

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 21, 1968

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

**ADELAIDE TO GAWLER RAILWAY
(ALTERATION OF DRY CREEK TERMINUS) BILL**

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS**COMMUNITY PLAN**

Mr. CORCORAN: On September 23 the Premier, when addressing a Commonwealth Club luncheon in the Adelaide Town Hall, suggested a plan that would enable the people of South Australia to have greater community involvement and dialogue with the Government of the day in order to help chart South Australia's future course. In explaining the steps that could be taken, he said that the South Australian community could select, from its centres of learning, sponsors for the programme, which could be called "Aims for South Australia". This body would draw up papers to be submitted to a conference. Finally he said that the Government was interested in having people approach it on this matter. Will the Premier say whether any approaches have been made by the public with regard to promoting the idea he expressed at the luncheon and, if they have, what steps have been taken to put his plan into effect?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have been approached by members of the public concerning this proposal, and have received a number of telegrams and letters expressing approval. I think the only disapproving reference I have seen was in the form of a letter in one of the newspapers (I forget which), all other contacts having been favourable. Last Saturday I was at a function with a person who is noted for participating in the activities of his district and who offered to be involved in such a plan if it was thought that he could be of any use. Therefore, there is still some awareness in the public's mind of this plan.

However, I must admit that, because of a certain political controversy that developed in the meantime, my attention was diverted for a couple of weeks from promoting this plan. But in the last several weeks I have sent material to one or two interested persons whom

I should like to see associated with the launching of the plan, and at the moment they are, I hope, studying that material. When I have received further expert advice from people who I think should be consulted if such a plan is to be successful, I hope to be able to make a public announcement and to bring further information to the honourable member. The matter is still current in my thinking, and I am trying to promote it on a proper basis. I think it could not be hastily promoted; it would have to have the support of people in particular categories in order to be successful.

EAVESDROPPING DEVICES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Attorney-General say whether the conference of Attorneys-General held in Perth last month was in agreement (1) that there was a threat to privacy in the availability and use of electronic "peeping tom" and eavesdropping devices; and (2) that legislation was necessary to safeguard the privacy of individuals in this regard? Does the Attorney-General intend to recommend to Cabinet the introduction of legislation to control the use of such devices?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This matter was discussed at the meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General in Perth a couple of weeks ago, and it was discussed at the previous meeting in Canberra. I must confess that I am not particularly enthusiastic about the matter, but most of the other Attorneys were and, of course, even before the meeting in Perth the Victorian Government had introduced a Bill; in addition, the New South Welsh intend to do the same at some time in the future. I think Mr. McCaw has said he intends to wait until March to see what the reaction of the public is to the matter. That will be after the next meeting of the standing committee which is due in Hobart, I think, in the first week in March. I do not intend to make any recommendation to Cabinet, either for or against, at least until after the next standing committee meeting.

CAR SALES

Mr. RYAN: I have been approached on many occasions by constituents concerning the buying of secondhand motor cars, and only on Tuesday of this week a constituent well known to me approached me because he had been well and truly taken down by a so-called reputable firm. He bought a motor car in all

good faith and, on telling the dealer that he would like an inspection by the Royal Automobile Association of S.A. Incorporated on the vehicle's roadworthiness, he was told, "That is unnecessary; we will give you an absolute guarantee and, if the car is not what we say it is, we will give you your money back." After having the car for two days, my constituent found that it was nearly worthless, and the same sort of thing has happened to many other people who have bought used cars. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the Government has considered introducing legislation requiring roadworthiness certificates for all used cars sold? If the Government has not considered the matter, will it do so in an endeavour to protect the public from sharp-shooters in the used motor car industry?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think I can answer the two questions respectively "No" and "Yes". I will refer the matter to my colleague for his views but, as a Government, we have not considered the legislation suggested by the honourable member. This is a terribly difficult problem. I guess that people have been taking others down as long as the human race has been organized into communities. The general rule of the law is *caveat emptor*: the buyer must satisfy himself, before he buys, of the value of the goods he intends to purchase, and this is as true of motor cars as of anything else. However, I know that that is pretty cold comfort to someone who has been rooked in any transaction. It is also difficult to know just how this problem can be controlled in justice both to the buyer and to the seller. I will certainly discuss it with Mr. Hill and we will try, as I think preceding Governments have tried, to find some solution.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Attorney-General answered the question about inspection of secondhand vehicles mainly, I think, from the point of view of the business and legal aspect. Will he ask that his colleague, when considering this matter, also consider the aspect of road safety involved in the condition of secondhand vehicles? With the mounting road toll, surely this aspect should be given due weight when this question is considered.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member obviously misunderstood the purport of what I said. I did not think only of the legal aspect. Obviously, just as important, or even more important, is the road safety aspect. I think that the police now have the power to go into a secondhand car

yard to inspect vehicles. I think that is the position, so that the power is there. One of the difficulties is the manpower required to do this on a large scale. As a former Cabinet Minister, the honourable member knows that it takes men to do this work, and the Police Force is pretty fully stretched. I will certainly include what he has said in my discussions with my colleague.

SALVATION JANE

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about a property owner in Gumeracha renting some land near an Engineering and Water Supply Department property so that he could control salvation jane on that property?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I am informed that, in the area referred to by the honourable member, normally the one-chain fire break around the pine plantations is ploughed to control weed growth, but in this case the slope of the land is such that it is not practicable to do this work with machinery. In the circumstances, the Conservator of Forests has indicated that his department would be most pleased to make suitable arrangements for the leasing of this one-chain strip of land, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department has indicated that it has no objection to such a proposal.

GOOLWA BARRAGES

Mr. HURST: Recently a constituent of mine had a most frightening experience while fishing at the river mouth at Goolwa. He informs me that no warning whatever is given to people in the vicinity when the barrages on the Murray River are opened. People often fish from small boats in the area and the surge of water when the barrages are opened is great. Fishermen lose many nets as the water surges into the open sea. I am informed that the surge of the water is so great that it washes away about 6ft. of the embankment an hour while the barrages are open. I have been told that a motor of 10 horse-power to 15 horse-power would be required to get out of the surge and be safe from being swept to sea. Will the Minister of Works see whether a warning cannot be given to the general public when these barrages are opened?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: As the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) asked a somewhat similar question yesterday, I will consider both questions at the same time.

SUPERPHOSPHATE PRICES

Mr. McANANEY: It is reported in today's press that the price of superphosphate has been increased by 90c a ton for bagged superphosphate and by only 15c a ton for bulk supplies. I point out that the price of bags has not changed since the price was last fixed, and I also point out that in Victoria, where superphosphate prices are not controlled, on August 1 last, following a decrease in the price of rock phosphate, the price of superphosphate was reduced by from 20c to 40c a ton, although last year the price in that State had probably been higher than our price. Will the Premier obtain from the Prices Commissioner a report on the reasons for the increase in prices in South Australia and, in particular, for the larger increase in the price of bagged superphosphate?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will ask my colleague to get a report from the Prices Commissioner. I think it will be found that superphosphate prices in South Australia would be similar to those in Victoria, except that the price in South Australia for supplies in farmers' bags would be about \$1 a ton lower. I know that the increase has been approved by the Prices Commissioner, and I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that, as superphosphate plants in Victoria have the advantage of large-scale production and throughput, we in South Australia probably have a better appreciation of the problem to farmers of superphosphate prices, in that we can maintain a price similar to that in Victoria.

ABATTOIR OPERATIONS

Mr. JENNINGS: Recently employees of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board have told me that they are concerned about the contribution made by the abattoir to our economy and also about their own security as employees. It has been put to me that the "export" part of the board's title is not being sufficiently emphasized and could be greatly increased. I also understand that private abattoirs are increasing their export of meat and by-products and that one private abattoir is using the facilities of the Gepps Cross abattoir. Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture whether a proper appreciation of the export opportunities of the board has made and, if it has not, whether this will be considered, with a view to marketing overseas?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will take up this question with the Minister of Agriculture, have it thoroughly examined, and bring back a reply as soon as possible.

SOUTH-EAST STOCK ROUTE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of November 14 about when the blocks in the hundreds of Bonney and Malcolm will be open for allotment?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Land Board has recommended the allocation of certain portions of the former travelling stock reserve in the hundred of Malcolm to the various adjoining owners. These will be proceeded with in accordance with the usual practice in such cases. The board has also recommended that certain areas of the former travelling stock reserve be retained as Crown land, as the adjoining lands have suffered heavily from wind erosion and the areas concerned would constitute a further erosion risk.

CANNERY CLOSURE

Mr. ARNOLD: I understand that a liquidator has been appointed to wind up the affairs of Moray Park Fruits Limited but that there may be insufficient funds to meet all creditors. Will the Attorney-General ascertain the position of growers who supplied fruit to the company in the 1958 season for which money is still owing? Since then, I believe the position has been satisfactory, but there is still money owing on the 1958 season.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will certainly have inquiries made.

FORBES PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. VIRGO: In the reply of the Minister of Education yesterday to a question I asked on November 6, the Minister said it was not desirable that the Forbes Primary School should have a frontage to Marion Road. I point out, however, that the school already has a frontage to Marion Road, and that the school committee is emphatic that there should be no further access to that road. So the undesirability fades into oblivion when one realizes that if the property were obtained, the position in respect of the fence on Marion Road would be no different from what it is now. That enrolments are decreasing is true in part: they have been decreasing, but I have been informed that they are now static and expected to continue at their present level. From the Minister's reply it seems that the purchase was negated mainly because the price asked was \$60,000, which I agree is a large sum. However, as the Minister would know, the Education Department would not have to pay all that for the land if the Land Board valuation was less, because, as I understand it, the

land could be acquired at the valuation of the Land Board. Therefore, will the Minister reconsider her decision, particularly bearing in mind the point I had raised earlier that if this property is not acquired now the chance to acquire it will have been gone for all time?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am cognizant of all the points raised by the honourable member, particularly that point concerning the availability of this block. For some years the school committee has desired that the department purchase this land but the price has always been prohibitive for such a small block.

Mr. Virgo: It has never been available before.

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Possibly, although I understand that the school committee has always desired the department to purchase it but that the price on it has always been too high. The enrolment figures I provided have been prepared by departmental officers who are skilled in assessing projected enrolments at schools, but because of the honourable member's further question I will ask for certain aspects of my previous reply to be amplified, and I will let him have a report at the earliest opportunity.

TAILEM BEND BUILDING

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the disused rabbit freezer in the Tailem Bend railway yard?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Apparently, the building referred to is one which was erected on land leased in the Tailem Bend station yard in 1949 for a rabbit chiller. In August of this year, the lessee company advised that it did not have any further use for the facility and requested termination of the lease. It was intended to terminate the lease on September 30, 1968, provided that the building, plant and all accumulations had been removed from the land by that date. The matter has been followed up twice but no reply has been received. It has been decided, therefore, that failing removal by the lessee by the end of this month, departmental forces will carry out the work at his debit.

MOONTA HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: In order to clarify my question, which concerns the hardship caused to country community hospitals by non-payment of insurance claims of patients admitted to those hospitals, I quote a letter that has

caused me much concern since I received it yesterday. Written by Mrs. Evans (Secretary of the Moonta Jubilee Hospital Incorporated), it states, in part:

At last night's board meeting I was instructed to write to you re accident cases which are admitted to the hospital. The members of the board were wondering if it would be possible for you to draw attention to the Government the hardship caused to hospitals with the non-payment of insurance claims of patients. During the last 12 months five accident victims have been admitted to the hospital, and it appears that the hospital will be forced to wait for several years before being paid. There are hundreds of dollars outstanding, and as we are a small hospital, we require a steady income to enable other commitments to be met.

If I obtain from the Secretary of the board all relevant facts concerning the cases referred to in the letter and make them available, will the Premier discuss these matters with the Chief Secretary with a view to having the payment of insurance claims of accident patients expedited?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: After receiving the relevant details from the honourable member, I shall be pleased to discuss this matter with my colleague.

PETERBOROUGH RAMPS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my most recent question about the ramps at Peterborough?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Little can be added to previous replies, except to state that the Standards Association of Australia code prescribes that, where intended to be used by incapacitated persons, ramps should not be steeper than one in 12. The ramps at Peterborough originally had slopes of one in six and one in eight, too steep to be intended to be used by incapacitated persons in terms of the code. With the reconstruction of the subway, all ramps have been standardized at one in six, this being brought about by certain space limitations.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier received from the Minister of Health a reply to several questions I have asked concerning air pollution?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not think I have it with me now. I had a note in my bag stating that this had been replied to some time ago, but I will check with my list, and

again get the relevant information for the honourable member. At one stage, after his previous several inquiries, I was referred to a previous reply which, I understood, was the reply the honourable member required.

RUBBISH DUMPING

Mr. BROOMHILL: The Minister of Works may have noticed the recent publicity given to the dumping of rubbish from the Torrens River outlet on the sea-front at West Beach. First, can he say whether his department shares the responsibility for cleaning up any debris that may be washed on to the beach; and, secondly, will he request his officers to inspect the upper reaches of the Torrens outlet so that it can be cleaned up in order to prevent rubbish entering the river during the course of its movement towards the sea?

The Hon. J. W. H. CUMBE: I am aware of the problem at the break-out creek that enters the sea adjacent to Henley Beach and near West Beach, and I will consider the matters raised by the honourable member to see whether the problem can be minimized. As the honourable member realizes, it is not often that the Torrens River comes down with such a degree of flooding as has happened this season but, apparently, on its way down it collects debris consisting of tree trunks, as well as other rubbish, and deposits them in the honourable member's district. I have spoken to the Mayor of Henley Beach (Mr. Whiteford) about it, but I will consider it further and give the honourable member a considered reply.

SALISBURY INFANTS SCHOOL

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the occupancy of the new Salisbury Infants School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The buildings at the new Salisbury Infants School have been virtually completed, as the honourable member has said. Construction reached an advanced stage at the end of the first term, when a protracted delay occurred because the contractor who had been awarded the site works contract became bankrupt. Because of unavoidable and protracted investigations and negotiations carried out by the Public Buildings Department, and because of wet weather, no work has been done for several months on site works, thus preventing the transfer of the infants grades to this new accommodation. Eventually, the contract for site work by the contractor was determined, and quotes have been sought for the paving and other associated work around the buildings. No new contract has yet been arranged, but one is expected to be let soon,

and if work proceeds quickly the school will be ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1969 school year. The Public Buildings Department and the Education Department have been well aware of the delay and have taken all steps within their power to expedite the completion of this work, but legal aspects and formalities have made it impossible to have the contract completed earlier.

PORT AUGUSTA ROADWORKS

Mr. RICHES: A rumour is current that there is a delay, because of a shortage of surveyors or planning staff in the Highways Department, in constructing the new bridge across Spencer Gulf and a highway through the municipality of Port Augusta. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether there is any truth in that rumour and, if there is, will he ascertain the reason for the delay?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

PENSIONERS' SPECTACLES

Mr. BURDON: On September 3 last, the Premier replied to a question I had asked about a spectacles service for pensioners in country areas. I previously raised this matter last year, when the former Premier (Hon. D. A. Dunstan) indicated that such a service would be commenced in Mount Gambier. However, it was then pointed out that the Australian Medical Association had referred the matter to the Commonwealth Government and that further action would be deferred until the Commonwealth's decision was known. Will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Health whether details of that decision have yet been received from the Commonwealth authorities and, if they have, will he make those details known to the House?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will find out for the honourable member.

FIRE RISK

Mr. LANGLEY: The Minister of Agriculture recently referred to the grave fire risk in this State and, indeed, I hope everyone is aware of the danger that exists in this regard. The Minister went on to say that all Ministers had been asked to urge departments to take special precautions regarding Government-owned or occupied land. I, like most members, have vacant Government-owned land in my district, and I also have railway and tram land in this category. As the Unley City Council has already issued notices dealing with the fire hazard in connection with certain

properties in the district, will the Premier say whether the various Government departments have yet taken action to ensure that the Government will set an example for others to follow and will he say whether the Government intends keeping this matter before the public by means of effective advertising in the press and over the radio?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Government's action on this matter has, in fact, been on the Minister's own initiative, the Minister having publicly indicated that he was contacting Government departments. I know that a copy of the Minister's statement was forwarded to me for my attention but, as Premier and Minister of Industrial Development, I have little physical responsibility in regard to property. However, I imagine that the information contained in the Minister's statement will help other Ministers in carrying out particular duties in respect of their portfolios. The Minister having initiated action in this regard, I think the departments concerned will be able to follow up the matter. Concerning the ultimate success of the plan, I suppose we will have to wait for the time being. However, the Government intends to follow through as much as possible any fire precaution measures that may be suggested. Although I have not heard about the Minister's plans for publicity, I am sure that he will continue to initiate the type of publicity for which he has previously been responsible and which, I think, the honourable member has noted in the last few weeks.

PORT ADELAIDE SCHOOL

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about installing an air-conditioner in the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I have a reply which I trust the honourable member will find satisfactory. On November 1, the Public Buildings Department was requested to comment on the proposal for the installation of an air-conditioner in the canteen at the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School. An inspection was made of the canteen and a report has now been forwarded to the Education Department stating that the scheme should prove satisfactory.

HILLS RESERVOIR

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday about establishing a reservoir in the Adelaide Hills at Castambul?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The honourable member referred to the possibility of constructing a reservoir at Sixth Creek. Surveys were made about 30 years ago in regard to building a storage on Sixth Creek. These have been re-examined in recent years. While a suitable dam site can be located, the valley at Sixth Creek is relatively steep and storage even with a major structure is small. With the construction of Kangaroo Creek dam, water from Sixth Creek can now be effectively diverted at the Gorge weir, except in time of flood, and this renders any proposal for a dam on Sixth Creek of little advantage at this stage of development of catchments.

SALISBURY-ELIZABETH TRANSPORT

Mr. CLARK: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently about the Minister's plans to help road and rail travellers in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The question of issuing weekly, monthly and season tickets for combined rail and bus travel to and from the Salisbury-Elizabeth area has been discussed by officers of the Municipal Tramways Trust with representatives of the South Australian Railways and with the licensed bus operators concerned. All interested parties have agreed in principle with the proposal, but details for implementing and administering the scheme have yet to be worked out. The South Australian Railways is actively engaged on this matter and it is understood that price details will be available soon. The proposal envisages that periodical and season tickets will be available for combined rail and bus travel to and from Salisbury, Elizabeth South, Elizabeth and Womma stations. The price of the tickets in respect of bus travel will represent a discount on the normal adult cash fare. With respect to rail travel, the discount normally applicable to the various classes of periodical and season tickets will apply.

STURT HIGHWAY TREES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the mutilation of trees along the scenic highway between Tanunda and Sandy Creek?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have a reply which I am happy to give. It is necessary to cut trees near overhead electricity

mains in order to prevent the possibility of bushfires and to avoid electricity blackouts. The Electricity Trust is very conscious of the value of trees in the community and in recent years has followed a policy of consultation with councils and the Highways Department and has endeavoured to minimize damage wherever possible.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: They cut them down to ground level.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: They do their best.

Mr. Jennings: Butcher Hill!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I think the present practices of the trust have been going on for a long time, even when the Hon. Mr. Hutchens was the Minister.

Mr. Corcoran: And Ministers before him, too.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Probably.

Mr. Corcoran: It's shocking.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Perhaps I should proceed with the reply.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Attorney-General should be allowed to reply to the question.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Unfortunately, in an area about a mile east of Sandy Creek, which is no doubt the area referred to, this policy was not carried out. The trust officer concerned referred the matter to the Highways Department but then proceeded to cut the trees much more severely than necessary. His reason for doing so was that he followed the level of cutting which had been done on the trees some years ago as was evident from the appearance of the butts. The trust regrets this happening and will make every endeavour to prevent a recurrence.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT CIRCULAR

Mr. LAWN: This morning I received a letter from the Local Government Association of South Australia Incorporated, allegedly from Mr. E. H. Smith (the Secretary).

Mr. Broomhill: I think we all received one.

Mr. LAWN: I think all members have received a copy of this letter. I wish to draw attention to the day on which I have received the letter (which is today) and to the fact that it is dated November 20, 1968. It is a lengthy letter dealing with the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill which was recently before Parliament and which was passed by this House on October 23. Part of the letter states:

The committee, with the greatest respect, expects you to give proper consideration to this matter—

referring to the Bill—

If councils are to be required to pay this tax, they would like to know for what reason. If there is no good reason, the committee considers that ratepayers should be advised of the circumstances, which are set out in a proposed form of letter to ratepayers. A copy of that letter is enclosed for your information. In this proposed letter, which Mr. Smith apparently intends to send to all ratepayers, the following appears:

A copy of the form of this letter was sent to your member of Parliament before the amendment was made to the Stamp Duties Act. As I said, the amending Bill was passed by this House on October 23, yet I received this letter, dated November 20, on November 21. My personal opinion is that, if this proposed letter were sent out, Mr. Smith would be committing a breach of privilege of this House. Therefore, will you, Mr. Speaker, examine this letter to see whether it constitutes a breach of privilege? Perhaps you could inform Mr. Smith, before he sends it out, whether the letter does constitute such a breach rather than that the letter should be distributed to ratepayers and the question of privilege raised afterwards.

The SPEAKER: I think there may be some misunderstanding about the position. I have not received a letter from this person. If the honourable member will let me examine the letter he has received, I will raise the matter with the Municipal Association of South Australia, consider it, and let the House know the result.

ADVERTISING SIGNS

Mr. WARDLE: Through the State Planning Office, the Meningie and the Mobilong councils have been removing signs from roadsides. They have completed this task in their own areas but the advertising signs on railway property have not been removed. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether he intends to have these advertising signs removed from railway land and, if he does, when?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

SOLOMONTOWN OVER-PASS

Mr. McKEE: I ask the Attorney-General again whether he has obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question about the Solomontown over-pass. If he does not have a reply, I hope that my question today will serve as a reminder to him and that he will obtain a reply next week.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member's question today will serve, as his question yesterday served, as a reminder to hasten the reply. I think the honourable member knows I do not have the reply today, because I explained to him carefully and courteously yesterday what is the normal procedure. I assure him again, as I assured him yesterday, that just as soon as I have a reply I will let him know about it.

SEACLIFF SCHOOL

Mr. HUDSON: I have previously asked the Minister of Works a question about the work being carried out at the Seacliff Infants School on regrading of the grounds. A contract for this work was originally let in March of this year, the original expectation being that the work would commence immediately after Easter. As the work is still not completed, I should appreciate the Minister's investigating the matter again to see whether action cannot be taken to hasten its completion. The effect of this whole business has been to extend over one full school year the work on the Seacliff Infants School grounds. As a result, the grounds have been unusable for the whole year. As this is a fairly serious matter and as this delay has taken place, will the Minister see what action he can take to produce a speedy remedy?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: If, as the honourable member has suggested, this contract was let early this year and the work has still not been completed, I will certainly want to know why. I will look into the matter and tell the honourable member what can be done about it.

TEACHERS SALARIES BOARD

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Education will be aware that the Teachers Salaries Board consists of two representatives of the Education Department and two representatives of the Institute of Teachers with a Chairman who acts as arbitrator if the representatives cannot agree. I understand that, subsequent to the recent salaries case that came before the board, the Chairman made a report to the Minister but that this report is not available to the institute. As it is usual, when a person (or persons) acting as arbitrator makes an award and submits a report, to submit it to both parties, will the Minister of Education have a copy of the report to which I have referred supplied to the institute, and will she have this made the usual practice in future?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I do not know whether the practice mentioned by the honourable member was followed when he was Minister of Education. A report was made to me, as Minister, and I understand that a report was also made to the South Australian Institute of Teachers by the institute's representatives on the tribunal. I did not see the latter report. However, I will follow up the honourable member's question and find out whether it is the usual practice to make such reports available to parties to a case before the Teachers Salaries Board.

HORMONE SPRAY

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to my question about the use of hormone spray?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that draft legislation designed to control spraying involving the use of agricultural chemicals has been prepared and is at present being examined, with a view to its submission to Cabinet for consideration.

SCHOOLTEACHERS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about a regulation affecting school-teachers?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The new classification scheme to which the honourable member refers is intended to raise the professional status of teachers. Whilst the Education Department has no wish to employ teachers with less than the qualifications for Assistant B (Sec.), it is sometimes necessary to do so to maintain staffs and to prevent re-organization when vacancies occur. As I have said previously, employment of people with Assistant C (Sec.) qualifications will cease as soon as possible. They have been employed when all other efforts to obtain the services of suitably qualified teachers have failed, and to a considerable extent the appointments have concerned direct entry of teachers of craft and commercial subjects. They have had special talents and experiences but lack the minimum academic qualifications for Assistant B. The whole purport of the regulation and circular is to raise the status of the teaching profession by setting minimum qualifications for Assistant B where previously none existed and basing the classification of teachers on qualifications gained in tertiary institutions instead of, in some cases, secondary school qualifications.

I cannot agree that the new regulation encourages appointment of persons with poor qualifications. In fact, the lower salary, determined by the Teachers Salaries Board which, in all fairness to qualified teachers, should be paid, will make it more difficult to employ such people. I would point out, too, that provisions in the regulations enabling the appointment of unclassified assistants in primary schools has not led to an increase. In the last five years the percentage of such unclassified teachers has fallen from 24 per cent to 12 per cent. In response to the honourable member's question, I say that no action will be taken to prevent the regulation from becoming operative but Assistants C will be appointed on probation only when emergencies in staffing exist.

CITY TRAFFIC

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question whether pedestrians should be made to cross the main section of King William Street only at traffic lights?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states that the suggestion that pedestrians be required to cross King William Street only at the traffic signals is a matter which directly affects the Adelaide City Council. It is suggested that the honourable member take this matter up with the council.

SOUTH-WESTERN DISTRICTS HOSPITAL

Mr HUDSON: Can the Premier say when the first medical students are likely to be accepted at the second medical school in South Australia, to be established at Flinders University in association with the building of the south-western districts hospital, whether this is not likely to be before 1974, and whether no increase in the number of doctors serving the South Australian community can be expected before 1980?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The several questions asked by the honourable member yesterday have been referred to the Under Secretary for the attention of the Chief Secretary, and I will make sure that the questions now asked are incorporated with those questions.

RELAXA TABS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question in which I asked whether the Government would consider requiring that Relaxa Tabs be issued only on a doctor's order?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The question of restricting the organic bromides to supply on medical prescription only has been considered by the South Australian Food and Advisory Committee on several occasions. The decision each time has been that this would be too severe a restriction, but that supply should be limited to pharmacies. The same decision has been made in every other State, except Queensland. Since Relaxa Tabs came on the market, the demands for the more dangerous barbiturate drugs without prescription have virtually ceased. Such demands used to be very frequent. Even so, barbiturates are still responsible for very many more suicides, suicide attempts, accidental poisonings, and drug dependence, than are the organic bromides. To restrict organic bromides to supply on medical prescription would make it unreasonably difficult for the great majority of sensible and reasonable users to obtain these drugs; and judging by the barbiturate experience, it would be an ineffective deterrent to those determined to misuse these agents. However, the matter will be further considered by the Poisons Schedules Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council this week, and our Senior Pharmaceutical Inspector will be at the meeting.

TRAIN PASSES

Mr. VIRGO: Some time ago I asked the Attorney-General to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider issuing free passes for interstate travel to retired railway employees and also to increase the number of concession passes for intrastate travel granted to retired persons. In his reply regarding interstate passes, the Minister said:

It would be necessary for agreement to be reached by all rail systems before either free or concession travel for interstate movement could be granted.

I ask the Minister to reconsider the statement, as I doubt its validity, because the existing provisions for free passes for employees are not uniform in all of the States, and because it would seem that there is no need for uniformity to be reached or for this lack of uniformity to be used as a barrier before free passes can be issued. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to have the Railways Commissioner again list for discussion at the next conference of Railways Commissioners the matter of the issue of interstate passes to retired railwaymen, and will he also

request the Railways Commissioner to vigorously support the proposal and provide reciprocal arrangements with those Railways Commissioners in other States who agree to participate?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

PROCEDURE

Mr. HUDSON: My question relates to an occurrence yesterday in respect of procedural matters before the House which in themselves were trivial, but if the practice adopted yesterday were allowed to continue it might produce a situation of some seriousness. It is my recollection that yesterday the Premier, in rearranging the Notice Paper, moved a motion that was put and carried, and it was then realized that the motion had been put incorrectly. You, Mr. Speaker, then put a motion on behalf of the Premier that the Premier have leave to withdraw his previous motion (the Premier had not asked for leave) and then put a further motion which, to my recollection at least, meant that the previous motion was withdrawn and that one item on the Notice Paper was incorrectly placed. In the upshot, members assumed that everything was all right and went on with the business. The matter that arose yesterday was not itself of great consequence and I do not believe that the point of order I took at the time was of great importance, but I believe an important matter of principle could be involved: that a motion moved by any member, even though it is incorrectly worded, is still the property of the House and should remain so without any alteration being made by the Chair. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you will adopt the practice in future, when a member moves a motion incorrectly, of gently pointing out to the member concerned that the motion has been moved incorrectly and that, if the member wishes to secure a particular object, he will have to alter the motion in a certain way. If this practice was adopted it would help the House and would avoid any suspicion that the Chair was riding roughshod over the rights of individual members.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has used the word "trivial", and I think he has referred to this matter correctly as such. The point is that the Government was in charge of the business of the day, and a small misunderstanding occurred. I think I adopted the correct procedure, when the Premier had moved his motion, to seek the leave of the House to withdraw his motion and move

another motion. The honourable member referred to a point of order, but a point of order can be taken only at the time, whereas his point of order was taken a considerable time after the incident occurred. I assure the honourable member that there is no ground for suspicion and that no member need have any fears whatever. I will try to do the best I can to expedite the business of the House and to protect the rights of members.

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now be read a second time.

This urgent Bill gives South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited the power to rationalize the acceptance of deliveries of grain to its facilities. Honourable members may be aware that due to improved seasonal conditions the estimated wheat deliveries this year will be over 70,000,000 bushels, nearly twice the average deliveries over the past three seasons. It is not unlikely that the previous record delivery will be exceeded by more than 20,000,000 bushels.

At the moment about one-fifth of last year's delivery amounting to 5,000,000 bushels is still in the silo system by way of carry-over. This carry-over, coupled with the expected record delivery, points to the need for some form of rationalized delivery system which will be fair to all producers. If this legislation is passed reasonably speedily, the co-operative has indicated that it will be possible to accept almost 75 per cent of the total of accurately estimated deliveries. This will ensure that every producer will get some immediate return for the bulk of his crop.

In form, the Bill grants the company the widest powers to rationalize deliveries, since it is thought that considerable flexibility in planning is desirable and the Government is confident that the company is sensitive to, and appreciative of, the true welfare of the producer. In addition, the company has been given, subject to the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1967, some powers necessary to rationalize barley deliveries. In further comment, I read an unsolicited letter which was received by the Minister of Agriculture from the General Manager of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited and which reads:

Rationalization of bulk wheat deliveries: Following many individual requests from growers, we have now received a letter from the United Farmers and Graziers of S.A. Incorporated advising that the following resolution was carried at a meeting of the grain section of that organization on November 14, 1968:

That the grain section of the U.F.G.S.A. requests the Minister for Agriculture to amend the Bulk Handling of Grain Act to enable S.A.C.B.H. to regulate deliveries of grain into the silo system in the interests of growers as a whole, and that the General Manager of S.A.C.B.H. be also notified of this resolution.

We understand that the United Farmers and Graziers of S.A. Incorporated also wrote to you on November 14, 1968, advising that the following resolution was carried:

That the grain section of the U.F.G.S.A. requests the Minister of Agriculture to amend the Bulk Handling of Grain Act to enable S.A.C.B.H. to regulate deliveries of grain into the silo system in the interests of growers as a whole.

This authority, in the limited time available, has discussed with you the procedures proposed to be adopted to enable all wheatgrowers in the State to deliver with a minimum of delay 75 per cent of their expected wheat deliveries, season 1968-69, in bulk into the silo system. Our board of directors, at a special meeting on Friday, November 15, 1968, approved the implementation of the proposed scheme, subject to your support, by the urgent introduction of enabling legislation into State Parliament. We would appreciate your action, therefore, in the support of this proposed legislation and its urgent introduction into State Parliament as soon as possible.

When those letters were received, the Minister of Agriculture took the matter to Cabinet and obtained permission to introduce legislation, which has already been passed by another place and which is now to be considered by this Chamber. Several members have spoken to me about the urgency of this matter, because harvesting is taking place now in various parts of the State. I appreciate the general spirit of co-operation from all members in their efforts to have this legislation considered immediately.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support the Bill. From the Minister's second reading explanation and from the details in the letters read by him, there is obviously an urgent need for this measure to be passed, in order to enable the co-operative immediately to organize deliveries and so that deliveries of wheat or barley will not be hampered. I am not sure how 75 per cent of the yield will be estimated, but no doubt the co-operative will be able to establish this figure. This legislation will enable each producer to put into the silos 75 per cent of his expected yield, so he

will be able to obtain an advance for that part of his yield. It is expected that about 20,000,000 bushels more than the previous record will be available this year, plus a carry-over of 5,000,000 bushels already held in silos, and this quantity creates the situation where rationalization of deliveries is necessary. The Opposition is happy to co-operate with the Government, because we consider this an urgent matter that will serve a good purpose. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading, and I hope the Bill has a quick passage through this House.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I agree with the Minister that this Bill is important and that it is urgent that it pass this House so that its provisions can be implemented immediately. In the early stages of this Parliament, when ever-increasing acreages of wheat were being sown, I asked a question on notice about the estimate of the harvest and of the number of silos that had been and were being constructed by the co-operative. I asked this so that the reply would indicate whether the growers would be able to place in the silos all the grain they expected to harvest. Obviously, with a record season expected, it did not seem possible that they would be able to do this. At this late stage, when wheat is now being deposited in silos, the co-operative has taken a necessary step, and I compliment it on doing so.

I congratulate the growers for agreeing to this action. Everyone will be treated equitably, provided that the legislation is implemented immediately. It is expected that when the scheme operates all growers will be able to place at least 75 per cent of their harvest in the silos, and they will then be able to obtain through the wheat stabilization plan the advance payment of \$1.10. Nothing would be worse for the industry and for growers than if some of them were able to get all their crop into the silos while others could place only a small percentage, because this would mean that some growers would receive a substantial sum while others would not receive anything. I hope that the effect of the Bill will be to enable sufficient accommodation to be provided for this record harvest, and that it will be an advantage to wheatgrowers of this State.

Mr. ALLEN (Burra): I support this Bill, which is the result of approaches made by most wheatgrowers in this State. It is to be hoped that wheatgrowers will be able to get about 75 per cent of their crop available for market

into existing silos. I represent an area that is recognized as a late wheatgrowing district, and under the present system growers in this area might not have been able to deliver much wheat into the local silos, because these silos would have been loaded with wheat from earlier growing districts. There is not sufficient bulk handling storage in this area to cope with the quantity of wheat grown, and I estimate that only about 40 per cent of the current crop could be stored.

At present, there is an anomaly regarding rail freights in my district, and much wheat is carried out of my district by road transports. The terminal at Port Pirie is 56 miles away whereas the terminal at Port Adelaide is 109 miles away, and that is the distance on which bulk freight is based. The co-operative is reluctant to build additional storage in this area whilst this anomaly exists. I have introduced two deputations to the Minister of Roads and Transport to try to have a decision made whereby this problem could be overcome but, at present, no solution seems to be available, so the anomaly will continue until the position is straightened out. This legislation is accepted by growers in my district, who will be able to get a large portion of their crop delivered in the early stages, and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): Because of the large storages in my district, I was approached some time ago concerning this matter and, as a result, I asked several questions in the House. I am happy to support this Bill, first, because it will give growers throughout the State the opportunity to store a percentage of their crop in the silos, and, because of the record yield expected, it would be impossible for many farmers to store all their harvest on their properties; and secondly, because it will allow growers to take advantage of the recent stabilization legislation, which, I understand, has been passed throughout the Commonwealth. I think honourable members will agree that, because of last year's severe drought, many farmers will welcome an early return for this season's yield. With the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), I congratulate growers on their co-operation in this measure. Every farmer will now have an opportunity to receive an early return for the work he has undertaken on his property this season. I support the Bill.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): This is not the first time that South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited has con-

sidered approaching the Government in connection with amending the Bulk Handling of Grain Act. Indeed, although we are confronted with a record harvest this year, it will not be the first time that the silos have been filled, for there have been several seasons previously in which the capacity of the storages has been insufficient for the harvest, and farmers have had to keep grain on their farms until space has become available in the silos. I have more than once canvassed growers in my district in regard to zoning of silos to enable every grower at least to make a delivery. I find on this occasion that, with few exceptions, the growers whom I represent wholeheartedly support the rationalizing of grain to be stored in the silos, and I am sure this scheme will be approved by all growers in South Australia. Indeed, the grain section of the United Farmers and Graziers, having conducted a meeting on the matter, has intimated, through the Manager of the co-operative, to this Parliament that growers generally are in favour of this scheme.

This measure will not solve all the problems of delivering grain to silos and terminals: anomalies will still exist. However, the measure has two main objectives, one of which is to enable all the growers to deliver at least a portion of their harvest, thereby giving them a chance to be paid the first advance on that portion. I have had some experience over the years of delivering grain to silos at the Ardrossan terminal where, as at the terminals at Wallaroo and Port Pirie, at times there have been long queues of lorries waiting to deliver grain. We have read press reports of what is happening in this regard, and it has already been reported that that sort of thing will continue this year. It is the ability of a silo to receive the wheat that brings about these delays. Because of the record harvest this year, there is not enough terminal or silo space in South Australia to receive the grain and, on that account, temporary provision has been made to receive large quantities of grain at places that have previously been used for bagged grain in these circumstances, for instance, at Wallaroo and in the barley sheds at Ardrossan. However, I believe it will still be necessary to provide other temporary storage facilities, and the question is whether the co-operative will be able to make the necessary arrangements.

Although growers have often asked the co-operative to zone various areas in the State for the receipt of grain, that has not been practicable. It must be remembered that in

South Australia, as well as in other States, a differential has applied to grain receival centres and, because of this, I do not think it is practicable to zone areas for the delivery of grain. If growers in South Australia were prepared to forsake the differential system of payment for grain and to place all growers on the one level concerning payment, it might be possible to consider the zoning of areas in regard to deliveries to silos.

Mr. McAnaney: You wouldn't advocate that, though.

Mr. FERGUSON: No, but I believe it is one thing that would make zoning possible.

Mr. Nankivell: It applies in Victoria.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes. I think it must be realized that the terminal at Ardrossan belongs not only to local farmers but equally to growers in the area around Balaklava. Indeed, I am sure that any facilities existing in Balaklava would also be available to Ardrossan growers. In encouraging the rationalizing of deliveries, a card system will be implemented and growers will be put on their honour, if the scheme is to be effective. I know it is difficult to estimate the returns from particular crops, but I think if all growers are reasonable in their approach the scheme will be practicable. I therefore have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Walleroo): I wish to say briefly that I am happy the Minister of Agriculture has seen fit to hurry this Bill through both Houses because it is essential, at this late stage, that this rationalization scheme be put into effect. I very much regret that action has been left until so late. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), through questions in this House over the last four or five weeks, has stated the concern of primary producers. Only last week the authorities saw fit to approach the Government to have this scheme implemented. In my opinion the rationalization of grain deliveries is the only fair and equitable scheme whereby primary producers will be able to deliver a portion of their crop and, by so doing, qualify for the first advance of \$1.10.

As one who has played a prominent part in the primary producing industries of the State, you, Mr. Speaker, will know that there are many early crops in my district and that many farmers have already taken off their barley while others are already reaping their wheat. Only last Monday evening, I spoke to two farmers one of whom told me that he was well on the way with his harvest. Yet the

other farmer, who lived farther south of Wallaroo, told me that he would not make a start for another three weeks. Therefore, this rationalization scheme will give a farmer, who lives in parts of my district where the harvest is late, an opportunity to have at least 75 per cent of his crop delivered to the silos. I agree with the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson) that temporary storage will be made available for primary producers this year. No doubt Wallaroo will be important in this regard as it has terminal silos and, in addition, provision will be made there for temporary storage of grain. Of course, other places will be involved. I notice that even in Paskeville preparations are being made for temporary storage for a certain quantity of grain. No doubt storage is being made available in most places in the State.

I congratulate South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited on the excellent way in which it has served the majority of primary producers in South Australia. Again I want to congratulate it on this move to rationalize grain deliveries whereby all primary producers in the State with grain on their properties will be given an opportunity to participate in the first advance of \$1.10. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, hoping it will pass the House as quickly as possible to enable the scheme to be put into operation.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the Bill wholeheartedly and congratulate Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited on its action in providing this scheme at the request of farmers. It has been suggested that this scheme has been left a bit late and that, had it not been for the prompting of certain people, it would not have been brought in. However, we do not know until fairly late in a season what the harvest will be. In my area we had a dry September and, had it not been for good rain, which came just in time, there would have been a low yield. People who say that a harvest can be estimated in July or August have not had experience as farmers because, at that time of the year, it is a big gamble indeed to estimate the total crop. The Bill has been introduced in time to cope with the situation so that farmers will have an equal opportunity to secure a reasonable advance on their wheat.

I do not think it will ever be possible to provide sufficient storage, even of a temporary nature, to cater for an unusually large harvest. It would not be economical to have permanent silos that would be filled only in unusual

years. Therefore, I think that, whenever there is a good finish to the season and a big harvest, it will be necessary, in the economic interests of the farmers (and that means in the economic interests of the community as a whole), to store some wheat on the farms for short periods. One good feature of the Bill is that the co-operative will have permanent power to rationalize deliveries; this will be in the best interests of everyone.

Mr. EDWARDS (Eyre): I, too, support the Bill wholeheartedly and I hope that its provisions work in my area. I am pleased to see that the co-operative has at last introduced a quota system. This has many advantages indeed, and it will mean that people in districts where the harvest is late will have an opportunity to get some of their grain into the silos before they fill up. Under the present system, many farmers with big plant, in the form of headers and trucks, get their grain into the silos, whereas the smaller farmers can hardly get in any grain at all, as the smaller farmers have often not finished with their barley, let alone reached the stage of dealing with their wheat. Under this system, small farmers will have a chance to get some of their grain at least into the silo.

Some farmers think that the position has become a rat-race to see who can finish harvesting first and to see who has the most modern machinery to enable one farmer to beat another. This is wrong. Of course, it is all right for the machinery firms and the truck salesmen because they are reaping a great harvest from this sort of thing. However, this is no good for the farmer because it is building up the costs of running a farm and making the overhead much higher than it need be. If, under this system, farmers can be sure of getting wheat into the silo before it is full, the practice to which I have referred will not be so prevalent in future. I feel sure that all farmers have commitments to meet and all should have an equal opportunity of getting grain into the silos. I hope this quota system will achieve that end. Now farmers will have an opportunity to receive an equal share so that they can pay off their most essential debts.

I trust that the Bill will pass the House today because, unless it does, its provisions may be too late to help in some areas. Some farmers have almost finished harvesting and, by this time next week, a number of those farmers will have finished. I trust that all growers will co-operate with the co-operative in this matter and that they will not resist the provisions.

People on Eyre Peninsula are grateful for what the co-operative has done in providing extra storage on Eyre Peninsula at Kimba, Arno Bay, Lock, Murdinga, Wudinna and, I understand, in the Tumby Bay area. I realize that production on the Eyre Peninsula is still outgrowing the building programme of the co-operative for this area. However, I commend the co-operative for what it has done in co-operation with the United Farmers and Graziers to help farmers realize that this quota system is necessary.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I, too, support the Bill. It is with some regret that I note that the present silo system in South Australia just does not have the capacity to cope with the coming harvest. However, I do not agree with the statement of the member for Stirling (Mr. McAnaney) that a harvest such as the one this year may not occur again. The honourable member said, in effect, that he thought it unlikely that South Australia would experience such a big harvest very often. The technological advances being made in the wheat industry could lead to further immense harvests. I thank Opposition members for the generous way in which they are supporting the Bill. Their support shows that, when they are approached in a nice way and apprised of the importance of legislation, they will co-operate and help the Government to pass measures. The principal Act was enacted in 1955, and I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your enormous contribution to the introduction of bulk handling in South Australia. I am not back-scratching: I am merely pointing out that, without your contribution, Sir, bulk handling would not be operating in South Australia today.

Mr. LAWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask whether the honourable member is speaking to the Bill. The matters that he is discussing are not mentioned in the measure.

The SPEAKER: I think the point of order is well taken: my name is not in the Bill. I ask the member for Light not to pursue that subject.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was merely giving information to the new members of the House, particularly those in the Opposition, including the member for Unley, who was politically in his knickerbockers when you, Mr. Speaker, got bulk handling through. I, as an active member of the South Australian Wheat and Wool Growers Association, took an active part in getting the legislation through the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member ought to get back to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) has said, by interjection, that I am talking rot.

Mr. Clark: I didn't say that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: That shows how interested the honourable member is in the wheat farmer.

Mr. CLARK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not use the expression stated by the member for Light. He misheard me.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the honourable member for Gawler. I remind the House, as I have done previously, that I do not mind a little humour in the Chamber, because I think it adds to good fellowship. However, I wish the honourable member for Light would stick to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. Lawn: He's being funny.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am not. I am trying to be serious, and I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your contribution towards the introduction of bulk handling. I thank the members of the Labor Party for their support of the Bill, which is designed to cope with a record harvest in South Australia and to enable South Australian Co-Operative Bulk Handling Limited to rationalize deliveries of wheat to South Australian silos, so that each grower will be able to deliver about 75 per cent of his expected harvest. For the benefit of members who do not understand how the system works, I point out that a wheatgrower cannot get his first advance from the Australian Wheat Board unless the wheat is actually delivered to a silo, and the part of the harvest not delivered does not attract a first advance.

This legislation will have a most beneficial effect in South Australia, particularly in the District of Light. I do not want to brag, but in wheat production, as in many other fields of agriculture, that district is pre-eminent. I have often said that it is the most famous wine-producing district, and it is one of the famous wheat-producing areas. In fact, the hundred of Alma, in which I live, is the heaviest wheat-producing hundred, on a production to the acre basis, in South Australia.

Mr. Hudson: How could you prove that?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: One only has to look at statistics, and it will not hurt the member for Glenelg to learn a little South Australian geography.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to get back to the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was speaking of the effect of this legislation in my district. The wheat areas in the District of Light are regarded as late in terms of harvesting time, but I was told last Monday at Kapunda that, although the wheatgrowers there do not normally expect their harvesting to commence until early December, wheat is already being delivered to the Kapunda silos from Waikerie, on the Murray River.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: So you want it through?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes. Wheatgrowers in the Premier's district deliver their wheat to silos in the District of Light, thus cramping growers in my district. I support the Bill, although I have one reservation. The Minister of Lands, who is not in the Chamber at present, said in his explanation that the Bill could not be acted on until all other State Parliaments and the Commonwealth Parliament had also passed enabling legislation. I should like the Minister to say whether this means that this legislation will not operate in South Australia until all the other States and the Commonwealth have passed their legislation.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Which legislation?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am referring to the legislation that we are debating.

Mr. Hudson: You aren't on the right Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, I am. The member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson), who knows something about agriculture, points out to me that I am dealing with the correct Bill. Now that the Minister of Lands has returned, I ask him what he means by saying that enabling legislation must be passed in the other States before our legislation can become effective.

Mr. Hudson: You're on the wrong Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I hope that the Minister does not mean that the provisions of our measure cannot be applied to this year's harvest.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): What can be said in support of this important Bill can be stated in a few sentences. The Bill will enable South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited to establish a scheme for the rationalization of grain deliveries. In a year of record harvest this legislation is essential.

There are many wheatgrowers in my district and I express their appreciation of the Government's introducing this legislation, which will be beneficial to them. I express pleasure at another place's having passed this legislation as speedily as it did. I concur in the remarks made by other members in supporting this legislation, which I trust will pass speedily through this Chamber. I support the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I give this Bill my unqualified support.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I join with the member for Albert wholeheartedly, but I shall not be as brief as he (unfortunately for the House) for the following reasons. The Minister has asked the House to do the extraordinary thing of cutting across all its Standing Orders to have a Bill introduced and passed through its remaining stages in one day. I do not object to that on special occasions, and I am not objecting to it on this occasion because of the time limit involved, but I suggest that, when the Government makes a request such as that, it ought to have the full support of its members and not engage in the needless repetition we have heard this afternoon from member after member who has got up and supported the Bill (which has the support of every member) for no other reason than to try to make some political capital or to jump on the band wagon.

Mr. Ferguson: You're wrong as far as I'm concerned.

Mr. RICHES: This is my opinion, and I am entitled to express it. I am not far out, either. The member for Light referred to the history of bulk handling and, without going through it, I invite him to read that history again. Mr. Speaker, I remember the part you played in bulk handling matters, but I ask the House whether a member can pass a Bill on his own without support from somewhere. I ask members to take the trouble to find out where the support came from and where the opposition came from. The original legislation was hotly contested, but not from this side. When a member drags past history into a debate such as this he should get his facts straight.

This Bill has the support of every Opposition member because it is the kind of thing we believe in, orderly marketing and delivery, but this is the kind of thing that has been opposed by the Government, and the member for Light in particular. I expected the member for Light to produce the Australian Labor

Party rule book and platform and point out that the Bill represented a measure of control of, and direction to, the primary producer, and an interference with the freedom of buying and selling. He could have drawn a lot out of this, but he did not do that today, for which we are grateful. I, too, support the Bill, and I believe every member supports it. Let us get on with the business.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I have listened to the remarks made by the member for Light and I was surprised to hear him support the Bill, because rationalization means "to bring into conformity with reason", and this is one of the things for which he is not noted. Mr. Speaker, as one who worked with you to form the first *bona fide* wheat-growers' association (at a time when the member for Light was not even in his diapers), I give the Bill every support.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I was a little disturbed by the remarks made by the member for Light, because as far as I can gather he was talking about the wrong Bill and was referring to the wrong second reading explanation. There is nothing in the second reading explanation about this legislation being contingent on complementary legislation being passed in other States. If it is contingent on legislation in other States, why is there a rush to pass this Bill? Obviously, this Bill must be passed immediately so that it can come into effect and have teeth immediately the House passes it and it is given Vice-Regal assent. I think what happened was that the member for Light was referring to the Minister's second reading explanation on wheat stabilization which, obviously, is contingent on legislation in other States. Members should not have to suffer the absolute, abysmal incompetence of the member for Light on a matter as significant as this. He could not even get the second reading explanation right and he did not know with what Bill he was dealing.

Mr. Clark: He accused me of saying things I didn't say.

Mr. HUDSON: Quite! We on this side, who have a fair and consistent record in favour of stabilization and rationalization in primary industry, are pleased to support the Bill, which is obviously a necessary measure and but for which we would have a system of first come best dressed and there would be considerable suffering in certain sections of the farming community where wheatgrowers were unable to get their grain into the silos or to deliver a significant part of their harvest. Under the

Bill, it will be possible for the co-operative to introduce a rationalization scheme so that each farmer will get fair treatment. I am pleased that even a private enterprise Government that espouses private enterprise, or at any rate gives lip service to it as often as this Government does, at least has the sense to introduce a Socialist measure such as this Bill. We on this side are happy to support the socialistic experiments that the Government has introduced on this occasion.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I was not going to speak to the Bill, because I am a director of the co-operative. However, I have listened with interest to the various speakers and know that the wheatgrowers of South Australia will be pleased with the co-operation all members have shown this afternoon in getting the Bill through the House so quickly. Last week, I had the opportunity of sitting in on the grain committee meeting of the United Farmers and Graziers Association, and I know that the meeting was unanimous in its view that the bulk handling co-operative should ask the Minister of Agriculture to do something about rationalizing deliveries in this State. As far as the co-operative is concerned, this legislation will apply only to wheat from the coming harvest, but the Act covers the situation with regard to all grains on future occasions. I support the Bill.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): Because of the remarks made by the member for Light, because of his habit of completely distorting facts in this House and of trying to make political propaganda, and because he did not know what Bill he was speaking to, I rise to support this measure, which is so vital to the wheatgrowers of South Australia. As the responsibility of controlling deliveries has now been handed to the co-operative, I, with other Socialist members on this side, having the utmost confidence in co-operative movements, realize that that body will do a good job in ensuring a correct rationalization with everyone receiving fair and just treatment. Because of the basis of co-operation and the Socialist tendency, with people having some say in these things, if the directors attempt to do anything that is not in the best interests of all growers, the growers will ultimately have their say and take the necessary action. I give my wholehearted support to this measure, because it conforms to the principles and ideals of Socialism, in which I believe.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Rationalization of deliveries."

Mr. HUDSON: Will the Minister comment on the significant question that was asked by the member for Light in relation to having complementary legislation passed in other States before this legislation can operate?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): The member for Light is correct when he says that the effect of this Bill is contingent on the Wheat Industry Stabilization Bill being passed by all State Parliaments and the Commonwealth Parliament.

Mr. Riches: You didn't refer to that in your second reading explanation.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I did not think it was relevant, then. A statement was made in the debate in another place to that effect. As far as I know every other State Parliament, with the exception of Victoria, has passed legislation on the wheat stabilization plan. I understand that Victoria is likely to pass it today and, if that is correct, by tonight all Legislatures will have passed this legislation. Hence the urgency for this legislation to be passed, because it can then come into effect.

I am sorry that the spirit of co-operation, and what we might call unanimity, in relation to the desirability of this legislation has deteriorated since the debate began. Initially, the debate went along well and reflected fairly accurately the way this Chamber works when we all realize the need of the community or of a section of it. However, the debate began to get a bit ragged, but I hope it will not continue in that way. I appreciate the way members set out to deal with this legislation, because I am sure they understand that it is for the benefit of the wheatgrowing industry generally, and I hope that the legislation will pass this afternoon so that it may operate immediately.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I, too, appreciate the rapid passage of this Bill through the co-operation of members. The wheat stabilization legislation authorizes the Australian Wheat Board to handle wheat on behalf of the Commonwealth. Under that legislation the board then authorizes licensed receivers to receive wheat on behalf of the board, and the co-operative in this State is licensed by the Australian Wheat Board to receive wheat on its behalf. Therefore, there is a connection between the two sets of legislation. The Commonwealth has no power of marketing, but

this is passed to it by legislation such as the complementary Wheat Industry Stabilization Bill, which was passed by this Chamber last evening. Each State must pass the complementary legislation in order to make the Commonwealth legislation valid. The Commonwealth legislation has been passed, and the Victorian legislation will probably be passed today, so that this measure will then be valid. Had the Bill been delayed and the Victorian legislation passed, it would have been about a week before this rationalization could be effected, because we would not have been able to debate the matter until next Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. HUDSON: It seems to me that even if wheat stabilization does not pass the other States and the Commonwealth tonight, and assent is given to this Bill tomorrow morning, the co-operative will then be entitled tomorrow afternoon to impose a rationalization scheme for the acceptance of any wheat delivered into silos. This Bill does not in itself require any complementary legislation, and my understanding is that the co-operative does not have to receive wheat purely as a licensed receiver of the Wheat Board; it can receive wheat into silos on its own initiative. It will be possible for the co-operative to receive wheat tomorrow afternoon if assent is given tomorrow morning and ultimately, when wheat stabilization goes through all the other States and the Commonwealth (say, some time next week), to have that wheat taken up by the Wheat Board. Is it intended that the co-operative cannot receive any wheat into silos until wheat stabilization has gone through?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No, the co-operative has the power to allow rationalization. This legislation is quite separate and will come into effect as soon as it is given assent.

Mr. HUDSON: The Bill will come into effect as soon as it is given assent by the Lieutenant-Governor (presumably tomorrow), and the rationalization scheme can then be imposed by the co-operative in relation to any wheat received from that time onwards.

Mr. Riches: In South Australia.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes; I assume that can be done even if wheat stabilization does not pass the other States and the Commonwealth Government until next week. Is this the case?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: There was recently a doubt whether licensed receivers of the Wheat Board had power to rationalize the delivery of wheat, the delivery of wheat having always been bound up with the legislation, and power

has now been passed on to the co-operative, which is a licensed receiver. Wheatgrowers may deliver any quantity of wheat they wish. We are trying to stop some growers from delivering all their wheat before someone who is late has a chance to deliver any.

Mr. Riches: That has nothing to do with legislation in other States.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It has. The provision was that the co-operative had power to receive all wheat in all silos, but the legal opinion was that we could not say to a person that he could deliver perhaps only 75 per cent. When this measure is passed, there will be no legal doubt whatever that the co-operative, being a licensed receiver of the Wheat Board, will have the necessary power.

Mr. Hudson: It can still receive wheat without being a licensed receiver.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It relates to bulk wheat and bagged wheat.

Mr. HUDSON: I should like to know the effect of the words "or otherwise". I presume they imply that this Bill has force independently of wheat stabilization and independently of the co-operative's being a licensed receiver.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Agriculture Department officers estimate the harvest at 83,000,000 bushels, although that remains to be seen. However, the co-operative has a storage capacity for only 55,000,000 bushels. A quantity over and above that has been received, and the co-operative has arranged to erect surplus emergency silos in order to handle deliveries as fast as it can. That is why the words "or otherwise" have been inserted.

Mr. HURST: Is the co-operative given the right to determine where growers shall deliver their wheat or are people free to make deliveries, pending the availability of another storage facility?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: It is not intended that the co-operative shall direct a grower to deliver at a certain point: he may deliver wherever he wishes, and there is no intention to establish zoning.

Mr. Hudson: But there is power to do that.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No, we do not desire that power. We wish to be able to say that a grower may deliver 75 per cent of his grain, and the local agent will be instructed from the head office to obtain from the grower a declaration regarding anticipated deliveries. A person who has delivered the 75 per cent quota, say, to Wallaroo will not be able to deliver another quota, perhaps, to

Saddleworth, and silo operators will have the relevant information. A grower will have to present a card to the local silo operator.

Mr. HUDSON: The wording of the clause will permit schemes other than the one that has just been outlined. I refer to new section 19a (c). I appreciate the fact that the scheme the co-operative has in mind at present will not involve the kind of things that some honourable members have mentioned. However, as far as I can see, clause 3 would empower the co-operative to impose a scheme involving the type of thing mentioned. In new paragraph (a) there is no restriction on the interpretation that can be given to a scheme for the rationalization of the delivery of grain. I respectfully point out that we are granting a fairly wide power to the co-operative. Although the scheme outlined to us (that is the particular scheme that will be introduced) seems perfectly reasonable, it is possible, under this clause, for schemes that are more onerous and restrictive to be introduced.

Mr. Nankivell: They might have to be.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, if there are ways around the present scheme.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I do not want this matter to be delayed, for we must pass the Bill and send a message to the Legislative Council while it is still sitting. I appeal to members opposite to allow the Bill to pass so that the message can be sent. I will give an explanation to the member for Glenelg later.

Mr. RICHES: I appreciate the honourable member's desire to have the Bill passed but, at the same time, I point out that only three members have seen a copy of the Bill. Further, we are not getting answers to the questions raised which, I believe, are important. I like to know what I am voting on. It has been claimed that this legislation depends on complementary legislation being passed in other States. If that is so, it would seem that our passing the Bill is not nearly so important as the Minister would have us believe. Am I right in assuming that the wheat stabilization legislation will come into force whether or not this Bill is passed? I understand that the Wheat Industry Stabilization Bill is a completely separate Bill and that it will come into operation whether or not we pass this Bill. Also, am I right in assuming that, because it will not be necessary in other States, this legislation will not be carried in all other States? If I am right in these assumptions, then obviously the member for Light and the Minister are wrong

in their statements. Although I do not want to delay the Bill, I would like to know what I am voting on.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will repeat again that this Bill is contingent upon the passing in all the States and the Commonwealth Parliament of the wheat stabilization legislation. I am informed that only Victoria has yet to pass that Bill and that it will pass it today. Although that type of information may not be definite, if I am correct, and that Bill either has been passed in Victoria today or will be passed today, there is nothing whatever to stop this Bill's receiving assent and being put straight into operation. That cannot be done until the Bill is passed in Victoria, but we do not want to have days slip by without this Bill's being passed here. I have done my best to make clear that, in good faith, we are asking Parliament to pass this legislation. Responsible primary-producer organizations and primary producers in cereal-growing areas all over the State have asked that the Bill should be passed. Frankly, this afternoon I did not have a copy of the Bill to distribute to anyone. I obtained three copies from the Legislative Council files, two of which I distributed to Opposition members. That was about the best I could do in the circumstances.

Mr. Casey: And we appreciated it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Thank you. I know that members would like more information, but I suggest that they let this legislation go through while both Houses are sitting so that it can be passed today and put into operation at the first possible moment.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Modbury North-West Primary School.

Para Vista (View Road) Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from November 20. Page 2650.)

Clause 30—"Suspension of inspection certificate"—which the Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe had moved to amend by inserting after "alterations" the words "other than repairs or alterations done in the ordinary course of maintenance of a boiler or pressure vessel".

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE (Minister of Works): When the Committee reported progress last evening, I had undertaken to consider the points raised by Opposition members on my amendment. Having had an opportunity to consider those representations, I am now prepared to alter my amendment by removing the word "alterations". If Opposition members indicate that they will accept an amendment without that word, I will ask leave to withdraw my original amendment with a view to moving a subsequent amendment. The effect of my new amendment on the clause will be that no repairs shall take place without the consent of the inspector, except for repairs carried out in the ordinary course of the maintenance to the boiler or pressure vessel. I assure the Committee that this means that any major repairs or alterations on the pressure vessel itself will require the consent of an inspector. Normal repairs carried out in the ordinary course of maintenance will be excepted. I think this will meet the objection of the member for Edwardstown. (Mr. Virgo).

Mr. VIRGO: I thank the Minister for indicating that the points raised last evening were valid. As a result of the amendment he has foreshadowed, many of the objections I raised to the amendment on file have now been removed. However, I should like the Minister to assure me that, in the regulations, the term "repairs carried out in the ordinary course of maintenance" will be more clearly defined. I realize that it is not practicable to do this in the Bill because the definition would be cumbersome. I suggested earlier that perhaps the term "minor repairs" could be used, but I now realize that once we use the word "minor" we must define that. Of course, this could be done in the regulations. In my experience, the term "repairs carried out in the ordinary course of maintenance" can be fairly wide.

I think the Minister's attitude and my attitude are fairly similar: it is a matter of expression. I do not think the Minister wants to open the flood gates, and I want to ensure that the flood gates are not opened. Will the Minister define "repairs carried out in the ordinary course of maintenance" in the regulations, so that it will mean what we understand it to mean and so that it is clear that they are repairs carried out on the ancillary equipment? We have encountered difficulties because the Bill is very wide. I want to ensure that repairs are not carried out on the pressure vessel itself. As long as the Minister will assure us

that this will be clearly spelt out in the regulations, no further objections are necessary. We should remember that we are dealing not only with people licensed under this Bill—under the categories of boiler attendant, etc.—but also with people like maintenance fitters, who come in and do jobs but are not in any way subject to a licence or to the cancellation of a licence.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I thank the honourable member for his remarks. I thought I had clearly said a moment ago that repairs or alterations to the pressure vessel itself do not constitute minor maintenance work. I would not agree to repairs or alterations to the pressure vessel itself being exempted, because they must have the approval of an inspector. The subclause as it will now read makes that clear. I shall have a look at the regulations, but I believe the clause itself should make it clear: we should not rely too much on the regulations. In view of the apparent acceptance by members of this foreshadowed amendment, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment with a view to moving another.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I move: "In paragraph (b) after "repairs" to insert ", other than repairs carried out in the ordinary course of maintenance of the boiler or pressure vessel,".

This will give effect to the views just expressed.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 31—"Operation of boiler or pressure vessel without certificate in force."

Mr. VIRGO: Subclause (2) obviously covers the contingency of a re-examination, or something of that nature. As long as it does only this, I have no objection to it. We must, however, bear in mind the previous clause, where a certificate becomes ineffective if certain kinds of repair are carried out. Can this provision be interpreted to mean that, for 28 days after a certificate becomes ineffective, the boiler or pressure vessel can be used? I know this is not the intention, but I am not satisfied at this stage that some smart cookie could not use subclause (2) to continue to use a boiler for which the certificate of inspection had become null and void.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: This provision was meant to cover the case where a licence or certificate had expired. A licence that has expired is different from one that is withheld or suspended. I ask the honourable member to accept that this is a convenience

clause, dealing mainly with expiry, and is not intended for the purpose he has mentioned. I assure him that the provision will be administered accordingly.

Clause passed.

Clause 32 passed.

Clause 33—"Non-application of Part to certain boilers and pressure vessels etc."

Mr. HURST: I move:

To strike out paragraph (a) and insert the following new paragraph:

(a) any motor vehicle or vehicle driven or propelled by an internal combustion engine or by electricity other than—

(i) any locomotive;

(ii) any vehicle known as an excavator, dragline;

or

(iii) any vehicle known as an excavator, face shovel.

We consider this amendment necessary to enable certificates of competency to be issued under clause 34 (3) to persons engaged in this occupation. By coincidence, a safety seminar has been held this week, and this Bill is designed for safety purposes. For the protection of employees, all locomotives, excavators, draglines and face shovels should be driven by competent men. Such a provision would also assist employers to determine the proper type of labour to engage.

The Hon. J. W. H. COURCE: I wonder whether the honourable member realizes the far-reaching effect of the amendment. The main purpose of the old Act was to minimize the occurrence of explosions, and other dangers associated with steam boilers, and such control was necessary in the days of steam locomotives. However, the only private line in the State today is the Whyalla tramway, and diesel locomotives operate on it.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: There are some steam locomotives in use, but not on the main line.

The Hon. J. W. H. COURCE: Drivers of steam locomotives were required to have a licence to operate a steam boiler or steam engine and they had to have a good knowledge of the operation of boilers, pumps, auxiliary equipment, gauges, and so on. Further, they had to be competent to drive the train and had to pass a test based on working knowledge. As diesel prime-movers now form the tractive part of a locomotive, knowledge of steam engines and boilers is not required. The driver of a diesel locomotive operates the diesel part of the prime-mover in a way similar to driving a large diesel haulage truck. Occasionally a diesel loco-

motive driver has to change an oil filter, but his main requirement is to be qualified in the working rules and operation of the engine from the point of view of safety. Diesel locomotives running on the private tramway of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited are usually repaired by mechanics sent from Whyalla or Iron Knob.

This Bill is designed to control, in the main, the operation of steam boilers or pressure vessels. I assume that the operator of a private diesel locomotive has to pass tests similar to those applicable to operating a train on a railway line. Locomotive drivers employed by the South Australian Railways Department must pass a test in normal driving rules relating to a train but do not have to pass any test in the operation of a steam boiler. Of course, we are dealing only with locomotives driven on private lines, because Railways Department locomotives are exempt from the provisions of the Bill. I submit that the Engine-drivers Board, which is the examining authority, would not be the competent authority to do the testing envisaged, and therefore I suggest that we resolve this matter affecting locomotives before dealing with the other vehicles mentioned. With a steam train, the safety of the passengers and crew must be considered in the possibility of a steam boiler exploding, but it is the safety of the crew only involved with a freight train.

Mr. VIRGO: The Minister's attitude seems to be conditioned because one of the organizations to be affected is the B.H.P. We should consider this as a Bill that seeks to achieve a high degree of safety. This amendment would include all locomotives other than those used by the Railways Department. I know the high degree of efficiency required of locomotives and the high degree of competency required of drivers in that department, and the same high degree should be applied to all others. The Minister presumed that persons driving locomotives on private railways or tramways would have to pass a competency test. Can he say whether these drivers have to have a proficiency equal to that of drivers in the Railways Department, and whether the locomotives are equally safe? The Minister wants us to provide reasons why the amendment should be accepted, but he should consider the matter in reverse. What harm will be done to the Bill if it is included? Will it affect detrimentally the provisions of the present Act? People who are best equipped to

give an opinion on this amendment have been consulted, and they strongly urge that it be adopted.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I have been waiting to hear why this amendment has been promoted, because the honourable member should give good reasons why it should be accepted. I doubt that this should be done under this Bill. Where steam boilers are involved, control is necessary, but the danger of explosion having been removed I doubt that it is necessary to persist with this aspect in this Bill. No person would obtain a job driving a locomotive on a private line unless he had had much experience, and he probably would have to pass a company test. The duty of a diesel driver is to operate it from point A to point B and work the train safely, and nothing in this Bill provides for or controls the safe working of the train.

I now turn to the other part of this amendment, which deals with excavator, dragline, and excavator, face shovel.

Mr. Virgo: I thought you said you were going to complete the question of locomotives.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: The amendment deals with both matters, and I am in order in dealing with them. The intention is to provide that operators must have a certificate of competency before they can operate that equipment. However, I am not sure whether the member for Semaphore realizes the implications of his amendment. Certificates for crane and hoist drivers have been required for many years, but they were included in the Act only because they have been for many years under the old Steam Boilers and Enginedrivers Act. This was because the original cranes, particularly jib cranes, were operated by steam. The old cranes had a steam boiler on the back, and before a person could operate these he had to be able to stoke a boiler and to have a licence to operate the boiler. That requirement was confined to jib cranes, which raised their booms and also slewed.

Consideration is being given to widening the scope of the Lifts Act, and I suggest that if there is a need for bringing operators of this type of vehicle under control it would be more appropriate to do this under that Act. It is intended to bring more types of crane and hoist under control, and at the same time to bring more types of operator under control. However, that will be done under the Lifts Act. I have a few doubts, even so, whether the operator of a dragline or face shovel requires

a licence. A dragline is not usually operated in the immediate vicinity of workmen. Also, the operator is in a cabin, and he works to a fixed scoop or drag. It is not like a jib crane, which lifts or slews in the immediate vicinity of men, who often are working underneath. Also, a jib crane is often operating in congested areas, so it is in the immediate vicinity of men and also it has limited room in which to work. It may even have obstructions overhead. Jib cranes can be luffed; in other words, the jib can be raised or lowered. A jib crane, which works on the triangulation of forces, can luff and slew. On the other hand, a dragline has a fixed boom, so it would not be possible for an incompetent driver to drop that boom on anyone. Another safeguard is that the operator of a dragline or face shovel cannot overload his jib because he can put only a certain amount of material in the bucket, whereas with a crane there is always a danger of overloading.

I suggest to the member for Semaphore that this second part of his amendment could easily and more readily be considered for inclusion in the Lifts Act. Many types of crane are not covered by the Lifts Act, and I and the Government consider that they should be. Also, many types of operator should be brought under control, and I consider that this should be covered by the Lifts Act. Therefore, the second part of the honourable member's amendment might cause a few problems. I cannot say that I will include in the Lifts Act the concession he seeks, but I give an undertaking that his representations will be considered.

Mr. HURST: Early in his remarks I thought that the Minister was going to consider my suggestions seriously, for he acknowledged the desirability of extending safety provisions. Therefore, I am somewhat disappointed that he cannot see his way clear to accept this amendment. The principle we should aim at is to achieve set standards to be observed. It is desirable to have a certain standard in these matters, and that this should be controlled by one board rather than a series of employers deciding their own requirements.

This is a safety measure, and the greater the uniformity the better the operation will be. Employees often transfer from one employer to another. In fact, it is not uncommon for a person working on a shovel or diesel locomotive to work for four or five employers within a couple of years. Therefore, confusion could occur. I urge the Minister to reconsider the amendment, because I cannot see how it will

wreck the Bill. Indeed, the amendment will effect necessary safeguards, the details of which can be worked out later.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: Dealing with the second part of the amendment, I said I thought it was more appropriate that these matters be dealt with under the Lifts Act. Dealing with the first part of the amendment, I understand, now that steam locomotives have been replaced, that the danger of explosion has been reduced. The examining board is not competent to test a driver concerning whether he can operate a diesel along a tramway or whether or not he can read signals. That is surely the responsibility of the operating company, just as in the South Australian Railways a man must pass an eyesight test, etc., and comply with certain requirements. I suggest that the Enginedrivers Board is not the board to deal with this aspect; it was set up to give a licence to a man to operate a pressure vessel, steam boiler, etc.

Mr. VIRGO: The Minister is entirely overlooking the fact that every diesel locomotive has, as an integral part of it, a pressure vessel.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: You're talking about the braking system?

Mr. VIRGO: Yes.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: I think the honourable member is clutching at straws.

Mr. VIRGO: I am not. The person in charge of a locomotive has to be competent to undertake running repairs. I am not impressed by the Minister's statement that when a B.H.P. diesel breaks down the men wait for a fitter to come to do the work. The driver has to be sufficiently competent to effect running repairs. I believe the Minister requires an exemption merely because it relates to the B.H.P. He has not said why privately-owned locomotives should not be subjected to exactly the same requirements as apply to every other organization. I again ask the Minister to accept the amendment, because of the necessity to maintain a high degree of competence in all fields.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: It is completely unworthy of the honourable member to suggest I am sticking up for B.H.P. For some time we were between us achieving something; then he became vituperative and our co-operation started to dry up. He talks about bringing the Railways Department into line with other authorities, but this clause

does not deal with the South Australian Railways: it is excluded. He cannot have it both ways. The safety provision in the old Act deals with steam boilers, and the risk there has now been removed. This is the wrong legislation to deal with that matter, but I am prepared to consider quickly the honourable member's representations on it when I introduce an amendment to the Lifts Act.

The Committee divided on the question "That paragraph (a) proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause":

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe (teller), Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst (teller), Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Edwards. No—Mr. Hutchens.

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

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. HURST: I move:

In paragraph (g) to strike out "steam". I need not labour this amendment. I am confident the Minister will realize its importance merely by looking at it.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUNBE: I accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 34—"Only holders of certificates of competency to operate certain apparatus."

Mr. HURST: As my amendments to this clause are consequential on the amendment that has just been defeated, I shall not proceed with them.

Clause passed.

Clause 35—"Categories of certificate of competency."

Mr. HURST: Again, as my amendment to this clause is consequential on the amendment that has just been defeated, I shall not proceed with it.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (36 to 52), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT
AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to make clear the extent of the powers conferred on the Governor by section 16 of the principal Act. This section empowers the Governor to transfer any Crown lands or "any lands for the time being reserved for Aborigines" to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. Last year, a question arose as to the precise extent of this power and the Government was informed that, while the provision could be held to have the meaning

intended (that is, the one that appears on the face of the Act), it would seem desirable to put the matter beyond doubt and clarify the principal Act. Accordingly clause 2, at paragraph (a), sets out the limits of the estate or interest in land that the Governor may, by proclamation, transfer and paragraphs (b) and (c) are complementary to that provision. Paragraph (d) clarifies the duty of the Registrar-General of Titles to give effect to the transfer by the Governor.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.40 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 26, at 2 p.m.