inspector to keep gradings more uniform between States, this will greatly benefit the export market. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I join with other honourable members in supporting this Bill and I am pleased to hear that the member for Stirling raised the point of inspection of lambs, which has been a major issue with primary producers in the past. The more uniformity that can be achieved in an industry such as this, the better it will be for everybody concerned. The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) mentioned that this matter had been raised and argued convincingly by the Leader of the Opposition about two years ago. It is

gratifying indeed, to have statements from the other side of the House that agree with Labor policy on matters of this nature. Once again we can debate a matter that was originally raised by the Leader and stress to the Government that we, too, are vitally interested in such measures. I am pleased that the Government has seen fit to bring down legislation according to the views that were expressed previously.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I thank honourable members for their support of the Bill, but I point out that no political capital is to be gained from this measure. It has long been the ambition of many people in the country to unify meat inspection, but legal difficulties have arisen, which is why it has not been raised before. I think it is fair to say that almost all sections of the community that have any interest in this matter have favoured it for a long time and I am glad that it has now become appropriate to introduce the Bill.

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

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 17. Page 915.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The provision contained in the Bill before us guaranteeing £500,000 to the Commonwealth Trading Bank is very similar to earlier measures when the Government executed a guarantee of a similar amount when South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited wished to obtain an advance of £1,000,000 from that bank. On this occasion, however, the opportunity is taken to bring barley and oats into the bulk handling procedure. Consequently it is desirable to examine the financial standing of the co-operative and the possible effects on the quality of barley and the continuation of the functions of the Barley Board. As at June 30 this year, the depreciated value of the fixed assets of the co-operative total more than £6,500,000, whereas the balance outstanding as owing to the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia, together with other sundry creditors, totals less than £1,800,000. The company has a silo construction programme of 8,170,000 bushels for 1964 and no doubt this is the main reason it is seeking the further advance of £1,000,000 from the Commonwealth Trading

Bank. In view of the asset standing of this company, I see no reason why the State Government should be obliged to guarantee its loans.

But by the same token if the bank insists on the guarantee, I do not see that the Government will incur any expenditure and consequently I support the provision contained in clause 4 to this effect. The terminology in this clause is practically identical to that which has been provided in regard to the advances on earlier occasions in that the Premier may insist upon certain terms and conditions in relation to the guarantee. The lumping of barley in bags is very heavy work which is responsible for many types of physical disorders for men engaged in this particular industry and the keeping of this operation to a minimum is, in my view, a step forward. As far as I can ascertain the growers are in favour of the bulk handling of barley and I am supported in this regard by the annual report of the co-operative for the year ended June, 1964, which states:

At June 30, 1964, 5,540 growers producing almost 15,000,000 bushels of barley had signed membership forms in support of the bulk handling of barley. This represents approximately 70 per cent of the State's barleygrowers.

As many of the barleygrowers are also wheat producers already, they have machinery on their farms which was designed for bulk handling operations. This machinery was expensive to purchase in the first place, and it is not being used in the most economical manner if some of the output from the farm is being handled in bags, with additional labour costs, whilst the machinery is lying idle. I also understand that the shippers are urging the use of bulk handling methods, and this is verified by evidence given by Mr. D. C. Martin, who is now the General Manager of the Australian Barley Board, when he appeared before the Public Works Committee in 1962 and said:

For several years it had become evident that, to charter vessels on a competitive basis for the shipping of barley, a quicker turn-round of vessels in loading was necessary. The board had in mind, firstly, erecting in-transit silos at Wallaroo and Port Lincoln, and then, subject to finance permitting, to go ahead with the erection of the silo at Port Adelaide. However, when it was seen that barleygrowers could not finance the scheme without a severe impact on their returns, the board cancelled their negotiations and then approached the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to see whether they could proceed with the scheme and the financing of same.

There is no doubt that once the grain reaches the bulk handling terminal there is a substantial saving in the time that it is necessary for the ship to remain at the wharf for loading operations. I have examined numerous statistics in an attempt to satisfy myself that the bulk handling of barley is in the interests of the State financially, but there are so many variables that comparisons are rather inconclusive. Now that many of the farmers are already equipped for bulk handling of wheat, they might be better off financially in the long run if they had bulk handling for the rest of their output. Nevertheless, the farmers must realize that with installations costing millions of pounds there must be a sufficient toll or charge in some manner to amortize the cost over the effective lives of the respective installations. To its cost, undoubtedly, this Government has had the lesson impressed upon it many times that whilst there is political capital to be gained from the announcement of costly public works, if they are proceeded with, they have to be paid for in some manner. Similarly, the costly and expensive installations being carried out by the co-operative will have to be paid for. However, the Minister of Agriculture, in his explanation of this Bill, did not see fit to inform Parliament where the bulk handling installations will be erected and what will be the capacity of the various receiving centres.

Members of the co-operative, through the annual report of the Chairman of Directors dated July 31, have already been informed that the company's building programme for 1964 comprises a capacity of 8,170,000 bushels, divided into an additional 4,950,000 bushels over five zones for wheat, 3,120,000 bushels capacity spread over three zones for barley, and a small installation of 100,000 bushels for oats at Port Lincoln. In terms of this report, the proposed locations of the barley installations are as follows:

PORT ADELAIDE DIVISION.		
Location.		Capacity. Bushels.
Owen	6-cell	370,000
Karoonda	part 10-cell	515,000
Lameroo	8-cell	500,000
PORT LINCOLN DIVISION.		
Yeelanna	10-cell	625,000
Rudall	6-cell	370,000
Lock	4-cell	240,000
WALLAROO DIVISION.		
Bute	8-cell	500,000

As with wheat, the co-operative is being granted a monopoly in the handling of barley in bulk. Whilst I am not in favour of monopolies, I

am in favour of orderly marketing, and I notice that the Barley Board is still to retain its identity as the purchasing and disposing authority for the barley output; but the co-operative is to have the sole right of handling the barley in bulk. Under the supervision and the encouragement of the Australian Barley Board, the barley industry has developed as a quality industry, which it must do if it is to measure up to the requirements of any food selling industry. There has been a most efficient sampling and grading system practised which ensures that the product is kept to as high a quality as possible and that the purchaser can be assured that if, for example, he pays for malting barley he will receive the very best grain. Of course, the quantity required for this purpose varies from year to year, but I am under the impression that about 5,000,000 bushels is required in Australia each year as malting barley, and this represents about 25 per cent of the yield during an average season. Consequently, members can see that Australian maltsters and brewers are most important customers of primary producers, and these producers should ensure that the use of bulk handling barley silos will not jeopardize the quality of the grain being purchased by these customers. As members are no doubt aware, the greater proportion of barley grown in this State is the two-row variety, supplemented by a small quantity of six-row. At present two-row barley in this State is graded into five grades, Nos. 1 to 5. Nos. 1 and 2 are reserved for malting purposes, and the best of the No. 3 supplements this if Nos. 1 and 2 are insufficient. Overseas No. 3 grade is freely used for malting when required. The balance of No. 3 with Nos. 4 and 5 grades are recognized as suitable for animal foods. I do not propose to discuss six-row barley, as the indications are that it will not be handled in bulk because of the small quantity grown.

The price paid for barley for malting is only obtainable if the receipts of barley are carefully segregated, delivered up to sample, and in good condition, otherwise the price falls to a feed level. At present in South Australia this segregation is carefully adhered to, and the five grades of two-row barley are stacked, handled, and delivered separately. This segregation is easily carried out with bagged barley stacked in stacking sites. It is more difficult to segregate into several grades in bulk than in bags because of the cost of providing a large number of silos to accommodate the five grades. Obviously, the greater number of

grades, the more silos or the more cells within existing silos are required. It is inevitable that, to economize in capital expenditure, the smallest number of silos will be erected in a district to cope with the barley harvest, and it is certain that the number of barley grades will be reduced. The indications are that for the present No. 1 grade and most of the No. 2 will be retained in bags and the No. 3 and 4 grades bulked in silos separately or together as is expedient, for that is what happened with No. 24 pool barley when 143,000 bushels of No. 3 and No. 4 grades was handled direct to bulk, whereas the rest was handled in bags. It is of interest to note that 24-pool growers received, for bag grades Nos. 3 and 4 barley, 10s. 3.76d. and 9s. 6.76d. respectively a bushel, whereas for the same barley in bulk they only received 9s. 7.48d. and 8s. 10.48d. respectively, that is, a lesser figure of 8.28d. a bushel. This I believe is a point that should be emphasized again and again to the grower that if he handles in bulk, the distribution from the Barley Board will be less and it is then for the individual grower to calculate whether he will make compensating savings on his particular farm or whether he considers that there has been sufficient reduction in heavy labouring work to justify his lower return. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, referred particularly to the fact that people using barley for malting purposes would have to erect silos to store their barley.

During the 1963-64 season, 1,200,000 bushels was handled direct to bulk in this State, but up to the present details have not been released either as to grade segregation or the comparative returns obtained by the growers handling in bags and in bulk. Possibly, in the long run, for the sake of economy in capital expenditure, grades Nos. 1 and 2 will be bulked together, the best of the present No. 3 grade being upgraded to No. 2, and the balance of No. 3 grade and No. 4 grade will be bulked together, making only two grades to be bulked. The small quantity of No. 5 may not be bulked. If this does occur it will mean a decline in the quality of the samples offered for sale and a more than equivalent decline in price. To minimize the effect of this it is essential that the grading of barley be left in the hands of the Australian Barley Board in this State and in Victoria as they have expert graders and an excellent system of grading based on experience, and it takes many years of commercial experience to learn to grade barley efficiently. What gives barley its unique value for preparation by the malting

process into human food is its capacity to germinate. If it loses this capacity it cannot be used for malting. A decline in the quality of barley for malting is reflected in the malt and products made from it, including beer and various food extracts such as vegemite.

I am particularly concerned about the quality of barley for malting purposes. Too much attention cannot be given to this matter. A high standard of beer is provided in South Australia and I understand that malt barley is used in its production as it is in the production of vegemite. I am concerned about the quality and standard of barley. When barley ceases to command its human food value its price declines to that of animal food. Bulking of barley into silos presents a great problem in the preservation of its germinating capacity and the bulk must be kept cool and aerated during storage. The drier the barley the better keeps in bulk and the critical content is 12 per cent of water.

As a matter of interest to members at this point, I will quote from the report of Mr. L. H. Heaslip (Chairman of Directors of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited) dated July 31, 1964, which states:

The Commonwealth Trading Bank further demonstrated its continuing confidence in the company by making a further advance of £1,000,000 early in the year for the purpose of building more barley silos, and it is hoped that the Barley Board will be able to make satisfactory arrangements for classification and moisture content procedures so that full use may be made in the 1964-65 and subsequent seasons of the seven country bulk barley silos now under construction. The State Government continued its solid support for the company by guaranteeing the above advance to the extent of £500,000 and the company's appreciation is expressed to all members of Parliament in this regard.

I thank Mr. Heaslip for his expression of appreciation, but I would ask the Minister of Agriculture, who introduced this Bill, or the Treasurer, if this is to be considered a financial matter, whether that guarantee has been given by the Government to the Commonwealth Trading Bank as stated, or whether we, as members of Parliament, are debating that very matter today.

Members will gather from my remarks that, although I support this Bill, I do not believe the financial benefits to be gained from the bulk handling of barley are all conclusive. Rather, I think it is a gradual trend of bulk handling taking over from the heavier bag handling of grain, and in the process, with the temperamental nature of barley, we must ensure that

the product continues to retain its high quality and a reputation that is acceptable to the consumers who use the barley for human food and malting purposes.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): Few Bills introduced into the House recently have given me more spontaneous pleasure than this Bill. My keen support stems from the experience we have had in the bulk handling of wheat in South Australia. This has been a complete success story. The bulk handling of wheat has proved to be an absolute boon to the wheat farmer and I do not doubt that it will prove to be a similar boon to the barley grower when adequate storages for the handling of bulk barley are provided. The provisions of the Bill clearly set out by the Minister in his second reading explanation, The first major provision concerns the guarantee of £500,000 to the Commonwealth Trading Bank to back the further advance by that bank of £1,000,000 to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited for the purpose of building further silos. The co-operative has for some time been negotiating with the Barley Board in this State for a scheme to handle barley, and it is good to note that so far there have been bulk barley receipts at Adelaide, Wallaroo, Port Lincoln and Ardrossan. I look forward to the time when we will have bulk silos in various country areas where barley is grown. The Minister summarized the rest of the Bill in a few words by saying:

It is to empower the company to receive, store, handle, transport and deliver not only wheat, but also barley and oats. At the same time the Bill will confer on the company sole rights in respect of barley as it now has in respect of wheat.

Looking at the general level of prices for all things these days, rarely does one see a decrease in the price of a commodity. Wheat is one of the few exceptions in recent years where, in spite of an increasing cost of production, there has been a decrease in the price of the final product.

Mr. Nankivell: Due to increased productivity?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, as well as other factors. We note an average increase of three bushels an acre written into the system of determining the price of wheat (from 14.5 bushels an acre on an all-Australian viewing to 17.5). This increase resulted in a decrease of 1.5d. a bushel in the price of wheat last December. This was a considerable decrease which led to a decrease of £2 12s. 6d. in the price of flour and a decrease in the price of mill feed, bran and pollard.

Mr. Nankivell: Was that reflected in the price of bread?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. One asks how increased productivity has a bearing on the decreased price of wheat and one wonders what else has had a part in the lowering of the cost of wheat. Efficiency in production and handling is the answer. Modern farming methods have had much to do with this situation. Different varieties of wheat being grown may also have some influence. I am speaking of wheat because I appreciate that that which applies to wheat supplies similarly to barley, and because of our past experiences with wheat we can see that the bulk handling of barley will reduce the cost of production. The reduction in the need to sew bags, and of the need to have grain stacked in bags at a time of fire hazard, is an important aspect of bulk handling. The grain can be taken up and within a short time transported from paddock to silo, and this relieves the farmer of a possible loss of his grain through fire. It reduces the cost to the producer of stacking sites and the loss from vermin attack. The costs of handling bagged wheat are substantial: first, the cost of the bag; then the sewing of that bag; then the handling of the bag as a unit; the lumping cost; the deterioration in bagged stacks through rodents and insects; and many other costs. The return to the grower of either barley or wheat is determined by the gross receipts for the product less the cost of handling, and administration. Anything that will decrease the handling costs must be a direct benefit to the producer and also through his ability to farm more acres on a given farm. Where bulk handling of the grain is practised we find a greater economy on farming units. I think that the increase in production, apart from the stable price that is now operating because of the excellent stabilization scheme in Australia, results from the facility to handle so much more easily a given crop with modern methods, as compared with the arduous days of handling in bags. It is amusing to note these days that elderly gentlemen usually drive the vehicles from paddock to silo. They do not wear working clothes: they sit in the trucks driving their son's or their own wheat into the silos. It has become a press-button or a pull-lever job without any physical labour.

Mr. Freebairn: Life is easy at Greenock.

Mr. LAUCKE: It is easy on any farm at harvest time when bulk handling is practised. I refer to the costly handling of barley last season. The co-operative received direct at

Ardressan, Wallaroo, Port Lincoln and Port Adelaide, 1,200,000 bushels at harvest time. From the last harvest to the end of June no less than 9,500,000 bushels of barley was taken from bagged stacks and shipped in bulk.

Mr. Nankivell: What happens to the bags?

Mr. LAUCKE: They are sold as second-hand bags, but the writing down of value from new bag to slit bag is substantial. It means that of the total 20,300,000 bushels of barley delivered last harvest, the co-operative shipped 10,700,000 bushels in bulk, or more than 50 per cent of the barley crop in South Australia last year. Costly processes are necessary to convert bagged wheat to bulk wheat. Oversea buyers are requesting more and more that their wheat be delivered in bulk. There are certain markets in wheat and barley, parcel lots, that are requested in bags, but in the main, the oversea purchasers are insisting on their wheat being brought to them in bulk. And no wonder! From any point of view it is much better for the receiving people at either local, interstate or oversea points to draw from a ship's hold the wheat with pneumatic systems rather than by the laborious method of taking out bags with the grain being handled again. The turn-round of ships is so much more rapid. Again this reflects back to the price received by the grower for his goods, bearing in mind that all costs incidental to the distribution and the handling of his product affects the grower's net return. I think it can be reasonably expected that the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company will be spending about £1,000,000 on the construction of silos for next year's harvest, in the light of both the tolls received by the company last year, which were no less than £1,000,000, and the good prospects for our cereal crops this year. If we were to have a 50,000,000-bushel wheat crop I would assume that the co-operative would handle, in bulk, no less than 42,000,000 bushels of the next harvest.

That handling, plus the barley, will return to this authority an income similar in magnitude to the one it received last year. The acceptance of bulk handling in South Australia can be judged, too, I think, from actual receipts last season. Of a harvest of 51,600,000 bushels—an all-time South Australian record—the co-operative received at 86 centres 46,800,000 bushels, which equals 91 per cent of the deliveries of all wheat in South Australia, of which 45,000,000 bushels (or 87 per cent) was received in bulk. That is a remarkable achievement when we consider that, at the last harvest, silos managed by the co-operative had a total capacity of 30,000,000

bushels. This was due to forward planning, sales being arranged early on, ships being chartered by the Wheat Board for timely berthing at our various outloading ports, and the co-operation of the railways, which has been superb at any harvest time to get wheat from the points of loading to the seaports.

Mr. Loveday: An outstanding example of public enterprise!

Mr. LAUCKE: It is an excellent example of farmers getting together for the common good.

Mr. Loveday: Collectivism!

Mr. LAUCKE: It is a working together which has shown great benefit to those prepared to take part.

Mr. Dunstan: That is community enterprise.

Mr. LAUCKE: It is not socialistic though. If we could have the success in all of our undertakings, be they in farming or industry generally, which has attended the activities of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, we would indeed have an extraordinarily buoyant economy—even better than the present economy.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): The purpose of the Bill is to provide barleygrowers in South Australia with bulk handling facilities, and I am pleased indeed to support the second reading. This crop is of great importance to South Australia's economy, and the South Australian production of barley is much greater than all the other States combined. The figures for bushels received for the No. 24 pool of the Australian Barley Board for the year 1962-63 help to illustrate this. That harvest in South Australia totalled 13,947,942 bushels and the next State in production was Victoria with 3,247,942 bushels. The gross return from sales of barley in the No. 24 pool realized £9,773,166. I am pleased to hear, from the Minister of Agriculture's reply to my question this afternoon, that the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Company's building programme is well ahead of schedule and that barleygrowers in South Australia can be assured of quite a reasonable system of bulk storage for the coming harvest. The completed facilities include a 1,000,000-bushel terminal silo at Port Adelaide. I notice from the annual report and balance sheet of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited that three large silos are on the building programme for this year in the Port Adelaide and Port Lincoln Divisions and one silo at Bute in the Wallaroo Division.

The general reception of bulk handling of wheat in South Australia has indicated beyond any doubt that farmers are well satisfied that the handling of wheat in bags is out of date and costly. Indeed, I think that we shall find that the farmers will soon apply the same reasoning to barley. In addition, the benefits to growers from the direct reduction from costs associated with bags to handling barley in bulk will also reduce the handling costs incurred by the Australian Barley Board at country stacking sites and at outports. It is reasonable to expect that handling costs alone will be lowered by several pence a bushel. South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited will make a charge on the Australian Barley Board for handling costs and, as they will be greatly reduced, the net savings will be reflected in higher net returns to the growers. It is the duty of the Australian Barley Board to market barley to the greatest advantage of growers, and the board has been under pressure for several years from barleygrowers who have demanded the introduction of a bulk handling system for their own convenience and to facilitate exports.

The problem of moisture control has always been regarded as a great difficulty in storing barley in bulk. I was pleased to hear that the Leader of the Opposition is well aware of this difficulty. The modern technique in aeration would seem to have overcome this problem. While I expect some initial trouble in moisture control I am sure the bulk handling facilities will be popular among growers. I am pleased to support the second reading.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I, too, support the Bill, which gives the bulk handling co-operative the sole right to receive barley in South Australia and which provides a guarantee in respect of the Commonwealth Bank for further facilities for the bulk handling of grain in South Australia. I realize that the bulk handling of grain, especially barley, in my district will affect the producers very much. I think the Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited in South Australia made it clear during the 1963-64 season receipts that it would be prepared to handle the South Australian barley production in bulk if a certain number of producers were prepared to guarantee that a certain amount of the barley would be delivered in bulk. During that season officers of the co-operative went out into the barley-producing districts and asked growers if they would sign an undertaking to deliver an

amount of 9,000,000 bushels, I think it was, in bulk. I think the result of that canvass was that the producers in South Australia said they would deliver in bulk 15,000,000 bushels of barley.

The Leader of the Opposition has had something to say about the number of grades and the question of classification of barley in South Australia, and, indeed, the receipt of barley in bulk in the number of grades in which it is received now in bags might present some difficulty. I realize, too, that the method of classifying barley undertaken by the Barley Board would also have produced some difficulty in the bulking of barley. The board now stipulates that before a sample can be submitted for classification 75 per cent of the paddock should be harvested, and under those conditions it has been very difficult to deliver a certain paddock of barley harvested in bulk. However, I believe that the board has indicated that perhaps those methods will be altered, because this season it will undertake experiments at bulk receiving centres direct from farmers' trucks and will try to classify the barley at the point of delivery.

Mr. Nankivell: It will not receive the barley until it is classified.

Mr. FERGUSON: That is so. I said earlier that the barley producers in my district have a great interest in the bulk handling of barley. I think it is fully realized that I represent a district which has a very high reputation and a tradition not only for the amount of barley it produces but for the exceptionally high quality of the product. I would say that the primary producers on Yorke Peninsula produce some of the best barley grown in the world. Furthermore, those primary producers were among the first in South Australia to enjoy the benefits of the savings which are to be made in the bulk handling of wheat. As all members know, Ardrossan was the first terminal built in the State. That terminal was built, of course, because the loading facilities had been installed at this port by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, and when this was done an agreement was entered into between the Broken Hill Proprietary Company and the Government for the use of those facilities, for products other than those used by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company, if ever the occasion arose.

Primary producers on Yorke Peninsula who produce barley as well as wheat and have had some experience in bulk handling have been asking for some years for facilities to bulk

handle barley. Barleygrowers, although realizing that it would be more difficult to bulk barley than it would to bulk wheat, thought that the difficulties were not insurmountable and that if it were practicable it would create a great saving not only in respect of the bags which are used now in bagged barley but in respect of the labour costs which have been mentioned here today. Another factor was that the farmer had already made a capital expenditure in bulk equipment which he now used for wheat, and the thought was: why not use that same equipment for the bulk handling of barley? Of course, one of the great difficulties in bulking barley is the control of the moisture content. We know that barley reacts to atmospheric conditions and varying degrees of climatic conditions more than wheat does. Even after it has been harvested, the moisture content varies.

Mr. Freebairn: Especially on Yorke Peninsula.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes. Dampness from the sea air often occurs on Yorke Peninsula. Many barleygrowers are adopting the idea of rolling and windrowing barley in order to safeguard their crops from wind and from storm. It has also been proved that this idea is a further means of controlling the moisture content in barley, for a crop windrowed or rolled can be harvested much earlier in the day because the moisture content is lower than it is in a crop that has been left standing. I think members will appreciate what I am trying to say, because we on Yorke Peninsula are subject to heavy dews in the morning and it takes some time before that dew can dry out of the barley and allow harvesting to commence.

The Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited received bulk barley into the Ardrossan terminal for the first time ex growers' trucks in the 1962-63 season, and I think that in that season it received about 143,000 bushels. As has been stated here this afternoon, following the successful handling of barley at Ardrossan in the 1962-63 season the company received in 1963-64, direct from farmers' trucks, bulk barley at Port Pirie, Wallaroo and Port Lincoln. The quantity received in the 1963-64 season ex growers' trucks was about 1,700,000 bushels. The total barley bulked ex terminals, loaded or part loaded into 32 ships, consisted of 105,150,000 bushels, or 234,000 tons. This was almost half of the total crop received in South Australia in the 1963-64 season.

After numerous discussions with the Barley Board, the Railways Department this year undertook to make trial railings of bulk barley

to other States, particularly Victoria. It will be realized that much of our malting grade barley has to go to maltsters in other States, and therefore if barley produced in South Australia is to be bulk handled we will have to find some means of bulk handling it in the other States. The Barley Board has also made arrangements with the owners of the ship, the *North Esk*, to make a trial shipment of barley to Victoria, and although there are no unloading facilities at the destination port in Victoria the *North Esk* has some in-built bulk equipment which can be used for that purpose. I am interested in the trial shipment of bulk barley in the *North Esk* to Victoria because it is hoped that soon there will be, in the southern part of Yorke Peninsula, a deep sea port with loading facilities that will handle bulk barley. Yorke Peninsula, particularly the southern part, produces some of the best barley in the world and if the barley produced in the southern part is bulked *ex* a port there, then a percentage of that barley will go to other States for malt. I have no doubt that bulk handling, if generally introduced for barleygrowing, will greatly benefit barley producers and the barley industry generally.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): The Bill deals with two subjects: the guarantee by the State Government of £1,000,000 (which is being loaned to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited), and the giving of a sole selling right to the co-operative to bulk barley as well as wheat. I can remember when this franchise was granted to the co-operative eight years ago, and the criticism then about farmers running their own organization. The criticism was that it did not matter whether the Bill was passed and the franchise given because within a short time the co-operative would be insolvent and bulk handling would again be the concern of the Government. However, in the next eight years the co-operative proved that farmers could run their own organizations efficiently. I was surprised to hear the interjection from the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday) when he used the word "collectivism", a word associated with Soviet Russia.

Mr. Loveday: It has a sinister meaning, has it?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not like the word and I am sure that farmers don't like it. When "collectivism" is mentioned we immediately think of Russia. The member for Whyalla also coupled farmers with Russia.

Mr. Loveday: A rose by any name smells just as sweet!

Mr. HEASLIP: If the honourable member calls that a rose, I say that primary producers do not call it that. In addition, the member for Whyalla more or less said that the co-operative was not private enterprise.

Mr. Loveday: Is it?

Mr. HEASLIP: If it is not, I do not know what is. It is a company run by directors.

Mr. Loveday: Is it guaranteed by the Government?

Mr. HEASLIP: No. The Government guarantees the Commonwealth Bank up to half the advances made to it. There is a Government director on the board, but similar boards are associated with all other companies in South Australia and, indeed, in Australia.

Mr. Loveday: It is a co-operative effort.

Mr. HEASLIP: Other companies that have shareholders are co-operatives. There are shareholders in this company. It is not collectivism and is certainly privately controlled and private enterprise. It is made up of a board that is elected and its 22,000 members have subscribed over £5,000,000 capital to run it. The rest of the finance has been borrowed from the Commonwealth Government. If that is not private enterprise, then I do not know what private enterprise is. The co-operative is an outstanding example of how successfully private enterprise operates.

I congratulate the co-operative on the work it has done during the past eight years. When it first got the franchise it was regarded unfavourably, but now it is held in high regard. During the past few years I have not heard any criticism on the way in which it has run its business. From starting from scratch it now has a capacity of 30,000,000 bushels in silos, built and spread over South Australia. This is an excellent effort. The money that the South Australian Government is now guaranteeing is to provide extra storage, a large proportion of which will be for bulk barley. The Leader of the Opposition expressed a few doubts about the storage of barley in bulk. However, this is not a new concept; the Barley Board has been experimenting for many years. However, I do not think it has all the answers and I agree with the Leader that probably many problems still remain that will have to be ironed out before all is known about bulk handling of barley. The moisture content in barley and the rapidity with which it heats are problems, but I believe that through aeration and modern methods barley will be able to be stored successfully.

Much has been said about malt barley, but I do not think this is a real problem because

it is a small proportion of the barley produced. Most of the barley that is going to be stored in bulk will be for export or feed. Much barley is exported. The malt barley used in Victoria and South Australia is mostly bought in small parcels that are too small to be handled in bulk shipments. Even if we now had provision for bulk storage of barley, a large proportion of it would still be bagged and shipped to other States in that way. As the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) stated, a trial shipment is being sent to Victoria in bulk, but the maltsters there have not the equipment to unload it. Whether they will rebag it or how they will store it, I do not know.

Mr. Ferguson: They are providing more facilities.

Mr. HEASLIP: Much experiment remains to be done but malt barley does not present a major problem. We have exported large quantities of barley, particularly from Ardrossan, where it has been received in bags and then goes through the installation on a belt. Seasonal conditions this year are such that we could face another problem in receiving the amount of grain that will be offered in bulk. I do not know how this problem will be overcome when the time comes, as it must, when we do not sell all the grain from year to year. In past years we have had stacks and stacks of wheat in bags and have been able to take care of it. However, it is physically impossible, or if not physically impossible, it is economically impossible to build sufficient silos to take care of more than one season's receipts. Once we reach the stage where we have sufficient storage for, say, two years' receipt of grain the whole thing will become more expensive than it is today when we are receiving half as much again as we have storage space for.

Last year 45,000,000 bushels went through silos that had a capacity of only 30,000,000 bushels. The co-operative collected tolls on 45,000,000 bushels. If we have a 60,000,000 bushel capacity and receive 30,000,000, we have an interest and capital outlay for a 60,000,000 bushel storage but receive tolls on 30,000,000 bushels. The co-operative will have to face this problem. Obviously, some grain, as it did last year, will have to go into bags, because if the silos are full the grain cannot be delivered to them. Rather than wait for two or three months the farmers bag the wheat. I know that this Bill is appreciated by all producers and will be of benefit to the State.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): This Bill is possible because of the good record of the South Australian Bulk Handling Co-operative Limited and of the Wheat Board, and we can look forward with confidence to the bulk handling of barley. Previous speakers have stated the views of the farming community, and I am indebted to the member for Albert for his assistance. It is apparent that where a wheat facility is available and a barley facility is to be built at the same point, during a year when the receipt of barley falls short of what is expected and the wheat receipts are in excess, it would be logical for the spare cells of the barley silo to be used for wheat. I do not know whether that is the intention of the co-operative but it would be common-sense. The co-operative should regard the entire facility in one area as being at the disposal of either grain, and spare cells should be used according to the need. I hope that the current building programme is adhered to and that silos will be finished on time. The silo at Owen may not be completed because the constructing authorities will find it difficult to finish it within three weeks. In the original legislation section 14 (2) stated:

The company shall not be obliged to erect bulk handling facilities at any railway station or railway siding unless the average annual amount of wheat received thereat during a period of five consecutive years after the first day of September, 1949, has been 30,000 bushels or more.

This is deleted by the present legislation. I do not complain about that as I believe that it is a sign of the times. However, I believe that some growers were under the impression that as long as their receipt point had received the 30,000 bushels in the critical five years that a silo would be erected.

Mr. Freebairn: Many growers signed the petition on that understanding.

Mr. HALL: Yes, but I understand that with the building of better roads and the introduction of better and economical motor transport, most growers can see that this programme cannot be economically applied to a silo system in this State. Nevertheless, I have sympathy for these people who supported the bulk handling with that in view. I hope that they will be satisfied with the treatment of the co-operative in this aspect of silo construction, and of what silo facility it will build and what distance apart. I believe the co-operative has taken a sensible attitude, because I have attended several meetings to thrash out these points. I have been impressed with the attitude of the co-operative and I

believe that it will carry out its final building programme with the greatest sympathy and attention to the demands and needs of co-operative members.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I support the Bill and join with other members in complimenting the South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited on the way it has handled bulk wheat. This Bill deals with the bulk handling of barley, and there is no doubt in my mind that the Barley Board will follow the procedure which the Wheat Board has followed and will probably improve on the methods used by that board. It is only natural that it should do so because, after all, we learn by other people's mistakes. The reason for the introduction of bulk handling is, of course, the world demand for bulk wheat and barley rather than for bagged grain. Of course, if a country such as Australia, which relies on its exports, is to keep abreast of modern times and of modern methods, it must succumb to the wishes of overseas buyers.

Mr. Freebairn: Bulk handling lowers costs as well.

Mr. CASEY: Naturally, that was the whole idea. Oversea organizations realized that fact and that was why they introduced this method. In Europe and in North America where enormous quantities of grain are handled it is only natural that the authorities would take steps to improve handling facilities. Of course, we have to follow their innovations because, as I said, we are an exporting country. As the member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) pointed out, the co-operative will eventually be owned by the farmers themselves. Initially a guarantee had to be sought from the Commonwealth Bank to commence the building of silos and, of course, the toll paid at the silos will eventually meet that guarantee. As the member for Rocky River also said, we shall probably be faced with a bigger harvest than last year because seasonal conditions, particularly in the last month, have changed the outlook in rural areas to advantage. I am not as conversant with the barley-growing aspect (because it is not grown to a great extent in the northern areas), but the wheat acreages are increasing every year, and it is only natural that with this favourable season a large intake of bulk wheat will occur.

The only way to overcome the problem of a grain surplus is to build more silos, although I do not profess to be an expert on bulk handling. The co-operative is faced with the immediate problem of trying to store grain; what will happen if our overseas sales ever collapse I do not know. The huge task of

storing our surplus grain will be difficult to overcome but I think the men of the bulk handling co-operative are capable and well experienced with this type of commodity, and I am sure they will solve the problem if and when it arises. From several meetings that I have attended I know that the co-operative's officers are fully conversant with the wheat industry in South Australia today.

Mr. Ferguson: Do you think the co-operative should provide facilities for a grower's maximum harvest?

Mr. CASEY: Yes. When the co-operative was first established its officers visited the various districts and assessed the quantities of wheat grown, but I think that, unfortunately, estimates were taken on a minimum production and that many farmers did not give a true picture of what they could grow.

Mr. Hall: There has been an upsurge in wheatgrowing generally since then.

Mr. CASEY: Yes, but that was taken into account with the original information, because it was based on a 10 to 12 year period. I think that if a maximum estimate had been taken in the first place the unfortunate carry-over of wheat that occurred last year would have been avoided.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed

Clause 7—"Amendment of principal Act, section 12."

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

In new paragraph (c1) after "situated" to insert "(or at any place in the metropolitan area as defined in the Town Planning Act, 1929-1963, if his malting house or factory is situated within that area)".

The purpose of the clause is to protect the interests of the maltster similarly to the provision in respect of a miller. A certain maltster pointed out that he had facilities which accepted his barley by rail in North Adelaide, that his malthouse was in Norwood, and that several other installations actually crossed the city boundaries. The amendment clarifies the situation and is really a drafting amendment. The only other way for this maltster to operate would be by permit from the Minister but I think it is a little unreasonable to ask the company to submit to that, and I think that most honourable members would agree.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 15), schedule, and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 29. Page 1106.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): By far the majority of the members of the Police Force join the force as young men and make police work their career for life. They work long and irregular hours and often jeopardize their health in the performance of their duties. In recent years there has been an increase in crime, which I believe the reports of the Police Commissioner will substantiate. Consequently, the burdens that the police officers and other ranks are carrying are increasing still further. I understand that at the present time there are insufficient first and second grade sergeants on strength, and that there are ample opportunities for the restoration of balance between police ranks, commissioned ranks, and other non-commissioned officers. Whilst there have been considerable organizational changes in recent years, I believe the system that operates in Western Australia regarding vacancies, and the policy of providing police according to population trends, should be considered by the Commissioner in this State.

Although there is some doubt in my mind as to whether the Police Force as a whole is adequately staffed, I take this opportunity of paying a tribute to all personnel of the force for their willing and untiring service in the interests of the people of this State. I have no doubt that all members in this House would endorse the sentiments I have just expressed about our Police Force, and consequently I believe it is our duty to ensure that when these persons reach the age of retirement they are adequately provided for. As this is a money measure, it is the responsibility of the Government to introduce legislation that will so provide. After a lifetime of service, policemen and their wives should be able to live in reasonable comfort in retirement, but in many cases that have been brought to my notice retired policemen have been forced to seek other employment in their retirement in an attempt to maintain a reasonable standard of existence. Do we ever consider the unpaid services rendered by the wives of police officers at many suburban and country police stations while their husbands are away on duty? These women have to answer the telephone and generally have to be at people's beck and call for almost 24 hours of the day.

Mr. Bywaters: In country stations the wife of a police officer often has to cook meals for the prisoners.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes, that is laid down, and any woman could be excused for not wishing to do that.

Mr. Bywaters: And she is usually making a great sacrifice.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Undoubtedly. In considering this question of pensions for those retiring from the Police Force, the unpaid services rendered by the wives of these people should be considered in a practical way. Incidentally, many retired police officers employed by the Housing Trust are doing valuable work.

No doubt contributors to the Police Pension Fund will be pleased that they are to receive an increase to bring the police scheme somewhat into line with the benefits provided for public servants under the provisions of the South Australian Superannuation Fund. However, members are aware that this fund compares most unfavourably with similar funds of other States and of the Commonwealth Government. There is no denying that all public servants in this State, whether they be public servants as defined and employed under the Public Service Act, or teachers employed under the Education Act, or police officers and other ranks employed under the Police Regulation Act, pay more for the same benefits or receive less for the same contributions than do their counterparts anywhere else in Australia.

In introducing the Bill the Premier said that its object was to increase benefits by about 17½ per cent and to increase contributions by slightly less. He went on to say that it was based upon a full report by the Public Actuary. However, he could not let the matter rest there, but instead went on to say that its terms had received the approval of the Secretary of the Police Association, and this statement is not correct. I consider this claim to be of such serious implication that it requires further explanation, and the correct explanation is that the members of the Police Association feel strongly that the benefits derived from the Police Pensions Fund are niggardly when compared with those in other States; that as members are paying as much if not more than their counterparts in the other States and the Public Actuary has reported that the Police Pensions Fund cannot stand higher benefits, then the Government is making insufficient contribution towards the South Australian fund; that the increase of 17½ per cent in benefits to existing contributors is more than

justified, but that existing pensioners should have received an increase of 17½ per cent in their pensions instead of 7½ per cent as provided for in clause 16. Nothing could be more unfair than to impose a condition which provides that a policeman who retires this week shall receive a pension only 7½ per cent greater than the benefits provided under the principal Act, whereas a policeman who retires subsequent to the passing of this Bill is to receive an increase of 17½ per cent. As this latter increase will still mean that the benefits being paid are less than in the other States, I can see no reason why all contributors to the scheme should not have received an increase of 17½ per cent.

Clause 4 provides the machinery for the Government contribution only. The Government is to contribute 70 per cent of the fund's outgoings to existing pensioners, 66½ per cent of the outgoings to existing contributors when they reach retiring age, and only 60 per cent of the outgoings to persons who join the scheme subsequent to the passing of this Bill. It is little recompense for the lifetime of service given by such men (and I do not want to discriminate) as Messrs. Bonython, Gill, Grow and Walsh to the Police Force of this State to be told that the Government is not prepared to make adequate provision so that their pensions can retain parity with existing contributors.

Inspector Bonython served many years in the country under all types of conditions. When he came to Adelaide there was a question whether he should take the place of Superintendent Walsh. There was a difference of a few days' service between Inspector Bonython and Inspector Grow as to who should be the Deputy Police Commissioner. Inspector Walsh served as Deputy Commissioner of Police and did the job of Commissioner in an emergency. However, he was not appointed to the position although he was considered good enough to act in it.

Detective Gill was in charge of the Detective Force of South Australia. He had a long association with the public and met almost every train that came to Adelaide from other States while he was in the Police Force. He also met coastal shipping. Whenever there was a question about the entrance of a person from another State into South Australia, Detective Gill was there to handle the matter. He gave great service to this State.

Will this miserable 7½ per cent compensate men who have given such grand service? Would it not be reasonable to expect that they

would receive the 17½ per cent? Is that not the least that can be expected? Is this niggardly treatment justified for such worthy officers? We should consider the public relationships built up by these men. One cannot build public relations overnight. We should think of the sacrifices they have made. When Detective Gill was in charge of the Detective Force, the Police Commissioner was Commissioner Green. Commissioner Green was reluctant to provide more than one motor car for the Detective Force, whereas today policemen travel two or three to a car. The Police Force in South Australia has gone out to meet crime and prevent it wherever possible. We are not giving them reasonable consideration by providing only the 7½ per cent increase in the Bill. Those who retire after the Bill has been passed will receive a 17½ per cent increase. I hope that Government members will have more to say on this matter because I believe that it is most important.

By way of comparison I give members the contributions made by the various Governments to the police pensions schemes in the various States per £1 of contribution by members. The New South Wales Government contributes between £3 and £4 for each £1 contributed by a member. In Victoria the figure is £2 10s. and in South Australia it is £1 14s. 5d. I was unable to ascertain a figure for Western Australia, but I will illustrate later how the benefits under that scheme are much more favourable than our scheme. The figure for Queensland varies from year to year based on the report of the actuary. This comparison does not place the Liberal Government in this State in a good light and is further proof if proof is needed, that the present Government does not represent, and does not intend to improve the living standards and conditions of, the wage and salary earners in this State.

Clause 5 provides that the minimum commencing age for new applicants shall be 21 years of age. I understand that members of the Police Association are in accord with this provision and I have no objection to it. Clause 6 relates to the increased scale of contributions for increased benefits, and to an extended age scale for new entrants. At present all persons who enter the Police Force over 26 years of age contribute to the pension fund at the same rate. It is considered that persons who join the scheme at a later age should pay an increased financial contribution, and I agree. I do not see why the scale could not be extended further if need be. In clause 6 there is also a

provision for non-commissioned and commissioned officers to make certain increased contributions which compare with the increased benefits provided by clause 14.

I believe that the rest of the amendments are machinery or consequential amendments, and, although they are essential, I do not think further comment is necessary, other than to see whether the provisions are reasonable and just. I refer in particular to clause 8 which provides for a variable retiring age and also a variable method of receiving pensions, and these are improvements which I endorse. However, I would point out that they are improvements that do not cost the Government one penny of additional financial contribution, and no doubt that is the reason why it was prepared to grant these improvements. No doubt the payments have been calculated actuarially, but I indicate to members what a senior constable would receive under the South Australian police pensions scheme compared with what he would receive under other States' and the Commonwealth schemes, based on the assumption that he retires at 60 years of age, and reaches the present normal average life expectancy of 73 years of age:

State.	Total Pension Benefit. £
New South Wales	15,600
Western Australian, Victoria and Commonwealth	13,000
Queensland	12,500
South Australia	9,000

The Government should not remain complacent about this picture. Therefore, whilst supporting the Bill for its improvements, I point out that there is not one atom of doubt that they are long overdue, and that this is still a niggardly hand-out. It is not my desire to dwell upon certain matters associated with this legislation, but the House should consider the contributions made by police officers today. It is all right to say that they will receive something in 30 or more years' time. Whatever the pension provided, now is the time to examine the percentage relationship between the retiring pension and the basic wage. In the Public Service, the Railways Department and the Police Department it is obvious that, because of improved status, an officer is given higher seniority and salary, and thus qualifies for a higher contribution to his superannuation. He is given the opportunity to pay a higher contribution and so receive a higher return when he retires. If this is done the officer finds a large sum taken from his salary so that his take-home pay is reduced.

When he retires he probably finds that his credit in the fund is nowhere near the amount received by a person on a Commonwealth pension. Married couple pensioners may receive £7 a week above the Commonwealth age pension, making a total of about £18 a week. It takes a tidy sum out of any salary to obtain £18 a week pension on retirement under the superannuation fund in this State. If the extra contribution were not taken from the take-home money the person's income would not be reduced and he would have more spending money. Because a person has retired and is receiving superannuation benefits it does not mean that he lives on a reasonable standard. This legislation deals with police officers, but before the matter is concluded the increase of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for existing pensioners should be amended to $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. We believe that this increase should be made in the interests of the service and that men who have built the reputation of the Police Force to what it is today but who have now retired, should have the increase extended to $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the second reading and agree with the Leader's comments.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. BYWATERS: There is no doubt that the Leader has gone into this matter thoroughly, and I agree with his suggestions. Although I realize that this Bill has been introduced to some extent as a result of a request made by the Police Officers Association, I do not think it has gone far enough in relation to benefits. The contributions payable at 21 years of age are £2 2s. a fortnight for a male and £1 15s. for a female. I think these contributions, particularly for the male, are too high, because at this stage of life a young man is looking forward to the future. He may be married, or at least he will probably be thinking of getting married, and he will have to provide a home and all the necessities required in the home, so it will be difficult for him to find this sum. However, this is the way the Public Actuary has worked out the contributions. He has also worked out the benefits that an officer will receive on retirement at 60. I know the Bill provides for retirement at 55 with the Commissioner's consent, but the majority of policemen retire at 60.

I have noticed previously that the Public Actuary assesses superannuation in a cautious way. We have noticed this in relation to the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund, which has grown to a considerable sum in a short time;

I know also that the South Australian Superannuation Fund has a big credit. I think the Public Actuary sometimes considers the extreme possibility of many people becoming entitled to benefits suddenly and as a result makes a wide allowance for emergencies. I think that contributions are excessive and benefits too low.

I agree with the Leader's comment about the part police officers play in the community. I think this is recognized by all members, who realize the need for a good force to carry out the laws passed in this place from time to time. Police officers do not have an easy life. They take their lives in their hands on many occasions; I have known of cases in which this has happened in my district. They must go out when someone has lost a loved one and notify the next of kin, so it is necessary for them to have tact and sympathy. The police officer has to be a man of many parts. He must be somewhat more than an ordinary person, as he has so many different roles to play.

I have known of police officers called to fatal accidents on the main highway in my district who for a day or two have not been able to eat any meals or sleep because of the things they have seen. They are just as human as anyone else. Sometimes we may think they are not, but they are. They have not an easy life. The occasional special bonuses granted them by the Government for services rendered are little enough reward for the job they do. They are on call more often than they should be. They are called out in many emergencies. They play an important part in the life of the community. Therefore, if their value can be recognized in any way when they retire, it should be.

As I said earlier, there are police officers in the country who fulfil certain tasks not in the ordinary line of duty. They do it cheerfully, helped by their good wives. Their wives are regarded as leaders in the community and are expected to take an active part in the life of various associations and organizations in their respective localities. Ordinary wage earners or business people would not be expected to perform many of the tasks that police officers' wives are expected to. I have much respect for the officers of the law and I value my good relations with those in my district. There are times when they call on me for help and there are other times when I have to call on them for help. We have been able to discuss things in a friendly way on most occasions and have usually arrived at an understanding with the exercise of a little common sense on both sides.

I much appreciate the assistance I get from the police officers in my district. We have some good types of person in the Police Force. At Murray Bridge we have at least three ex-sergeants of police now living in the town, each of whom is playing an important part in the community. One retired only recently. He is now a councillor giving good service. Also, he has been recently elected to the show society and is performing other services in the town. So the police officers play their part in the community after they retire. If possible, we should recognize this to the utmost. The contributions are high enough (in fact a little too high) compared with the benefits they receive.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): Briefly, I support our Leader and the member who has just resumed his seat, who referred to the desirability of recognizing the outstanding services of the Police Force. In that respect, he suggested that the contributions were slightly too high. There are two ways of looking at this. One can say either that the contributions should be slightly lower or that the benefits should be higher. I draw honourable members' attention to the fact that in his second reading explanation the Premier stated that the benefits and the scheme in general were based on a full report by the Public Actuary. I have no doubt that, if that is the case, the Public Actuary would exercise his view on this matter the same as he would exercise it regarding other public servants. In other words, he would have a schedule of benefits for given contributions. If anything can be done to reduce contributions, surely the work of a police officer warrants consideration of the benefits having a loading, which would represent some form of financial recognition when he retired. I support the remarks of our Leader and of the member for Murray in this regard.

The duties of police officers in my district are all-embracing; they are men in positions far removed from any centre of civilization and they have to be almost everything to the community in which they live. They travel enormous distances; their wives are left on their own for considerable periods of time and have to bear the brunt of whatever happens in the area where they live. If officers are absent their wives have to act as best they can, often in difficult circumstances. Many police officers have to spend a certain amount of time in out-back areas, which I think tests a man to the limit of his initiative, ingenuity and versatility.

I believe that, in determining pensions for police officers, some regard should be had to this.

It has been obvious that the Police Force has experienced certain difficulty in obtaining recruits; I know of an officer who was, in his opinion, unable to pay for his home, and to meet his liabilities in other directions, on the salary that he was receiving. As a consequence, he left the Police Force in order to meet these particular liabilities, but when he came, after some time, to try to rejoin the force he found that it was the usual procedure for the Police Force not to accept an officer who had resigned. I believe he was a good officer and, indeed, in the end, after a number of representations had been made, he was taken back. However, it is obvious that the Police Force could be made more attractive, with advantage to the community, and this is one particularly good way of doing it. I do not think that the variety and nature of jobs that an officer is called upon to perform are sufficiently recognized in the community. As the member for Murray has rightly emphasized, a police officer's duties are often of a disagreeable, dangerous and extraordinary character—the sort of job that few other people in the community would encounter. Surely it deserves adequate recognition in view of those circumstances. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, hoping that something better will be done to meet the particular circumstances to which we have drawn attention.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Enactment of section 32c of principal Act."

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): As I understand it, this clause provides that the pension payable to an officer who retired before this amending legislation is proclaimed will be increased by $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, whereas those who retire after the legislation is proclaimed will receive a greater increase. Can the Premier explain this difference?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I gave the answer to this question when I explained the Bill, as follows:

Clause 16 provides for increases in all pensions which are payable at the date of commencement of the Bill. On previous occasions when the Act has been amended pensions payable at the time of amendment have been increased according to changes in living costs which had arisen between the date of the last amendment and the date of the proposed

amendment. A similar provision is now proposed. Since 1960, when the Police Pensions Act was last amended, the consumer price index for Adelaide has risen by only about 4½ per cent. After due consideration of the position of the fund, the Public Actuary recommended an increase of 7½ per cent in current pensions, which is greater than the increase justified by changes in living costs. Clause 16 makes provision for this increase in new section 32c (1).

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The Premier has said that the Public Actuary recommended an increase of 7½ per cent in current pensions, which was greater than the increase justified by changes in living costs. What is the percentage relationship between police pensions and the basic wage? What would be involved in increasing the existing pensions by another 10 per cent? What sum will be involved in adjusting the increase from 7½ per cent to 17½ per cent in the cases I have mentioned?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No doubt the Public Actuary could give the calculations the Leader desires if he were given sufficient time. I certainly cannot give them. The Government contributes 70 per cent to the fund (and that has already been accepted) and contributors contribute 30 per cent. It is necessary that the fund be solvent if the contributors are to receive the Government's 70 per cent. This is under the control of the Public Actuary, who gives a certificate concerning the benefits that can be given. He has given the necessary certificate in this case. The Leader has mentioned a sum, but the Police Pensions Fund is limited by the amount paid in by the contributors. The contributors pay in to keep the fund solvent. The Public Actuary has reported upon this matter. Representatives of the Police Association have seen the report and asked for this Bill to be introduced. I believe that the rights of one section of the Police Force as against another should be worked out by the Police Pension Fund organization.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Were the members of the fund consulted in this matter?

Mr. SHANNON: Obviously the Public Actuary would consider the impact of any increase on the benefits that will remain for the officers still serving. Is it fair to use the fund for those who have retired and to reduce benefits payable to those now serving? I do not think the Police Officers Association would approve of the proposal inherent in the Leader's suggestion.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) 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 Agent-General Act, 1901-1953, the Audit Act, 1921-1957, the Industrial Code, 1920-1963, the Public Service Arbitration Act, 1961, the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1963, and the Public Service Act, 1936-1959, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank honourable members for the opportunity of bringing this Bill before the House with no delay. I suggest to my friends opposite that, as the point at issue is trifling and small, the Bill can be disposed of forthwith. It provides for increases in salaries of certain public officers whose salary is fixed by Statute. As honourable members will recall, since a similar Bill was passed last session the basic wage has been increased by £1. The increase was effective from June 22 of this year and has been applied throughout the Public Service.

Clauses 2 to 7 inclusive will add £52 a year to the salaries of the Agent-General, Auditor-General, Commissioner of Police, Public Service Commissioner, President and Deputy President of the Industrial Court, and Public Service Arbitrator. The salaries of the Auditor-General and Public Service Commissioner will be £5,202; of the President of the Industrial Court, £5,052 (Deputy £4,302); of the Public Service Arbitrator and Commissioner of Police, £4,852; and of the Agent-General, £4,052. Under clause 8, the increases will be retrospective to June 22 of this year—that is, the date on which the basic wage increase became effective. Clause 9 (1) provides for payment of arrears of salary in a lump sum, and clause 9 (2) provides for an appropriation of revenue.

Honourable members will observe that the Bill merely gives those officers whose salaries are fixed by Statute the same increase in the basic wage as has been given to all other public servants of the State, and as has been awarded by a general Commonwealth award to all Commonwealth public servants. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I have not yet received a copy of the Bill but am willing to support it after hearing the second reading explanation. I appreciate that the salaries of these officers are fixed by Statute. I do not desire to delay the passage of this Bill.

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

POULTRY INDUSTRY (COMMONWEALTH LEVIES) 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 authorize the holding of a poll of certain owners of poultry relating to a scheme to be implemented by the Commonwealth in respect of the poultry industry for imposing levies on those owners and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Motion 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.

As honourable members are aware, the Commonwealth Government intends to introduce a scheme in respect of the poultry industry for making levies on certain owners of poultry. The scheme has been recommended by the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities of Australia and is commonly known as "the C.E.M.A. plan". It is intended that the collection of the levies be undertaken by the State Egg Boards, and in this connection, if the Commonwealth legislation is passed, complementary legislation by this State will probably be necessary. However, the Commonwealth does not wish to introduce the scheme without the concurrence of the States. This Government has decided that before it concurs in the C.E.M.A. plan or a modification thereof a poll should be held of the poultry owners affected. The purpose of this Bill is, therefore, to authorize the holding of the poll of owners of 50 or more hens. The present proposal of the Commonwealth Government is that levies

should be made on all owners of 20 or more hens, the amount of the levy being prescribed annually. The purpose of the levy is to cover any losses on export sales, but this Government considers that for various reasons it would be unfair to impose these levies on small poultry keepers when the benefit accruing from the levies would go to the larger poultry keepers. The Government has, therefore, decided that in this State, in the event of a favourable poll, the levies to be collected by the Egg Board will be restricted to the owners of not less than 50 hens.

I turn now to the provisions of the Bill. Clause 1 contains the short title and clause 2 defines certain terms used in the Bill. Clause 3 (1) provides for the poll to be conducted upon publication of a notice by the Minister in the *Gazette*. Under subclause (2) the poll shall be conducted by the Assistant Returning Officer, subject to any directions of the Minister, and under subclause (3) he is required to notify the Minister of the result of the poll. Under clause 4 (1) each person who owns 50 or more hens will be qualified to vote at the poll, and clause 4(2) provides that in certain cases a person in possession or control of hens may be taken to be their owner for the purposes of the poll. It is intended that the poultry owners who are qualified to vote will, in the event of a favourable poll, be the persons obliged to pay levies in this State.

Clause 5 provides for particulars of the scheme and any other relevant matter to be set out in the ballot paper. This procedure is necessary because, until the Commonwealth legislation is passed, it will not be possible to describe the scheme fully. Clause 6 provides for the reception of informal votes if, in the opinion of the Assistant Returning Officer, a person has indicated a clear intention of voting in a particular manner. Clause 7 provides for the appropriation of moneys required for the poll. Clause 8(1) empowers the Minister, by notice in the *Gazette* to give directions, prescribing the manner of conducting the poll, the form of the ballot paper to be used and any other matters incidental to the poll. Clause 8(2) provides that the Minister may revoke or vary any notice published under subsection (1) of this clause or under clause 3. I want to give some information about the background of the proposals and the stage that has now been reached in the poultry industry. It has been recognized for years that the poultry industry has been in extreme difficulties because of the uncertainty

of the marketing position. The production of eggs far exceeds the consumption on the home market. In recent years the export market has been unprofitable. The result has been that heavy losses have been incurred by someone in the marketing of his eggs. Although the States, in almost every case, have statutory boards controlling the marketing of eggs within their own borders, because of the Commonwealth Constitution it is possible to market eggs in any State with absolute freedom. That means that persons marketing in other States are selling eggs on the home market. It follows that the State egg boards are left with large surpluses of eggs, which must be placed on the unprofitable export market.

The result has been that each State instrumentality has been in financial difficulties. Consequently, their levies have risen and the support given to the various boards has been diminished because interstate trading of a private nature has been relatively more attractive. In order to overcome this situation many proposals have been put forward and conferences held. C.E.M.A. in reality consists of the members of the egg board of the various States. They have met on numerous occasions and have formulated a plan, the contents of which are fairly well known but which do not provide for a levy on the eggs submitted to the egg boards, which is the normal way of financing the State instrumentalities. However, the plan provides for a levy to be paid by an owner on the number of hens he possesses, and the money will be paid into a fund that will eventually reimburse the boards that are selling eggs on the unprofitable overseas market. In theory, this will counter the excessive interstate trading that has taken place and may reduce the transit of eggs from one State to another. The scheme is solidly supported by C.E.M.A. The other State Ministers have accepted the scheme as being satisfactory to them, and support it. The Commonwealth Government is involved not because it is directly concerned with the marketing of eggs but because it is the only authority that can actually levy owners according to the number of fowls owned. This will have to be done as an amendment to its powers of excise. The Commonwealth Government is agreeable to do this and is keen on the scheme, but it will do it only if all States agree.

I have been accused, with some justification I suppose, of holding up the scheme because I have not been convinced that all aspects of the scheme are satisfactory. Some aspects of it are most unsatisfactory, and I have voiced

this opinion at every opportunity and at every meeting of the Agricultural Council. Wherever it has been necessary I have made clear my attitude.

There is a desperate need for more, light to be thrown on the industry in general in Australia. The Commonwealth Government instituted a committee of inquiry into the dairying industry. Many of the committee's conclusions have been acted upon and some have not, but the result of the inquiry was an extremely illuminating report that disclosed much we did not know about the dairying industry. A similar need exists for an inquiry into the poultry industry so as to have more light thrown upon it. I have frequently made this suggestion, and, although I have received little support, I am convinced that we need more information about the industry.

In South Australia it is clearly a side-line industry. The overwhelming proportion of poultry keepers are owners of small flocks. Only a small number own large commercial flocks. The scheme as propounded by C.E.M.A. provides that owners of hens more than six months old shall be levied on all but the first 20 hens. The levy is to be prescribed by the Minister for Primary Industry on the advice of C.E.M.A. which will set the levy according to the needs at the time, probably once a year. However, extraordinary variations have been made in the suggested levy, and no-one is able to officially forecast what it will be. It has been suggested that it will be as high as 10s. and as low as 3s. a bird a year. I believe that C.E.M.A. could easily meet and say what the levy should be for the initial year, but it has declined to do so, which I think is a pity. It would be better if it said frankly what the levy should be. I have repeatedly asked for it, but have been denied this information. The Minister for Primary Industry will accept the advice of C.E.M.A. in prescribing this levy, and although he may prescribe less than the amount advised he cannot prescribe more.

The Hon. Sir. Thomas Playford: If a fowl tax is paid will a levy be paid to the board?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, there will be a levy to support the board. The C.E.M.A. plan is not constituted with the idea of supporting the State egg boards: its purpose is only to help them in the unprofitable side of their marketing activities.

Mr. Bywaters: It will not be as great as it is now.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I agree. I understand that the greater the difficulties in which egg boards find themselves the higher will become their levies on the owners of the eggs delivered to them. If this scheme works, there will be more support for the egg boards, and the levies will drop. The result may well be that the levy of the State Egg Board is low, but there will always be a levy of some size to support the State Egg Board, as well as the levy for the Commonwealth scheme.

Mr. Bywaters: The levy for the State Egg Board will be mainly for administration, will it not?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The levy for the Egg Board will have to support the board in its work. Deductions on eggs at present delivered to the board are used partly for administrative expenses. There are grading and handling charges as well, but this levy to support the board will inevitably drop if the scheme operates, but it cannot disappear completely.

I cannot say whether this scheme will stop interstate trading. I have asked the proponents of the scheme about this and have been told, "Well, it may not stop it, but it does not matter if it goes on." That answer has been given to me often and, with that in mind, I have had grave doubts about the scheme. First, if it is introduced, I think that the persons who are to be affected should have the right to say whether they want it. If they are asked that, I believe that, in fairness, they should be told what the amount of the levy will be. They cannot be told what it will be in every year but, at least, they could be given a starting figure and at least some forecast of what it might be. However, that has not been forthcoming.

The other point about this that worries me is that if the scheme is successful, there will be nothing to stop a tremendous increase in production as a result of that success. This increased production might come from existing poultry owners or it might come as a result of persons being attracted into the industry. As the House knows, the poultry industry is subject to sudden fluctuations in production. That is something about which I am concerned and I do not know the answer. Those in favour of the scheme say, "If there is more production the levy will go up and, consequently, a situation will always exist where only the efficient producers will be able to survive in the industry." That explanation may be right and it may be wrong. I think many uncertainties are associated with this matter.

One further point that worries me is that it has become clearer to us, in the administration of the poultry industry, that the percentage of small poultry owners is far greater than we suspected a few years ago. Many poultry owners have only 20, 30, or 40 birds. Very many of them own only a few fowls. Many of them sell a few eggs when they have them surplus; they consume some themselves and give a few away. However, they are not commercial poultry farmers in the real sense of the word. I suppose that the net profit from a fowl would be no more than about 10s. That profit worked out on 50 birds will not bring in much money each year. Under the C.E.M.A. plan as at present constituted, every person owning over 20 fowls will have to pay a levy. Many of these people will not have account sales receipts from which this levy can be deducted so the initiative will be on them to forward the tax to the authorities.

Because of this, some months ago I wrote to the C.E.M.A. asking it to consider having the plan apply only to owners of more than 100 birds, leaving out the small man altogether. After a long delay, I got a blank refusal to alter the scheme. The C.E.M.A. expects the Commonwealth Government to bring in a Bill to make every person owning more than 20 fowls pay this taxation, and it expects State egg boards to collect it. The Bill now before members provides that a poll will be held of owners of more than 50 fowls. The South Australian Egg Board is prepared to collect the levy from such owners, but it is not prepared to undertake to collect levies from owners of less than 50 fowls. We think that if we did this the administrative problems would be ridiculous and that the scheme would cause wide evasion, be ineffective, and be onerous on the owners of poultry. As a compromise, this Bill provides for a scheme for owners of over 50 fowls.

The C.E.M.A. does not meet often enough to give me a clear answer. However, as I do not want it understood that as it is near the end of the session we have done nothing about the matter, I have introduced this Bill so that I will be empowered to hold a poll if the C.E.M.A. accepts the 50-bird proposal, which I think it will do. If it does not, I should like to know why it wants to bring in the small producers. I hope I have answered the queries that honourable members may have raised.

Mr. Riches: Once the State joins the scheme, can it withdraw?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think constitutionally it would be able to do so, but I think that would be undesirable. I think we

should be in or out of the scheme. I do not think anyone would want us to join on trial.

Mr. Laucke: Would it be for a period, the same as wheat stabilization?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That has not been raised with me. As the C.E.M.A. has never put a limitation on the scheme, I take it that it expects it to last indefinitely.

Mr. Riches: Then producers should have more information?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think they should, and I shall try to obtain it. If the Bill is accepted, I shall have time to find out what information is available and to prepare proper conditions to submit to poultry owners. I hope that when the question is submitted to them they will be given sufficient information to enable them to make up their minds. Although I criticize the plan I am not saying it is no good, nor am I trying to swing opinion against it. I am worried that there are not sufficient answers to the questions that have been raised, and I consider it important to know what the size of the levy will be.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is there any limit on the levy?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have not heard of any, but if this Bill is passed it will enable me to obtain more information. At the same time nobody will be able to say that they have been blocked by the inadequate legislation in this State.

Mr. BYWATERS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC SERVICE ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from September 1. Page 710.)
Clause 3—"Interpretation."

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

In new subsection (2) to strike out "Except so far as inconsistent with any" and insert "Notwithstanding any provision of any other".

I have a number of amendments on the file and their purpose is to overcome difficulties concerning some of the Acts under which the salaries are fixed. The amendment takes away all restrictive provisions and enables certain matters to be referred to the Public Service Arbitrator.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

In new subsection (2) after "instrumentality" to insert "(except a person or officer whose salary or remuneration is at a fixed rate prescribed by Act of Parliament)".

This amendment excludes salaries fixed by Act of Parliament from the purview of the Public Service Arbitrator.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I move to insert the following new subsection:

(3) In the case of a proclamation under the preceding subsection of this section that this Act applies to persons employed pursuant to the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1963, subsection (2) of section 7 of this Act shall not apply to any claim application or matter by or in respect of such persons, but the arbitrator shall notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act determine conditions of employment in addition to the matters specified in subsection (1) of that section.

I want to bring to the notice of the Committee some important police matters. The Police Association of South Australia is an association registered under the Industrial Code. The Industrial Court can deal only with matters of salaries because conditions are governed by regulations under the Police Regulation Act.

A representative of the Public Service Commissioner at the last hearing in the Industrial Court left no doubt in the court's mind that the Police Regulation Act is a special Act dealing with the regulation of the Police Force, and this Act overrules the provisions of the Industrial Code or any other Act. Agreeing with this proposition, the Industrial Court refused to deal with the application for increased annual leave. It is now abundantly clear that any other conditions of employment embodied in the Police Regulation Act cannot be dealt with by the Industrial Court or other similar tribunal. The court has indicated that the Commissioner of Police is empowered to deal with annual leave and the association lodged an application for increased leave with the Commissioner in June of this year, but it is considered that such applications placed the Commissioner of Police in the dual role of employer and arbitrator and that it would be difficult for him to adjudicate in industrial matters while remembering his responsibilities to the men under his control and the Government at the same time.

At this date no reply has been received in respect of this application, which goes back to September 10. They asked what the Government would do to correct the obvious anomaly that exists in the law at present, which denies them the right to have an adjudication on their conditions, as well as salary, before an independent arbitrator. The Chief Secretary indicated that he was prepared to examine a proposition that would

come within the jurisdiction of the Public Service Arbitrator, and on that note the discussion closed. In respect of the 1,750 members represented by the Police Association, the amendments to the Public Service Arbitration Act serve no useful purpose. It is true that members of that association could be brought under the Act by proclamation, but for what purpose? The Public Service Arbitrator can deal only with salaries and, in any case, the Public Service Arbitration Act is subject to the decisions of the Industrial Court and, above all, it does not overrule the Police Regulation Act.

The association, therefore, found itself in precisely the same position as it is at present. Police officers differ from all other branches of Government employees, by whatever name they are called. Their duties and conditions of service are different. The association is convinced that the only type of tribunal that would properly decide all issues relating to pay and conditions of the police service is a properly constituted board set up for that purpose. In setting up a Police Classification Board the association would be prepared to agree to the Public Service Arbitrator's being the Chairman of the board, and he would be assisted by a representative of the Commissioner and a representative of the association. There is no reason why such representation could not be provided without additional cost to the Government. The association wants the arbitrator to deal with both pay and conditions; it does not want to be involved with the Public Service Board. The association committee cannot be satisfied until it has obtained for its members the right to appear before an independent arbitrator for the purpose of having a proper determination made in relation to conditions as well as to salaries.

In support of this amendment I referred to a certain application. The association stated that the application submitted to the Commissioner of Police for an increase in annual leave had been replied to by the Chief Secretary, who had informed the association that Cabinet had decided that increased annual leave would not be granted to police officers. Their annual leave of 28 days was fixed in 1927 by the Industrial Court, but their application was refused. It was said that the court had no power to consider the matter because of police regulations, but that it could be considered by the Commissioner of Police, which, as already indicated, is not in keeping with the normal practice of creating harmonious industrial relationships.

It is just another way for the Government to escape its obligations in the interests of the Police Force by suggesting that it should be the Police Commissioner to deal with these matters, but he, in turn, must submit the matter to the Minister who, in turn, should take it to Cabinet, the final answer being "No". It appears that that is another way by which the Government is able to sidestep its obligations. The Police Force of South Australia is the lowest paid Police Force in Australia, and it has the worst annual leave provisions. Western Australian and Tasmanian police officers have 35 days' annual leave; Victorian officers at present enjoy 35 days but expect that, in the near future, this will be increased to 42 days; New South Wales at present has 42 days; and Queensland, although not quite as well off as the other States, has provision for 35 days for shift workers and 28 days for day workers. Although it has been held by the courts and accepted by the Police Association that the only fair comparison to make in respect of pay and conditions for police officers is with other police forces, the association does not think it would do any harm at this stage to point out that public servants enjoy 21 days' annual leave, plus 10 public holidays, and, generally speaking, they receive two grace days at Christmas, giving them a total of 33 days' holiday a year.

When granting the 28 days to police officers in South Australia in 1927 the court considered that the onerous nature of the duties of a police officer entitled him to more annual leave than was given to public servants, and in its judgment gave effect to this decision. However, at present the police officers find themselves behind even public servants, as well as the other police forces, because the 28 days they receive is their entire annual leave: they are not entitled to any public holidays.

I think it is quite reasonable that we should make this amendment in order to give this very responsible body of people an opportunity to gain reasonable wages and conditions. Although this body can go before the Industrial Court, as soon as it asks for something that could mean a reduction in hours, or an extension of leave, it is told that it functions under police regulations and that it must deal with the Commissioner.

I do not think the Commissioner should be the responsible party for the Police Force to deal with in this matter. The Commissioner has a job to do in seeing that his officers carry out the duties expected of them. The Police

Force should be able to go before an independent arbitrator, such as the Public Service Arbitrator. There could be a representative from the Police Commissioner and one from the Police Association, and the procedure could be similar to that adopted by State wages boards, which have representatives of employers and employees in equal numbers, with an independent chairman. Those people discuss matters such as hours and wages and arrive at decisions, and if they cannot arrive at a decision the union then has the right to appeal to the Industrial Court for its case to be further considered. However, the Police Force (I exclude the most senior officers, who are under a different set-up) does not have this right; it can go only so far, and it is blocked as soon as it asks for something.

As I pointed out earlier, much unpaid service is rendered by police officers' wives in answering the telephone and taking messages, and, in country stations, even providing meals for prisoners detained in the cells. The amendment should be accepted in the interests of very responsible people who carry out their public duties for the benefit of the people.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The effect of the amendment will be to provide for a small number of people, who may come under proclamation, to have the right to go before the Public Service Arbitrator on different terms from the bulk of people who go before him. By Act of Parliament, the Public Service Arbitrator is confined to fixing salaries for public servants. The Bill deals with some people who are at present not getting their salaries fixed at all by arbitration and provides for them to have their salaries fixed by the arbitrator. However, the Leader's amendment provides that their terms and conditions of employment could also be fixed by the arbitrator. The Bill is designed to bring many people into a common arrangement, but the Leader's amendment deals with an entirely different matter.

This Bill arose from a deputation received by the Chief Secretary from a number of officers who did not have an approach to any tribunal for fixing their salaries. When they went to the Public Service Arbitrator they were told by him that he could not legally fix their salaries. The Crown Solicitor said that the arbitrator was correct in this. Cabinet examined the position and decided that it was proper that these people should have the right to have their salaries fixed. That was the request that was made, considered and included in the Bill. I have two letters on my file, one

from the Public Service Association and one from the Police Officers Association, which brought the request to the Government. The letter from the Public Service Association states:

I thank you for your letter of June 23, 1964, and appreciate the action of the Government in introducing the necessary amendment to the Public Service Arbitration Act to bring the Police Commissioned Officers within the jurisdiction of the Public Service Arbitrator. My association will look forward to the passing of this legislation and I can assure you that it will be taken advantage of by the members concerned. I note your remarks regarding the submissions made at our recent deputation asking the Government to agree to an interim salary increase for the members concerned, and have to advise that this matter is receiving further consideration by my association.

The letter from the Police Officers Association states:

On behalf of the commissioned officers of police, I desire to express our deep appreciation for the sympathetic consideration given to our recent request on the question of a wage fixing tribunal and for the prompt and effective action taken by yourself to remedy the unfortunate situation which had been created through no fault of the officers concerned. Members of the association were reluctant to worry you with our troubles but had no other channel open to them to achieve their objective. From previous dealings with you, Sir, we had every confidence that you would take the necessary steps to protect our interests and the early results in this case are consistent with the reputation you have earned over the years, of ensuring that the various groups under your Ministerial control were fairly treated.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In case the levity of the member for Norwood is directed at me, I point out that this letter is addressed to the Chief Secretary, who is the Ministerial head of this department, and I am not making any personal claims to the words of the association.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The honourable member need not be jealous!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. This Bill was introduced to allow persons who had not the benefit of a wage-fixing tribunal to have one that they themselves considered adequate. The Leader intends to bring in extraneous matters that could disrupt this legislation. I suggest that in those circumstances the amendment should not be passed.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Premier has given a concise and, no doubt, accurate account of how the Government's proposal came before Parliament. I point out that this has not been opposed by members of the Opposition. We see no reason whatever why commissioned

officers of the Police Force should not have the opportunity to go before the arbitrator and have their salaries fixed. But the Premier has not answered the case that the Leader of the Opposition made out on behalf, not of the commissioned officers but of the rank and file of the Police Force, the overwhelming number of members of the force in South Australia. They are people who have to sustain onerous conditions of duty. In my district I know what kind of strain is on members of the Police Force.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I can understand that.

Mr. Shannon: That will be refreshing news for some people.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Government members have forgotten the occasions when I have raised this matter during my period here. Let me remind them that at one stage in my district Sergeant Fry was in charge of the Norwood police station. He was one of the most responsible officers known in the Police Force, and one with whom I had the best personal relations.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I hope it was reciprocated.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It was to the extent that on a previous occasion when election literature was distributed in my district his photograph appeared on it. Sergeant Fry had a great burden in carrying out his duty in the Norwood district with an under-staffed station and a busy district, and he was faced with a serious breakdown in health.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Norwood.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am happy to hear the empty laughter on the Government benches. On many occasions Sergeant Fry has thanked me for the assistance I have given him in the district. Such officers as Sergeant Fry have been faced with a very heavy burden of duty indeed. Their duties have called them out at all hours of the day and night and they are not in the same position as ordinary members of the Public Service who work from 9 to 5. Back in 1927, police officers were granted extra conditions of service by the Industrial Court, which thought that they had to be rewarded in some measure for the onerous duties they had to undertake. The effect of the legislation has been to deprive these people of the right to go to a tribunal to obtain reasonable conditions of employment.

Mr. Casey: And they would number about 2,000?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly. Apparently, the fact that these people cannot go to a court is a matter of great merriment on the part of the Government members. It is a great laughing matter and they could not care less.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That is not what they are laughing at, and you know it.

Mr. DUNSTAN: If that is not what honourable members opposite are laughing at, perhaps the honourable member will rise and say what is his attitude on this matter and explain why members of the Police Force are denied, by the Government, the right to go before a tribunal about conditions of employment. We are having difficulty in recruiting sufficient members to the Police Force in South Australia and in keeping it up to strength. In my district, I have had complaint after complaint from previous occupants of the sergeant's post about the fact that they could not secure sufficient staff for stations.

Mr. Heaslip: Is that because of outside interference?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Where is the outside interference? Those people saw fit to pour their trials into my very receptive ears. I have often risen in this place and pointed out the necessity for their being given added assistance by the Police Commissioner, but the answer was that they did not then have enough members in the Police Force to be able to staff the station effectively. The Government has not been able to recruit sufficient policemen and there have been many resignations because of the onerous duties that these people have to undertake. They are able to obtain better conditions of employment outside the Police Force.

If we are to be able to obtain a proper Police Force in South Australia, one which is up to the full complement, we have to provide these people with some satisfaction for the very considerable discontent that now exists because they are not able to go to a tribunal and ask for reasonable conditions of employment. To whom can they go? They can go to their employer who, through the Chief Secretary, the Commissioner's Ministerial chief, tells them that they are not going to be granted better conditions. They cannot go before an independent tribunal and argue a fair and reasonable case—and that their case is fair and reasonable is undoubted. The members of the Police Force in this State have the worst conditions of employment of any Police Force in this country.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Or of any section of the community in this State.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. I believe there is hardly a member on this side who has not had complaints from members of the Police Force about their conditions of employment.

Mr. Ryan: I get them every day.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am sure that other members get them every day, too. I do. What does the Government intend to do about this? The Premier's only answer to the Leader's reasonable claim in this matter is that this amendment introduces a new feature into the Public Service Arbitration Act. Well, a new feature is needed in the Act to meet a reasoned case. Something must be done to provide a means by which these people can go to an arbitrator. They are prepared to accept the Public Service Arbitrator.

Mr. Frank Walsh: As the chairman.

Mr. DUNSTAN: If they are going before him as an arbitrator, and each side is placing its own case, they are going before an arbitrator effectively. He would be acting as a wages board. They do not ask that they come under the Public Service Board. The general conditions of the Public Service are necessarily different from those of the Police Force, and because the Police Force is in this special position the Public Service Arbitrator has seemed to them to be a reasonable tribunal to which to go. All they are able to do otherwise is go to the Public Service Arbitrator on wages matters only. They are prepared to do this, but they want someone to whom to go on their conditions as well. They reasonably say that their conditions should not be laid down by the Commissioner of Police or by the Government by mere regulation. Back in 1927 they were able to go to a tribunal, so why should that be denied them now in terms of the Police Regulation Act? This amendment will provide a simple procedure by which they will be able to do so.

They are not asking for the general procedure laid down for the Public Service—the application to the Public Service Board, the hearing by it, the reference to the arbitrator, and the like. They simply want the Public Service Arbitrator to be able to deal directly and simply with their claims. That is simply what the amendment does; it provides that they may lodge a claim not only in relation to wages but also in relation to conditions; that the arbitrator shall deal with the claim for conditions; that the claim must be directed to the arbitrator and not to the Public Service Board; that it can be served on the Commissioner of Police; and that it can be determined by the arbitrator on a procedure to be laid

down by regulation. The regulations (there is a regulation-making power under the Public Service Arbitration Act) can provide for a simple procedure before the Public Service Arbitrator. How else are these people to be dealt with? The Premier has not answered that. If his answer simply is, "As far as we are concerned, the Police Force in South Australia will continue to have its conditions laid down by regulations, and our attitude to the regulations is summed up in the Chief Secretary's answer to the regulations—that they are not going to get better annual leave in this State, and that is the end of the matter; there is no appeal to anyone else", discontent in the Police Force arising from conditions will thereby be very much increased. So far, we have had no answer by the Government to the deputation that the Police Association took to the Chief Secretary. The only answer he gave was that he was prepared to examine the case put forward for an arbitrator to deal with their claims. There is no provision in the proposal before us that that should be done, but members on this side of the House believe it should be done and that the reasonable and proper claims of this very large body of men should be met in this simple, effective, and just way.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Hughes. No—Mr. Freebairn.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, section 4."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved: After "holding that" to strike out "office" and insert "appointment".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

To strike out all words after "State" and insert "in which event he shall be paid the salary in respect of his appointment as arbitrator or the salary in respect of such other appointment whichever is the greater: Provided further that nothing in this subsection shall preclude the arbitrator from receiving such additional remuneration as the Governor may determine in respect of any part-time appointment held by him."

The purpose of this amendment is merely to tidy up the position with regard to the arbitrator's salary.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Amendment of principal Act, section 8."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

In paragraph (a) to strike out "inserting therein after" and insert "striking out"; after "thereof" to insert "and inserting in lieu thereof"; and in new paragraph to strike out "clause" and insert "e".

These are purely drafting amendments.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

To strike out paragraph (j).

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.32 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 8, at 2 p.m.