HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 18, 1969

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

PETITIONS: ABORTION LEGISLATION

Mr. EDWARDS presented a petition signed by 253 House of Assembly electors who viewed with concern any efforts to extend the grounds on which abortion was at present legally allowed and prayed that the House of Assembly do not pass the Bill relating to abortion.

Received and read.

Mr. NANKIVELL presented a petition signed by 1,018 electors suggesting that the present law relating to abortion was inhuman and anachronistic in the light of present-day attitudes and medical knowledge and requesting that the law be amended to enable a legally qualified medical practitioner to terminate pregnancy.

Received and read.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS presented a petition signed by 902 House of Assembly electors suggesting that the present law relating to abortion was inhuman and anachronistic in the light of present-day attitudes and medical knowledge, and requesting that the law be amended to enable a legally qualified medical practitioner to terminate pregnancy.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In the last two months there has been an alarming increase in the number of persons unemployed in South Australia. Last month there was an increase of .8 per cent, and this month there has been a further increase, so that 2.21 per cent of the work force is at present unemployed. Last month, in reviewing the situation, the *Advertiser* headlined the news of an increase of .8 per cent as "Decrease in South Australian Jobless", and this month it has headlined another increase in unemployment as "Workless Rise Kept in Check", in startling contrast to the way in which it dealt with figures at the time the Labor Government was in office. In commenting on these figures, the Minister of Labour and Industry is reported as having said that the figures indicated a continuation of the great improvement in the South Australian position which was evident during the last half of 1968. As the difference in the figures now as compared with those for January last year represents less than .1 per cent of the work force unemployed, will the Minister say how he can put these figures forward to the South Australian public with his reported comments as a serious statement?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Having noticed the comment in this morning's paper, I wish to correct one word. I did not use the word "great": the word I used (and I have a copy of the statement that I made) was "gradual". Many school-leavers come on to the market at this time of the year, and this has been reflected right throughout the Commonwealth. In the last eight months there has been a gradual improvement in the employment position in this State, and this has been, up until this time, reflected in several ways: first, in the number of people employed; secondly, in the drop in the number of people receiving unemployment benefits; and, thirdly, in the number of job vacancies available. In January, this was still the position regarding all three aspects. Even with the many school-leavers now available for employment, this improvement has continued to take place. In fact, 3,290 persons were receiving unemployment benefits at the relevant time this year compared with 3,619 at the same time last year. From those figures it can be seen that there has been an improvement of about 350. Although this is not substantial, the position has gradually improved over the last eight months. What I have been able to ascertain indicates that this trend will continue.

Mr. CLARK: Referring to the unemployment position, the article in today's *Advertiser* states:

> The South Australian increase in unemployment benefit recipients was mainly in the Port Lincoln, Elizabeth and Port Pirie districts.

I am disturbed to find that Elizabeth is included. The Premier will know that everyone in Elizabeth, I think, has been somewhat disturbed over the years that the growth of industries in that area has been less extensive than most of us would have liked. Further, many people living there have to travel to work or to find work. Can the Premier say whether there are any plans for increased industrial development in the Elizabeth area?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, and I hope to have good news for the honourable member's district next week.

BAROSSA VINTAGE FESTIVAL

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last week I asked the Minister of Immigration and Tourism whether, in order to publicize the Barossa Valley and in the interests of tourism, he could arrange through the Tourist Bureau for the filming of highlights of the Barossa Valley Vintage Festival, which is to be held in April next. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Director of the Tourist Bureau states:

It is not intended to film this year's Barossa Valley Vintage Festival. The Tourist Bureau's current 16 millimetre film *Valley of Barossa,* released in February, 1967, includes a fairly full coverage of a previous vintage festival as the final segment of the film. *Valley of Barossa* is likely to remain topical for at least another two years, after which a replacement film will be made which will probably contain a coverage of the next vintage festival, scheduled for 1971. The film is receiving a considerable distribution through the placement of prints in film libraries in Victoria, New South Wales, New Zealand, San Francisco and London, as well as being available from the Tourist Bureau. The bureau intends again this year to cover the vintage festival fully in colour and black and white still photographs. It finds many opportunities to place such pictures in newspapers, magazines and other publications. A new Barossa Valley folder, at present being printed for the bureau, includes pictures taken during the 1967 vintage festival.

In endorsing that report, I add that the question of filming the festival this year is chiefly a matter of cost. As the Director pointed out, we have a satisfactory film at present, and he must do the best he can with the money available. If the honourable member is dissatisfied with this reply and believes that, in spite of what I have said, something more should be done, I shall be happy to discuss the matter with him to see whether anything further can be done. However, in the face of present evidence, I endorse the Director's opinion.

DAVENPORT RESERVE

Mr. RICHES: Over the weekend members of the council of the Davenport Reserve approached me about the employment of labour on the reserve by the Aboriginal Affairs Department. I was informed that, during the regime of the previous Government, an arrangement was entered into whereby Aborigines employed on the reserve were paid the full basic wage, and margins for skill were paid to bus drivers or plant operators. I was also informed that, since the October adjustment to the total wage, an application had been made for that adjustment to apply to Aborigines, and that the Government had refused this request, giving no reason. Members of the council claim that this is evidence of discrimination, and they are most concerned about it. They have asked me to ask the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs whether he knows about this situation. If he does, can he give the reason for the refusal to make an adjustment? If he has no knowledge of the matter, will he obtain a report?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Because of the seriousness of the matters that have been raised by the honourable member, I think I should give a considered reply. I will try to do that this week.

Mr. RICHES: The members of the Aboriginal Council on the Davenport Reserve are concerned about the housing situation and job opportunities in the northern districts. Members of the council have told me that four houses for Aboriginal families are being built at a cost of about $15,000 and that they have been informed that applicants for these houses must be people who have applied to the Housing Trust for houses but have been unable to obtain them. The council states that the only grounds on which the trust refuses to grant tenancy to an Aboriginal are inability to pay rent and inability adequately to look after a house. The council members have also told me that it is two and a half years since an Aboriginal has been allotted a trust house, and they have asked me to inquire of the Minister how many of these rental houses are being built, who will occupy them, and what rental will be charged. Will the Minister obtain that information?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will try to get it by the end of the week.

TELECOMMUNICATION CENTRE

Mr. NANKIVELL: I noticed in the press this morning a statement that the Commonwealth Government intended to build a new telecommunication centre in Waymouth Street, Adelaide. As we have been looking forward to this proposal for some time, can the Premier give any information about the details of the building?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: True, this is the sort of Commonwealth Government activity that we are extremely pleased to see taking place in South Australia. Obviously, the building relates to the growth of telecommunications in this State and will provide modern facilities for such growth. As I

expected to be asked a question on this matter because of its importance to the building industry in South Australia, this morning I obtained a brochure regarding the building. This brochure gives an extremely good preliminary outline of the building and, although it is not possible for me to give much detail about the building, I shall, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House, read a few sentences to outline the extent of this building programme.

The SPEAKER: Order! As long as the Premier does not read it all.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not capable of reading it all.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: However, I am capable of reading the parts that I am about to read. The brochure states:

The proposal is to erect a building having a basement, a sub-basement, and 14 floors above ground, on a site situated at 65-79 Waymouth Street, Adelaide. The rear of the proposed building will abut the existing Franklin exchange building, which at present operates as the main telecommunication centre for South Australia. The new building will be the first stage in the development of the Waymouth exchange, which will progressively take over as the main telecommunication centre for the State.

Later in the brochure there is an indication of the use that will be made of the building, as follows:

Space will also be provided to accommodate a post office computer centre, a telex exchange, radio and television programme switching facilities, and radio telephone equipment associated with the intrastate and interstate trunk traffic. The building will be designed to incorporate a radio tower to rise approximately 100ft. above the roof.

The time table for the commencement of this building will fit in admirably with other major projects that are proceeding in South Australia. In the last few days work has commenced on the building on the corner of Hindley Street and King William Street, and I spoke to the principals of one of the companies in London and subsequently in South Australia about that project. I consider that the commencement of another major building in Adelaide at the beginning of next year will provide continuity of work for the building industry in South Australia. We certainly welcome the Commonwealth Government's intention.

SHIPYARDS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Premier a reply to my question about ship construction at Whyalla?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have received the following letter from the Acting Prime Minister (Rt. Hon. John McEwen):

I refer to your letter of November 7 to the Prime Minister regarding shipbuilding facilities in South Australia. Commonwealth policies in relation to the local shipbuilding industry are, of course, long standing and the industry has been subsidized since 1946. Because of the efforts of Government to maintain an efficient local shipbuilding industry, production has doubled from $18,000,000 in 1962-63 to $42,000,000 in 1967-68 and the industry now employs more than 5,000 persons. I agree with you about the importance of the shipbuilding industry to the South Australian economy and to the continued development of Whyalla.

The letter is in reply to my request for additional consideration for that industry. The letter continues:

As you have mentioned, the Commonwealth has had discussions with Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited about the company's plans to invest the necessary capital in the Whyalla yard to allow the building of an 86,000-ton dead-weight bulk carrier there. The question of increased building capacity at the yard is, of course, a matter to be determined by the company itself, but the Commonwealth has expressed the hope to it that it will still be able to tender for the 86,000-dwt. vessel.

I happened to run into Sir Ian McLennan in Sydney on Friday (it was not a planned meeting) and he told me that the B.H.P. Company is still seriously considering the future of its operations at Whyalla in relation to the construction of larger ships. I think that the representations made by the Government and the company will result in a turn of events soon but, at the moment, progress depends very much on the Commonwealth Government and the company as to negotiations on additions to the yard, the subsidy to be paid to the purchaser of a vessel and, therefore, the impact the subsidy will have on the ability of the purchaser to have the vessel built at Whyalla.

BOWLING CLUBS

Mr. VENNING: Recent legislation has permitted the larger bowling clubs in the State to install the elaborate equipment required by the Licensing Court for the serving of refreshments. Will the Attorney-General say what is the present situation regarding the serving of refreshments at smaller bowling

clubs throughout the State which are not financially able to make such elaborate arrangements?

The SPEAKER: Does the Attorney-General wish to reply?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me to do so.

The SPEAKER: I understand that you are not expressing a legal opinion on the matter.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is impossible to answer the question without to some extent expressing a legal opinion.

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General knows that it is not permissible to express a legal opinion in reply to a question.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Then do you, Mr. Speaker, rule that I should not answer the question?

The SPEAKER: It is in your hands.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not think it is possible to reply to the question without some element of a legal opinion being expressed.

The SPEAKER: I will allow the Attorney-General to answer, and I will judge later.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The position is the same as it has been since the Act was passed in 1967: the conditions laid down for clubs of all descriptions are those laid down by the court. Whether or not they are onerous is a matter of opinion, but each application is judged on its merits and the premises for which the licence or permit is sought are inspected. There have been many complaints from the smaller bodies that the conditions imposed and the requirements sought by the court, through the Superintendent of Licensed Premises, are onerous, but those requirements have been sought only because it is considered that a certain standard should be kept up. I have not been able to find any way legislatively of suggesting any satisfactory change to the position. This is a matter that must be left to the court but, if the honourable member has a certain application in mind where it is considered that unreasonable requirements have been laid down, I shall be glad to consider it myself, although I cannot promise there is anything more I can do about it.

NORTHERN ROADWORKS

Mr. CASEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of February 11 concerning northern roadworks?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have a reply for the honourable member, and I am glad to be able to say that it is entirely factual.

Mr. Casey: How do we know?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member has my assurance. In addition to the normal programme of maintenance, and sundry small works of improvements to short sections of certain roads, the following major works are programmed for the northern area for the next 12 months:

Birdsville Track: Commencement of construction of 70 miles of gravel road between Marree and Cannawaulkaninna Bore.

Quorn-Hawker district road: The construction of a sealed road between these towns will be completed.

Mount Gunson mine: A gravel road will be constructed to provide access to this mine, and at the same time, an adjacent deviation of the Stuart Highway will be constructed.

Overall planning of the whole road system in this area is currently being investigated, and a firm decision has not yet been taken as to the future programme for construction north of Hawker. The road from Hawker to Marree is one of those currently being considered.

WHEAT

Mr. ALLEN: Early last week I attended a meeting of wheatgrowers in the Mount Bryan area at which I was informed that wheat silos on the Burra and Spalding railway lines had been filled for more than three weeks and that no railway trucks had been available during that time because the terminal at Port Adelaide was full, although many growers in that area had delivered only 40 per cent of their wheat. I was requested to ask South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited whether railway trucks could be made available for these lines when space became available at Port Adelaide. I was informed by the co-operative that a ship was calling at Port Adelaide about the middle of last week to load bulk wheat and that railway trucks would be available immediately. Members will recall that a strike occurred in the Railways Department last Wednesday and Thursday and, as a result, no railways trucks were moved during this period. Consequently, growers in my area hired all available road transport and used this to forward their wheat to Port Adelaide. Indeed, while travelling to my home last Thursday evening, I passed about 30 motor transports carting wheat from this area.

Because there have been two recent rail stoppages (and according to this morning's newspaper there may be more), will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Agriculture to discuss with the co-operative the provision of more grain storage in country areas instead of at Port Adelaide?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will ask the Minister of Agriculture to inquire about this matter.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on February 5 about the shipment of wheat from Port Pirie rather than from Wallaroo?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

I have been informed by the South Australian Manager of the Australian Wheat Board that the article referred to did not emanate from the board: the vessels loaded the following quantities at Port Pirie: *Amstelmeer,* 10,180 tons; and *Demetra* 12,340. Hard wheat for Japan was shipped on the *Demetra.* This wheat was sold on a quality basis with a protein guarantee. The hard wheat of the 1967-68 season available at Port Pirie was considered suitable for this shipment. As only 2,200 tons of hard wheat of the 1967-68 season was available at Wallaroo, the vessel could not load there because of an insufficient quantity of this wheat.

PROPERTY ACQUISITION

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although my question concerns the Highway Department I want it clearly understood that I am in no way criticizing officers of that department, because they have been most co-operative in this matter. Preparatory to widening South Road in Croydon and Hindmarsh, the Highways Department is acquiring several properties along that road. One of my constituents has told me that he is buying his property under a mortgage and having paid $4,200 for it, has spent about $2,500 to renovate the house. The department intends to acquire 7ft. of the land and has offered him $920 compensation for this strip, but the loss of this land would render his property almost useless because of the difficulty of manoeuvrability, as it would bring the house right up to the road alignment. As an alternative the department has offered to purchase the whole of his property for $5,950. No doubt there will be many queries on these aspects, because it seems that a satisfactory amount is not being paid to compensate such people for finding alternative accommodation and shifting from one place to another. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to make a statement of Government policy concerning these acquisitions and also to consider the case of my constituent if I give him the full details?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act covers the legal position and sets out the rights of purchase in these matters, but I will certainly take this matter up with my colleague and, if the honourable member gives me the details, ask the Minister to examine this case urgently.

HONG KONG FLU

Mr. BROOMHILL: Recently, statements have been made by officers of the Commonwealth Serum Laboratory about the possibility of an epidemic of Hong Kong flu in Australia during the coming winter. I think most members of the public have seen these statements, which indicate that a virus could be present in the nasal passages and that with the advent of cold weather the virus could break out. A letter published in yesterday morning's *Advertiser,* signed by a general practitioner (whose name was supplied but not printed), asked the following questions:

(1) Whether there is any scientific evidence that the Hong Kong serum is effective?

(2) If it is effective, is it not very likely to produce eventually complete lack of natural resistance to a multiplicity of viruses?

(3) Or is it, as I suspect, a blatant money-making racket?

The writer concludes:

I would like to know the results of controlled trials as to effectiveness and safety.

Because many people have read the original statements and are approaching doctors to order the serum, I believe that these questions should be answered by the Health Department and, in these circumstances, will the Premier obtain from the Minister of Health replies to the questions asked in the letter to the *Advertiser* to which I have referred?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to refer this matter to my colleague and ask him to obtain as much information as he can for the honourable member.

MIGRANTS

Mr. McANANEY: It was reported in the *Advertiser* last Friday that the Commonwealth Government intended to erect flats in South Australia to house skilled migrants arriving in this State. Has the Premier additional information about this project and can he say

what progress has been made in the Government's efforts to attract skilled workers to South Australia?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I cannot give any further details of the building of these flats, although I have been involved in previous moves on their establishment. When I was in London last July, I asked the Commonwealth immigration authorities to allocate as many skilled migrants as possible to South Australia because of the pending increase in industrial activity in this State. Subsequently, I spoke to the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration (Mr. Snedden) and at that time he thought that the migrant intake into South Australia had slowed down so much during the previous three years that the building of flats to house these migrants was not warranted and he indicated that, when the position required it, the Commonwealth Government would consider building flats. However, since then we have seen a significant increase in the number of migrants to this State and the Commonwealth Government has obviously now decided to build flats not only to assist in assimilating migrants but also to attract them to South Australia. The Minister of Immigration and Tourism may have some information on this matter which he can furnish to the honourable member.

Mr. McANANEY: I heard today from a reliable source that five ships bringing migrants would come to South Australia soon. Will the Minister of Immigration and Tourism give comparative figures of the number of migrants coming to the State now and in the previous year?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will get the figures asked for as soon as possible. The number of migrants who arrived during the six months ended December 31 was considerably more than the number arriving during the same period in the previous year.

BOOK SALES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Late last year both the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) and I asked the Treasurer questions about the selling of books by Grolier International. Has the Treasurer information on this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Prices Commissioner and the Government investigator have made extensive inquiries into the activities and methods employed by the organization in question and have interviewed the representative of the company in South Australia. The Prices Commissioner has reported that Grolier International, of St. Leonards, New South Wales, employs only one representative in South Australia to sell its books on the basis of personal sales. It appears that the company may not have fully complied with the Book Purchasers Protection Act, 1963-64, in some respects, and the report on the methods of operation has been forwarded to the Attorney-General. Profit margins on these books are similar to those for other oversea publications.

CHOWILLA DAM

Mr. HUDSON: The report of the technical committee of the River Murray Commission in its conclusion at page 8 states:

The storage of 3,000,000 acre feet at Dartmouth would provide an increased benefit to the system when measured in terms of additional average annual supply to the upper States of 860,000 acre feet per annum above that which is now anticipated could be provided by storage between 3,500,000 and 5,060,000 acre feet at Chowilla.

One may conclude from that statement and from the documents provided in the report that, on the committee's estimates, the increase in the average annual supply to the upper States from Dartmouth is estimated at over 1,000,000 acre feet a year, that is, over and above the present average annual supply. In reply to a question of mine last week, the Minister of Works indicated that the estimate for the average annual flow of the Mitta Mitta River at the Dartmouth site was 580,000 acre feet, and it is rather puzzling to understand how that average annual flow, which, after all, cannot be increased by the dam, can lead to an increase in the average annual supply in excess of 1,000,000 acre feet. There is a comment in the report about the possibility of revision of critical storage levels, and I refer the Premier to the current provision in the River Murray Waters Act. Although the Act refers to Chowilla, I presume that a similar position would exist after Dartmouth had been built. Clause 50 (2) provides:

After the Chowilla reservoir has been declared to have become effective for the purposes of this agreement, the discharge from the Hume reservoir and the Chowilla reservoir shall be regulated to provide a reserve of water in storage for use in dry years, that reserve to be fixed from time to time by the commission and drawn on at the discretion of the commission, but the quantity of water so held in reserve shall not be less than 2,400,000 acre feet at the thirtieth day of April in any year . . .

My question relates to this discrepancy between the annual average flow of the Mitta Mitta River at Dartmouth and the extra increase, not in the minimum yield but in the average yield,

which is supposed to come from Dartmouth and which is referred to in this section of the River Murray Waters Act regarding certain minimum storages to be held. Will the Premier say how the technical committee obtained a yield from the Dartmouth dam in excess of the average annual flow of the Mitta Mitta River at Dartmouth? Is it a consequence of presuming alterations in the River Murray Waters Act to provide for lower minimum storages and for the greater running down of existing storages than is allowed for at present?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member should know that the Murray River system, which flows more often than not at a great rate, flows into South Australia at the rate of about 8,000,000 acre feet a year. Therefore, the basic principle of storage on the river relates to storing water in years of good rainfall so that supplies may be made up from storage in lean years. This type of operation does not directly relate to the annual flow of the Mitta Mitta River at Dartmouth. Although the annual yield can be guaranteed, it does not mean that the minimum flow each year of the Mitta Mitta River must be a base guarantee over the 1,000,000 acre feet in question. The annual yield is directly related to the poorer years of rainfall over the river system. I remind the honourable member that the 260-odd computer studies have been complete studies of the input and output of the river system, and this is something about which I think even the honourable member should think twice before he quarrels with the extent of the studies. As to the quantity to be left in storages in certain years, I will try to obtain for the honourable member the additional information he has requested.

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the Minister of Works has replies to a series of questions I asked last week on the technical committee's report on Chowilla as the site for a dam, and matters related thereto. Will he give as many of those replies as he is able to give to the House?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member asked various questions, and I have prepared very full replies for him. There are four replies in all, and I have put them as much as possible in chronological order. The studies were first concerned with securing South Australia's entitlement of 1,254,000,000 acre feet a year, which was the benefit South Australia would receive from Chowilla in the 1961 study. The yield of the system as a whole was examined for various combinations of storage, using as a condition of acceptance that no State would receive less than 70 per cent of the 1970 demand in the period of worst drought covered by the studies. Benefits of storages at Chowilla, Ovens River (Victoria) and alternative storages above Hume reservoir, namely Jingellic, Murray Gates, Gibbo and Dartmouth, were examined with and without the use of Menindee Lakes for this entitlement level. By holding the yield to the Eastern States to the minimum acceptable level, it is possible to examine the upper limits of yield to South Australia.

In the case of Chowilla, South Australia would be unrestricted at 1,254,000,000 acre feet a year, but this figure could not be increased significantly without adverse effects on the yield to the Eastern States. The Dartmouth studies indicated that South Australia could have an unrestricted supply up to 1,500,000 acre feet, with acceptable restrictions to the Eastern States in time of drought. The studies were not designed to consider South Australia in isolation, but the present work has shown the order of the maximum yield available to this State, while at the same time more than satisfying the current requirements of Victoria and New South Wales. A few studies only were carried out using a base flow of 300 cusecs at Mildura, as this order of flow was not sufficient for river regulation. It is not possible to prepare a complete yield against storage capacity curve as with the 600 and 900 cusecs flow.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Works a further reply to my question about the technical committee's report?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have the following reply, which deals with the second question raised by the honourable member:

The average annual loss by evaporation was established at 600,000 acre feet in the 1961 studies and was estimated to vary from 820,000 acre feet to 920,000 acre feet under various assumed conditions in the present studies. Estimated evaporation losses are calculated by the following formula: Pan coefficient $\times$ (Evaporimeter reading — rainfall) $\times$ surface area of storage. In the 1961 studies, a pan coefficient of evaporation of .8 was assumed for the Chowilla area based on evaporimeter records at Lake Victoria. An area of water spread was assessed from survey data available at the time to calculate the total evaporation loss. In the current studies a pan coefficient of .9 was used following a 1964 investigation into the changes of level in Lakes Hattah, Hindmarsh and Albacutya. A ground survey of the water spread area was carried out prior to the current studies and it was found necessary to increase the figure assessed for the 1961 studies by 8 per cent. The combination of the revised

coefficient and increased water spread area produced an increase in the estimated evaporation losses.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Minister now give the further replies to questions I asked last week concerning the technical committee's report?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The following are the replies:

(1) A possible diversion of 190,000 acre feet a year to the Kiewa hydro-electric scheme was made in obtaining a net figure of 580,000 acre feet at Dartmouth.

(2) The State Electricity Commission (Victoria) had a gauging weir at the Dartmouth dam site for 20 years and the data was correlated with figures obtained over the same period from Tallandoon station downstream of dam site. The data from the downstream station was then adjusted by the established relationship for the remainder of the study period.

(3) As there was no reason to doubt the correctness of the flow records of the Mitta Mitta River, the studies were confined to the available data and there was no point in carrying out further studies using hypothetical figures.

OAKBANK SCHOOL BUS

Mr. GILES: Various buses take schoolchildren from Lenswood six miles to the Oakbank Area School, and it appears that the bus service is not keeping pace with the increase in the number of children needing transport. During the past week one bus carried 76 children (the average has been 68), although I have been told by members of the Oakbank school committee that the bus is registered to carry only 32 passengers. Will the Minister of Education examine this matter with a view to having provided an additional bus so that the children can be taken to school in less crowded circumstances?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will get a report on this bus service.

TOURIST BUREAU

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Immigration and Tourism a reply to my question about how many people are employed by the South Australian Tourist Bureau and about how many other State Governments have an agency in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There are 81 persons employed in the Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney offices of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau. Victoria, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania each have a Government tourist office in Adelaide.

PERPETUAL LEASES

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question about delays in the transfers of perpetual leases and about the possibility of interim approval being given by the Minister?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This matter having been considered, I have a fairly lengthy report which I will give to the honourable member to read but which I will not read to the House. To summarize, at present, as soon as the Land Board has decided to recommend a transfer and the gazette notice required by legislation has matured, the department writes to the seller or his agent to notify him what requirements are needed to enable the application to be submitted to the Minister. A note, such as suggested by the honourable member, could not be sent any earlier than the present letter of requirements. In the long run, it is most unlikely that there would be any effective shortening of the time between the date of application and the date of formal consent. Considerable difficulties are associated with any interim approval. The honourable member also referred to delays and, as he will see when he reads the report in detail, it contains a break-down of 53 applications for consent to transfer that have been received. It can be seen that none of these cases is being held up by failure to act within the department. In the vast majority of cases, the department has been waiting for certain requirements to be met by the applicants. The honourable member will see that there are varying situations but, in each case, the department has done everything possible to carry through the transfer. In almost all cases any hold-up is because further information has been required from the applicant.

ISLINGTON EMPLOYMENT

Mr. VIRGO: I draw to the Premier's attention a direction from the Railways Commissioner that, as a result of a shortage of work caused by the policy of the present Government in closing railway lines and letting work normally done by the railways to private contractors, no new staff is to be employed at Islington and no natural wastage of staff is to be replaced. Can the Premier say whether this direction has been given with the consent

and knowledge of Cabinet or whether the Minister of Roads and Transport has made the decision of his own volition?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will get a report.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr. EDWARDS: In North Terrace opposite John Martin's parking station is a set of traffic lights used mainly to allow people to drive into and out of the parking station. Although the lights are necessary when the parking station is in use, will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to see whether these lights are necessary over week-ends when the parking station is not being used and when the lights interrupt the flow of traffic on North Terrace unnecessarily?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss the matter with Mr. Hill.

SAND REMOVAL

Mr. HURST: I have been informed by the Woodville council that a ratepayer living on Military Road, Semaphore Park, has complained bitterly about sand continuing to be removed from the foreshore until past midnight on Tuesday, February 11, 1969. The area concerned is understood to be under lease to Australian Consolidated Industries. Will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines to ascertain whether the management was aware of this work continuing until after midnight and whether any provision in the lease can be used to curtail these activities of an evening, so that the disturbance of residents can be eliminated? If this practice is permitted under the terms of the lease, how often is it likely to occur?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be pleased to obtain the necessary details from my colleague.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the completion date of, and the details of the tender for, work on the Modbury Hospital?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I have the following information:

The overall completion date of the Modbury Hospital project is as originally programmed for July, 1971. Planning is proceeding to schedule to achieve that date. The project is to be undertaken in stages which provide for all buildings to be completed at the same time. The proposed tender target dates for the various stages are as follows:

1. Stage I (main hospital block)—tenders to be called June, 1969.
2. Nurses home—tenders to be called December, 1969.
3. Boiler house and workshops—tenders to be called November, 1969.
4. R.M.O's building—all tender documents are complete, but it is not scheduled for tender call until February, 1970.

LIBRARIES

Mr. BURDON: I have received from the Town Clerk of the Corporation of Mount Gambier a letter dealing with the supply of library books by the State Library to the library at Mount Gambier. I understand that councils, when applying to the State Librarian for the supply of books, must forward a sum with the order. In this instance, the sum is about $3,000, and the council is rather perturbed at having been asked to forward another $3,000 for books although it has not received the previous allocation. Delivery of books is made in small spasmodic parcels, over about 18 months, and I hope that the Minister of Education can help the council provide a better service than is being provided at present. Will she find out from the State Librarian whether the supplying of books to council librarics can be expedited?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I shall be pleased to obtain a report on the matter as soon as possible.

TATTOOING

Mr. LAWN: Last week, when the Premier was good enough to reply to my question about tattooing he said that the one tattooist in Adelaide confined his work to the accepted traditional designs and sights and also that he did not tattoo children under 18 years of age. The Premier concluded by saying that the Government would watch the progress of legislation in Great Britain and in New South Wales. The *Sunday Mail* of February 15 contains a report by Helen Caterer about the tattooing of children, and I ask the Premier to have that report investigated. It has also come to my attention that at the McNally Training Centre (Magill) and at the Wandana Remand Home youths of 15-17 years of age have been tattooed, not with the traditional designs, but with the following: obscene designs of bare-breasted women and, I understand, other obscene tattoos; blood-dripping knives through a heart; 5in. to 6in. eagles; skull and cross bones; signs representing the Rundle Street gang and the Hindley Street gang; and butterflies, flowers and hearts. I am also told that some of these children have forged their parents' signatures, while others,

who have no parents, have not been able to supply signatures. Before Cabinet makes a decision, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to investigate Helen Caterer's report in the *Sunday Mail* and my statement today to find out whether these children are obtaining these tattoos in Adelaide (because they are professional jobs, not home-made ones) and whether the children have had their parents' consent?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I saw briefly the report in the *Sunday Mail* to which the honourable member refers and, although I did not have time to read it in detail, I made a mental note to examine the matter to find out whether there was available to the Government further information that had not been available previously. I may say that I consider it wrong for professional tattooists to tattoo minors. Being tattooed is a rash act that a young person often regrets later, and pain and expense are involved in having the tattoo imperfectly removed: a mark may be left for life. If tattooists in South Australia are tattooing minors in this way, the Government is extremely interested in their activities and will consider the matter carefully. However, I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that we would have no control over tattooists in other States. I also understand that tattooing can be done by amateurs, although they would not produce the same type of job. Therefore, there can be no blanket control over tattooing. Nevertheless, we consider it most undesirable for a professional tattooist to do this work on minors particularly these obscene tattoos that the honourable member has mentioned. I will refer the matter to my colleague again.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A film was shown on channel 10 last Saturday evening which purported to be a review of the situation under the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Survey. I understand that it was prepared and screened by public relations consultants to the Highways Department. Will the Premier say whether the production of this film and its screening were paid for out of Highways Department funds or out of the Premier's Department funds? If they were paid for out of Highways Department funds, under what section of the Highways Act was money spent on the session; how much was spent; and how is it that Government money can be spent on a session of such appalling quality as that shown on Saturday evening?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Unfortunately, I could not view the programme, therefore I cannot comment on the Leader's assertion that the film was of poor quality. However, as I recognize the Leader's acting ability as being of a high calibre, I believe he is well qualified so to comment. I will obtain the necessary details for him.

Mr. VIRGO: The Premier has said in the House (twice, I think) that Cabinet has been sitting extremely long hours day after day discussing the various projects associated with the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. Will the Minister of Education say what information she has supplied to Cabinet about how many schools will lose part of their property if the M.A.T.S. Report is implemented and how many will be completely destroyed, and where these schools are located?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The officers of the Education Department are considering this matter from the point of view of what schools will be affected by the M.A.T.S. plan, but I understand that the number is four. However, as I am not sure of the location of those schools or the extent to which they will be affected by the plan, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of February 6 regarding the registration of vehicles in country districts?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague states:

Delay in effecting a registration can occur because of any one of a variety of causes, and it is difficult to be precise in answer to the honourable member's general statement that there appears to be a continuing build-up in delay. However, a major cause is that there has been an unprecedented increase in receipt of incomplete applications in recent months, which is out of proportion even to the increasing volume of business. The result is that a record number of applications is held, awaiting completion of requirements by applicants. This in turn has caused much extra work in the Motor Vehicles Department in initiating, handling and linking correspondence. Where an applicant is asked to complete requirements (and this is likely to delay registration beyond the 14-day period), the department provides, where possible, only a further permit at the same time, but this can be done only if it has received an insurance certificate to cover the period. Procedures have become more complicated for applicants since introduction of

additional requirements such as stamp duty, road maintenance charges and inspection of vehicles in certain circumstances.

If applications are lodged correctly and promptly and any additional requirements are answered by applicants without delay, the period of 14 days should be sufficient. However, the department experiences many cases where these requirements are not met and delays cannot be avoided. Furthermore, country clients frequently forward applications through insurance companies in the city, and it has been found that this often causes delays of several days. There are disadvantages in extending the permit period as provided by the Motor Vehicles Act. With the ever-increasing density of traffic, it is considered undesirable to allow vehicles on the road without a number plate identification for longer than is reasonably necessary. As the honourable member has indicated, extensions can be obtained in those cases where delays are inevitable for the reasons I have stated.

KIMBA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of February 11 regarding a start on the Polda-Kimba main?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As planned, work commenced on the Lock-Kimba main on February 10. Some inconvenience was caused by the rain at the weekend but the camp was occupied on Sunday, February 9; clearing and marking out was commenced on February 10; trenching was commenced on February 11, on which date also the first load of pipes was delivered. The first pipes delivered were for the high-pressure section, and the current laying is taking place 12 miles east of Lock.

EDUCATION SYLLABUS

Mr. HUGHES: I have received a letter from a person who holds a prominent position in a Government department and who has recently been transferred to Kadina. He considers that a grave injustice has been done to his daughter because of the lack of uniformity in the subjects taught at various schools. The letter states that the student concerned enrolled at the Plympton High School at the beginning of 1967 and that, as her ambition was to become either an infant or a primary teacher, it was necessary for her, in order to matriculate, to do mathematics I and mathematics II (old mathematics was taught in her class). On attending the Kadina Memorial High School last Tuesday, the student was told that old mathematics was no longer taught in third-year classes, and she now has the alternative of doing two other subjects or switching to new mathematics, which has been taught to the class for the past two years. The letter states that the other subjects she could do will lead her only to Leaving standard and that she will be unable to matriculate. This would mean that her ambition to be a schoolteacher would be impossible of achievement. The letter states that this whole situation seems ridiculous and requires looking into, especially when there is a shortage of schoolteachers and when a student's ambition has been completely shattered. If I give the Minister of Education a copy of the letter, will she bring down a report on the matter at her earliest convenience? If this position, which places certain students at a disadvantage to others, still obtains, will she take steps to remedy the situation?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

CALTOWIE SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about paving an area at the Caltowie Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Public tenders for the sealing at the Caltowie Primary School closed on November 26 last but no satisfactory response was received. Tenders have again been called, and they closed on February 11. Several tenders were received, and these are being technically appraised by the Public Buildings Department.

GLENELG TREATMENT WORKS

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about work being done at the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works for the disposal through an experimental sludge outfall to sea and whether there would be any harmful effects to the beach and the surrounding area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The disposal of sludge to sea from the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works was approved on December 5, 1966, following a favourable recommendation by the Public Works Standing Committee. This recommendation was made following five years of operation of a two-mile long experimental off-shore sludge pipeline. During this period, studies showed no adverse effects in the form of a health hazard, increased seaweed growth or littoral

deposits. No complaints were received during the experimental period and no aesthetic disabilities were observed.

The two-and-a-half mile permanent sludge outfall was laid on May 11, 1968. The screening plant and sludge pumping station were coupled up and the outfall commissioned on June 11, 1968, since which time it has given successful and continuous service. The final lowering of the shore end of the outfall pipe is in hand at present and certain anchoring work on the seaward end will subsequently be carried out. The whole project should be finally completed by April, 1969.

The honourable member may be assured that the disposal to sea of digested sludge from the Glenelg Sewage Treatment Works will not have an adverse effect on any South Australian beaches or coastal waters. Other works in progress include the beautification of the buffer area of the treatment works land to the north and the stabilization of the frontal sand dunes to limit erosion and halt drift of these sand dunes. Because of serious erosion of the sand dunes, additional support of the effluent pipes was necessary towards the end of last winter. The requirements for further protection of these important structures is currently being investigated.

JAMESTOWN SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the headmaster's residence at Jamestown Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Cabinet approval was recently given for a new housing programme for this department, and an order for these houses was placed with the South Australian Housing Trust on February 11, 1969. Included in these houses is one for the headmaster of the Jamestown Primary School. This house will be built on land held by the trust and, when it is finished and occupied, the old residence will be demolished.

RECEIPTS TAX

Mr. VIRGO: I have had forwarded to me from two poultry farmers their accounts showing that a tax of 1c in $10 was deducted despite the fact that both farmers had applied and obtained permission to make bulk tax payments. Attached to the account is a printed slip that states:

Deduction of stamp duty on the enclosed account at the rate of 1c for each $10 or part is made as required under the Stamp Duties Amendment Act, 1968, which came into force. No further duty is payable by you in respect of the proceeds shown in this account sale. This applies to all associated woolbrokers.

This firm is a poultry broker and also a wool broker. It seems that this firm is cashing in on the stamp duty tax, because it is overcharging. In one instance, where the account for the sale was for $18, naturally 2c was charged whereas it should have been 1.8c, and on the other occasion it was for $14.30 and the tax should have been 1.43c. Obviously this firm is cashing in on this taxation imposed by the Government on the people. Will the Treasurer inform this firm and any other firm that is cashing in on this taxation that appropriate action, if it is available under the Act, will be taken against them?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not accept the honourable member's conclusion that someone is trying to cash in on something.

Mr. Virgo: They are making money on it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not accept that. I think there is another reason why this situation has arisen. The Act sets out a clear obligation on the agent to pay the tax on behalf of his client unless the client has applied for a bulk return and has informed the agent that he has been accepted as a bulk taxpayer.

Mr. Virgo: Which they have done.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member did not say that in his explanation.

Mr. Virgo: I am saying it now: they have done it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If they have done so, there is no obligation on the agent to deduct the tax on the return to the producer.

Mr. Virgo: This firm has taken it out of everyone's return, irrespective.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If this is so and the honourable member is sure that they have been informed of the S.D. number allotted for a bulk taxpayer, I will take up the matter with the firm concerned. I emphasize that the Act provides that the agent is responsible to deduct the tax unless the taxpayer concerned has notified the firm that he is a bulk taxpayer and quotes his S.D. number to the agent, who then has no obligation or right to deduct the tax.

Mr. WARDLE: A lady in my district brought three dozen eggs valued at about 45c a dozen to a local store, and when she received

payment for them 1c was deducted and retained by the store concerned. Will the Treasurer comment on this?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The value of the eggs sold by the lady to the store was apparently not in excess of $10, and I assume that the lady concerned is not a poultry farmer as described in the relevant Act but merely keeps a few hens in the back yard. Clearly, she is not required to pay any tax. The Act clearly provides that a person not carrying on a trade, business or profession is not liable to pay duty on any individual sum received for the sale of goods for which less than $10 is obtained. The lady to whom the honourable member refers was therefore not liable to pay any tax, and the storekeeper had no right to deduct 1c from her payment. In any event, the storekeeper had no right to deduct the tax from her payment unless a receipt was issued and a duty stamp attached to it. The Government and the department will take a dim view of people who take what is alleged to be tax out of payments made without converting the sum so taken into stamps or into the payment of duty, because this represents a way of taking money from certain persons without accounting to the Government for it, and this is clearly illegal. In the case referred to, first, the lady is not in business as a poultry farmer and therefore is not liable to pay tax on a sum less than $10 in any case; and, secondly, if the storekeeper had to deduct the sum he should in her presence have given her a receipt and placed a duty stamp on it.

Mr. HURST: I have received complaints from persons who depend on the payment of commission for their livelihood. Under the Commonwealth system, these people are taxed on that commission as though it is their weekly income and are not required to pay provisional income tax, as is required in other cases. I understand they are required to pay stamp duty on the commission they receive, even though that commission is their means of livelihood. As this appears to me to be an anomaly, will the Treasurer see whether it can be removed, so that these people receive the same treatment as that received by everyone else who earns a livelihood?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The matter revolves around whether or not the payments received are salaries and wages. I am not clear what type of person the honourable member is referring to.

Mr. Hurst: Land agents and other agents.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: They are taxable: there is no doubt about that. These are not salaries and wages but the result of personal exertion on the part of those conducting the business. If the honourable member will give me examples of the cases he has in mind, I will refer them to the department to see what is the precise legal position.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Is it incumbent on a person who receives money for goods sold to pay the stamp duty or receipts tax?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thank the honourable member for his question. Perhaps I did not emphasize that point adequately in my reply. The Act clearly imposes the obligation to pay the tax on the person who receives the money. As I said earlier in reply to the member for Murray (Mr. Wardle), in this case the person was not liable to pay any tax but, if she had been, there was not an obligation on the storekeeper to take the tax out of the amount that he paid her. The tax has nothing to do with him and is not his business unless he is an agent for her and sells the goods on her behalf to someone else. If he buys the eggs for his own resale purposes, there is no obligation on him, nor has he any right, to take the amount of tax out of the proceeds he pays her. The obligation for payment of the tax is clearly on the person receiving the money.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works details of the progress being made by his department in its study to give the township of Watervale a reticulated water service?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will try to get an up-to-date progress report for the honourable member.

WHYALLA LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Local Government to my recent question about the report from the committee that has been dealing with the question of full local government for Whyalla?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Local Government has been informed by the Chairman of the Whyalla Local Government Committee that the committee expects to submit its report towards the end of March.

BEACH FACILITIES

Mr. HURST: Has the Premier obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked recently about the alleged unhygienic conditions of beach facilities?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is not intended to make any special investigation of the toilet facilities at metropolitan beaches as a result of the press report. The councils concerned, in fact, regularly inspect toilets and other facilities. Councils spend much money on these facilities and experience considerable and continuing difficulties in ensuring that all members of the public use them in a reasonable manner.

RAILWAY FREIGHT

Mr. CASEY: Over the weekend I was approached by several pastoralists in the Mannahill district concerned about the lack of information they obtain from the Railways Department about goods sent by rail to them at Mannahill. Apparently, in accordance with the Government's policy on railways throughout South Australia, the stationmaster who was previously resident at Mannahill has been transferred and no-one has been appointed in his place, which means that there is no liaison between the railways and customers in that district. As merchandise carried on the railways has lessened considerably, the Commissioner possibly believes, bearing in mind that less revenue is obtained, that it is not advisable to have a stationmaster at Mannahill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question.

Mr. CASEY: I mention that in passing, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: That is out of order.

Mr. CASEY: Will the Attorney-General take up with the Minister of Roads and Transport the feasibility of the Railways Commissioner's appointing an agent at Mannahill to notify customers when goods arrive at the station, so that goods are not lying in the station yard for maybe several days until they are picked up and so that perishable goods are perhaps not damaged or destroyed?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will discuss the matter with Mr. Hill and ascertain whether the honourable member's suggestion is feasible.

SNAKE GULLY RESERVOIR

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week about the possibility of constructing a reservoir on the Little Para River at Snake Gully?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The possibility of a reservoir on the Little Para River was suggested first in 1949, and soon after an overall survey was carried out. Since that time, preliminary layout and design work have been performed, and from mid-1959 more detailed site investigations with auger and diamond drillings have continued to enable geological reports and foundation investigations to be made of alternative sites. No land acquisition has yet commenced.

MOORLANDS CORNER

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Attorney-General discuss with the Minister of Roads and Transport the possibility of having a traffic sign erected on the southern approach to the Moorlands corner indicating that the corner can be safely negotiated only at a certain speed or, alternatively (and possibly more effectively), having erected a sign stating "This corner is a killer; 10 people have lost their lives on it in the last three years"? Since the last fatal accident at the corner, at least two or three minor accidents have occurred there and, unless the Highways Department intends to re-align the corner, due warning might be given to all cars approaching it, particularly from the Victorian or southern side, that the corner is dangerous and that it cannot be negotiated safely at more than a certain speed.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will take up this matter with the Minister.

LIQUOR PRICES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question whether the Liquor Industry Council had considered certain matters, one of which was the price charged for wine served with meals at hotels and restaurants?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Liquor Industry Council has before it a number of matters relative to liquor prices, one being the question of prices of wine served in the dining-rooms of licensed premises. The establishment of fixed prices for wines and, indeed, of any type of liquor served in dining-rooms presents a number of problems; the differences in types and standards of hotel or restaurant, and the choice which is available of standards of service are but some of the aspects to be

considered. The council has already collected much information as to the range of existing wine prices in dining-rooms. This information is being studied by a subcommittee with a view to reporting at the council's next meeting early in March. I have been told that I will be kept informed of developments in this regard.

MOCULTA WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: During the latter part of last year, I asked the Minister of Works several questions about a reticulated water supply for the township and district of Moculta to come from the Swan Reach to Stockwell main, which is nearing completion. When I raised the matter again on October 22, the Minister said that the report of a certain committee investigating the supply to Moculta would be available to him soon and that he would let me have a copy of it as soon as it became available. Can the Minister say whether it has yet been decided whether Moculta will receive a reticulated supply and whether the report to which he referred is now available?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will get the information for the honourable member.

HEATHFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: As I understood that late in 1968 tenders were called for repair work and painting at the Heathfield Primary School, can the Minister of Works say whether a tender was accepted and, if it was, when work is expected to commence?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will get a report.

HOUSE INSPECTIONS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Housing a reply to my recent question about the condition of a trust house at Whyalla?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have received the following report from the General Manager of the Housing Trust:

The house mentioned is of timber frame construction and was completed on October 18, 1968. The building contract included a 13 weeks defects liability period and the final inspection on this particular house was carried out on January 21, 1969, with the purchaser being present. The defects found were those usually associated with "labour only" timber frame houses and in the main were the result of timber shrinkage and not bad or shoddy workmanship. The refitting of doors, the repair of a crack in the cove of the concrete verandah floor and the adjustment of clips and springs to the window sashes were included in the final inspection report. All items listed on the report had received attention by February 7, 1969, and indeed the majority had been carried out before the honourable member brought the matter to notice in Parliament. In view of the statement in the honourable member's question that "the window of a bedroom fell out, frame and all", I submit the following explanation of the incident:

In the first place it is not true that the window frame fell out. The windows used in these particular houses are designed and manufactured by Stegbar Windowalls Proprietary Limited and the sashes (which contain the glass) are designed to be taken out for cleaning and to permit easy painting. The sash fits into aluminium channel guides on the sides of the built-in frame, one guide being tension spring loaded. To remove the sash it is pressed against the spring loaded guide which frees it from the opposite fixed guide. Two metal latch keepers (one each side) are then turned and the sash frame is lifted out. When fitting these windows the tension loaded guide must be adjusted to assure the sash slides freely, but not loosely, and, after fitting, the two metal latches are turned to the "lock" position. (The manufacturers have tested windows with correctly adjusted spring guides and latches to withstand a 70 miles an hour gale.) This particular window sash fell out because the metal latches were not in position and the tension on the spring load guide had required adjustment. The final inspection report lists these points for attention and they are carried out in much the same way as a dealer carries out adjustment under a warranty on a new car.

It is considered that the purchasers of this house have grossly exaggerated the defects reported. The family concerned moved in with trust tenants on arrival from England in August of last year. They subsequently applied to the trust for rental accommodation, upon which the trust gave them permission to remain with their friends for a limited period although this meant overcrowding. The family was told that it would be many months before rental housing could be made available, after which an application to purchase was submitted. Keys of the house in question were handed over on October 18, when the purchasers indicated their satisfaction. It is trust policy to make available for letting houses of similar design and construction to special priority cases and it is felt that this is one of the reasons for these people now wishing to be released from their contract. In the circumstances, the trust being satisfied with the condition of the house and with the bank loan having been approved, it is not prepared to release the family from this contract and provide rental housing out of line.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question about a symposium of councillors, fire officers and clerks at which

the Bush Fires Act could be explained and ideas submitted by those present in an effort to prevent the spread of bush fires in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

The matter raised by the honourable member will receive my close attention. In fact, I have already thought along similar lines myself, and I shall certainly discuss with Cabinet the matter of a symposium.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Before the Christmas adjournment I asked the Minister of Lands to inquire of the Minister of Agriculture whether the Red Comb Egg Co-operative Society Limited could be treated similarly to any other primary producers' co-operative and be permitted to return its profits to members of the co-operative. As I have not yet received a reply from the Minister, and as the financial year of this co-operative ends in February, will the Minister again take this matter up with his colleague?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although I have no reply here, I may be able to get one later this afternoon.

WATER RESOURCES

Mr. NANKIVELL: Earlier this session, towards the middle of last year, I moved that an inquiry be held into the water resources of the South-East. The Minister of Works, in moving an amendment, agreed to set up a committee to inquire into the water resources of South Australia. Can he now say whether he has set up this committee and considered its terms of reference? If he has not done that, can he say what progress he is making in this matter?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Much work has been done and much information and material collected on this matter, which the honourable member initiated in a debate in the House last year. Further work has been authorized on the investigation of the underground water resources of the State, and this work has commenced. Work such as photographing, mapping, surveying, and flow gauging is already in progress on a recommended area of land in the South-East. Most of the work is being undertaken by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Mines Department, but an approach was made to the Commonwealth Government and I am grateful for the assistance that has been given by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and the Bureau of Meteorology. In addition, the Flinders University Department of Oceanography, headed by Professor Radok, who is outstanding in this work, is co-operating. The reply is that much work has been commenced before the committee is set up. The subject referred to by the honourable member would be one of the fields in which the committee would make investigation. As soon as I am able to determine the membership of the committee and its terms of reference, I will tell the honourable member.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question about work on the Port Pirie overpass?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Commonwealth approval was received today. The successful tenderer is L. M. Robertson Construction Company. Work will commence in the near future and construction should take approximately 40 weeks.

WALLAROO HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: The Acting Minister of Works at that time (Hon. G. G. Pearson) was good enough to reply to me by letter on January 16 to a question I asked on December 12, 1968, about the installation of air-conditioning in the Wallaroo Hospital. In short, his reply was that work was to begin in mid-February and that it would be completed by mid-April. As I was at the hospital yesterday and the work had not been started, will the Minister of Works say when the contractor intends to do this work?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I seem to recall that a tender has been let for the work and that I saw the approval go through recently, but I will check on this matter and let the honourable member know this week.

RAILWAY LAND

Mr. McKEE: Has the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport, a reply to my question of February 12 about the old Ellen Street railway station building in Port Pirie?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: My colleague reports that preliminary steps have been taken to secure a land grant, subsequent to which it is proposed to call tenders for the sale of the property in accordance with approved procedures for the disposal of Government property.

ANZAC HIGHWAY

Mr. BROOMHILL: Last week, the Minister of Works undertook to consider the problems being created at the St. Leonards Inn as a result of the work being performed by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I understand the Minister has further information on this matter.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Access to both the entrance and exits to the bottle department of the St. Leonards Inn have been maintained and will be kept open for the duration of the sewerage work being undertaken on Anzac Highway. Entrance to the bottle department can be made when travelling east from Glenelg along Anzac Highway, but it is not possible to enter directly from Anzac Highway when travelling along the highway from the Adelaide side, because this would involve crossing a restricted traffic way. However, by making a detour, entrance can be made from Sturt Street or by approaching the hotel from the sea-front along Anzac Highway.

POTATOES

Mr. CASEY: Will the Minister of Lands obtain a report from the Minister of Agriculture regarding the position of the potato industry as a result of the recent heavy rains in the Adelaide Hills which, I understand, have created a hazard for potato growers? Will he ascertain the extent of the damage and its likely effect?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes.

SERVICE STATIONS

Mr. VIRGO: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my question of February 12 concerning service stations and the plight of the persons operating them?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Persons employed at the service station concerned are subject to the Federal Vehicle Industry (Repair, Services and Retail) Award. As inquiries have revealed that the person to whom the honourable member referred is performing duties substantially subject to that award, the Regional Director of the Department of Labour and National Service (which department polices Federal awards) has been asked to investigate the matter.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr. HUDSON (on notice):

1. What is the current safe diversion of water a year from the Murray River in South Australia, for all purposes?

2. What are the current probable maximum demands for water from the Murray River for irrigation, domestic, stock and industrial purposes?

3. What would be the safe diversion of water a year in South Australia, with an assured minimum flow of 1,250,000 acre feet, and 1,500,000 acre feet, respectively?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

1. Minimum supply: Supply to South Australia without Chowilla, is estimated, under current conditions (year 1970 of R.M.C. technical committee studies) likely to drop as low as 710,000 acre feet. Allowing 564,000 acre feet dilution water this leaves a usable component of only 146,000 acre feet.

2. Present committed supply for irrigation is 450,000 acre feet, and for domestic, stock and industrial use, 330,000 acre feet, a total of 780,000 acre feet.

3. Dilution water at 564,000 acre feet is known to be inadequate to protect the river in South Australia from loss of level and in quality. At 564,000 acre feet the available water would be:

Entitlement	Diversion
1,254,000	690,000
1,500,000	936,000

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION 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 read a second time.

In section 4 of the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1968, which was passed last year, there is a reference to the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act, 1964. This reference is incorrect and the reference should be to the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act Amendment Act, 1964. This Bill, which is in the nature of a Statute revision measure, corrects that reference.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): The Opposition is happy at all times to co-operate as much as it can. In these circumstances, it agrees wholeheartedly to the Bill.

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

MONEY-LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Money-Lenders Act, 1940-1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill, which amends the Money-Lenders Act, 1940-1966, does two things:

(*a*) it provides that persons, including companies, lending on the security of a written mortgage of land at a rate not exceeding 9 per cent on the balances outstanding from time to time will not be "money-lenders" within the meaning of the principal Act if the instrument of mortgage sets out the prescribed particulars set out in proposed new subsection (3) relating to the loan; and

(*b*) it gives a degree of restrospective removal from the definition of money-lender to persons but not companies who lent money on mortgages of land at a rate not exceeding 9 per cent on outstanding balances.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2, paragraph (*a*) provides two new classes of exemptions from the definition of "money-lender" in section 5 of the principal Act. These exemptions are contained in new paragraphs (*ea*) and (*eb*). Paragraph (*ea*) exempts any person, not being a company, who, before the Bill becomes law, has lent money only where the security for the repayment of money so lent was a mortgage of land and the interest charged was not more than 9 per cent per annum when calculated on balances outstanding from time to time. Paragraph (*eb*) exempts any person (including a company) who, after the Bill becomes law, lends money only where the security for the repayment of money so lent is a mortgage in writing of land setting out such particulars as are prescribed by new subsection (3) as inserted in the section by paragraph (*b*) of the clause, and where the interest charged does not exceed 9 per cent per annum when calculated on the balances outstanding from time to time and the lender delivers to the borrower a copy of the mortgage within 7 days after the loan was made.

The amendment effected by proposed new paragraph (*eb*) will enable such persons and companies to conduct their affairs without being registered as money-lenders and in particular will allow companies which are approved lenders under the Housing Loans Insurance Act, 1965, of the Commonwealth, to conduct their business without being so registered. Honourable members will be aware that this Commonwealth Act was designed, by establishing a scheme of insurance, to release funds for home building at a lower rate of interest that would otherwise be possible and the Government is anxious to facilitate the operation of these lenders.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Hallett Cove to Willunga Railway Line.

Ordered that report be printed.

PUBLIC PARKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence with appendices.

Report received. Ordered that report, minutes of proceedings and evidence be printed.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL (VESTING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 13. Page 3606.)

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): The proposal that the Government should take over the Whyalla Hospital is of long standing. In his second reading explanation the Premier said:

As honourable members may be aware, certain administrative difficulties have occurred in relation to the hospital at Whyalla. Since these difficulties appeared in the circumstances to be insoluble, the previous Government decided that the hospital, which is being operated by an association known as the Whyalla Hospital Incorporated, should be taken over by the Government and operated as a public hospital under the Hospitals Act.

I draw the attention of members to the fact that the request for the Whyalla Hospital Incorporated to be taken over by the Government and to become a Government hospital was made a long time before the appearance of the difficulties referred to by the Premier in his second reading explanation. In fact, the people of Whyalla some years ago were for

a number of reasons greatly in favour of the Government's taking over the hospital. They believed that the management of the hospital under Government control could probably be improved, as more efficiency could be introduced as a result of people, used to administering hospitals, coming more into the picture. Furthermore, there were advantages to age pensioners requiring treatment at a Government hospital as compared with the treatment they would receive in the Whyalla Hospital as it was then incorporated. I stress the fact that the questions that have arisen from the long dispute that has gone on between the doctors and the matron are not just the only reasons in connection with the taking over of this hospital. The move was started a long while before the dispute occurred.

I am pleased to say that the terms of this Bill have been drawn up in consultation with the Whyalla Hospital Board, and the Chairman of the board informs me that the terms are in accord with the board's thinking. After I had read over to him the Premier's speech, the Chairman expressed satisfaction on behalf of the board with the terms of the Bill. I consider that in general the Bill is quite satisfactory; I welcome the take-over by the Government of the Whyalla Hospital, and I am sure that it will meet with the wholehearted approval of the people of Whyalla. In his second reading explanation, the Premier said:

Clause 9 ensures that an opportunity exists for hospital staff, who on the vesting day obtain employment with the Government otherwise than as officers under the Public Service Act, to count their previous service with the hospital for the purposes of leave of absence.

This is quite good, and I do not cavil at it at all, for it protects their accrued benefits. However, the Premier continued:

A similar provision already exists to cover the case of persons who become officers under the Public Service Act. However, I would point out that this section does not confer any right or entitlement to future employment with the Government.

I should like the Premier, when we reach the Committee stage, to amplify this statement, because it has been interpreted by the heads of departments and senior staff of the hospital as meaning that their offices will be declared vacant and applications called for these particular positions. I understand that the Premier has received a letter from the heads of departments and senior staff of the hospital, who are deeply concerned about the apparent lack of provision being made in the takeover proceedings for members of the existing staff who had served the hospital, in some cases for many years. I understand that the letter has been signed by the Physiotherapist, the House Engineer, the Matron, Deputy Matron, Sister-in-Charge of Maternity, the the Supervisory Sister, Tutor, Catering Officer, and the Housekeeper. At the time of their appointment by the present hospital board, these people presumed that, unless they were not carrying out their duties to the satisfaction of the board of management, they would continue in these positions until such time as they could take advantage of the retirement and superannuation provisions of the hospital.

Repeated inquiries by virtually all members of this staff to the board of management and to Government representatives have obtained no real assurance of continued employment at this hospital following the Government take-over. The people who signed the letter say that replies received would seem to indicate that many of them would be replaced or that their services would be terminated as being redundant. Most of the people concerned own their own homes in the city, many of them being the sole breadwinners for the family, and naturally they believe that if their services are to be dispensed with they should immediately be looking around for other employment. These people are concerned not only with their employment at present but also in connection with their future employment and with the sale of their property if they have to move from Whyalla. Generally, when there is a change of administration and a take-over by some other board or by a statutory body created by Parliament, there is invariably a provision in the relevant Bill safeguarding the future employment of the staff and of others who may be employed by the body concerned, and usually the clause that protects the interests of such people clearly provides that they will lose no benefits or their employment in the changed circumstances.

Having discussed with the Parliamentary Draftsman an amendment in this regard, I am informed that one cannot bind the Crown regarding the employment of people who will come under the Public Service Act (assuming that, working for the hospital, they will in fact come under that Act), and that under the terms of the Act it is impracticable to frame an amendment that will protect the interests of these people in the same way as the

interests of employees are usually protected when legislation of this character is introduced before a take-over occurs. I think we should receive at least a firm verbal assurance in regard to the future of these people, if it is impossible to move an amendment to the Bill itself. Although a dispute has occurred between doctors and the matron at this hospital, this Bill should not be introduced merely for the purpose of getting rid of the matron in order to settle a dispute. The permanency or otherwise of the matron's position surely should be considered having regard to her services to the hospital in the past and to her qualifications. I hope we will not see legislation of this type used simply to solve a problem that has arisen as a result of this dispute between the doctors and the matron. I believe a prolonged attempt has been made by the doctors in Whyalla to get rid of the matron. The previous Government appointed a committee to investigate the situation. From memory, I think I am right in saying that the committee reported that there were possibly some faults on both sides in the dispute.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Are you willing to abide by the recommendations made by the committee appointed by your Government?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Before replying to that, I should like to check the exact wording of the report, which I do not have with me now. When the Premier was out of the House a few moments ago, I said, first, that I did not think this legislation should be introduced solely as a means of solving a problem referred to in the Premier's second reading explanation as being insoluble, and, secondly, that the future of the matron (and this has been the centre of the controversy) should surely be decided on her service to the hospital in the past, on her qualifications and on nothing else. Her future should certainly not be involved in the fact that certain people have made a deliberate and prolonged attempt to get rid of her. I believe this point is most important in regard to this Bill.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Are you saying that all personnel must be retained?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am saying that all personnel should be assured (if this cannot be put into terms of an amendment to the Bill, which I understand is the position) that their services will be retained. I draw the Premier's attention to the usual type of clause which is included in a Bill providing for a take-over and which gives the Minister certain discretion regarding the status of employees; it certainly protects the employees regarding their employment.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You are saying that every one of the people at the hospital should be retained.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

Mr. Riches: I am, too.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am saying that the services of all the people employed in the hospital should be retained in a way similar to that which is provided for similar changes in administration or in take-overs. I believe this is a general principle that has applied almost without exception. I have looked at the history of legislation in this regard and I have found that invariably provision has been made in legislation to protect the employment and the benefits of those people working for the concern involved. I believe that is a general principle from which we should not depart.

I felt impelled to draw special attention to the situation of the matron, even though the letter referred to has been signed by all the people to whom I have referred, because, after all, it is no secret that this dispute has been going on for some time. Seeing that the Premier emphasized this aspect, I felt we must be quite frank about it and look at the situation from the point of view of the general principle involved, so that we would not have the position where an agitation created by a few individuals who were determined to get rid of someone was sufficient to create a public outcry for a take-over, with these people having in mind that, if they could cause this to happen, they could get rid of the person concerned. That is what it amounts to. If we succumb to that sort of agitation, then we are certainly not doing our duty as members of Parliament. I believe that the question of the matron, which has been a controversy for so long, should be judged on the merits of the person and on her services to this hospital. I draw attention to the fact that, whatever may be the failings of the matron (and I do not say there are any), let it be remembered that when she came into this appointment, as far as I know, the hospital board was unable to get anyone else to apply for the position, because the previous matron had been dismissed by the board in most unsatisfactory circumstances. I may say that I had much to do with trying to protect her position, because I believed she was unjustly dismissed by the board.

As a consequence, the Whyalla Hospital was not a popular hospital to go to in the eyes of people eligible to apply for the position, and the present matron was appointed. She was the matron whilst, for a number of years, the enormous building programme took place around her ears, and, to the best of my knowledge, she conducted the office of matron with great efficiency during that difficult period. I think members should know these things. Therefore, I hope that when we reach the Committee stage all these matters will be considered by the Premier, and that we can get an assurance that what I am asking for will in fact be granted unequivocally in this House. Apart from this, I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): I congratulate the member for Whyalla on his statement of the case and wish to underline and emphasize everything he has had to say. I believe this House would be unreasonable to accept the position as suggested, although not directly stated, in the second reading explanation that the Government is adopting this attitude merely to settle a dispute that arose at the Whyalla Hospital. The desire of the people of Whyalla for a public hospital was made known to me right back at the time when I represented that district in Parliament. Many times inquiries have been made into the workings of a Government hospital as against those of private hospitals. When the people of Whyalla looked around the State and saw Government hospitals at Mount Gambier, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Port Lincoln, they continually asked why they could not have a Government hospital at Whyalla. That agitation started long before any suggestion was made of dissension at the Whyalla Hospital. I suggest that this Bill should be viewed in the light of its impact on people in the area and on the economics of the State. Consideration of it should be divorced entirely from consideration of any dissension that may have arisen between the officers of the hospital in recent years.

I also want to support what the member for Whyalla said about the matron. Having known her for nearly all the time she has been in Australia, I know that her record is excellent. She has been able to hold staff and to give service to the satisfaction of the people. I will not have any part of the controversy that took place between the matron and the doctors. As the member for Whyalla said, there may have been mistakes on both sides but, to my knowledge, at no stage has anything ever been proven that would warrant action being taken against the matron. In fact, in most cases everything she has done has been vindicated, there having been general appreciation of the work she has performed. I believe the people want this change to a Government hospital in place of a private hospital, but not at the expense of those who have served the hospital loyally over the years. There is no reason why they should be required to pay such a price or why their position should be placed in jeopardy. I have had experience in such matters as the taking over by the Electricity Trust from councils of electricty supply undertakings. In all matters of that kind it has been understood and laid down that employees are to be taken over with the taking over of the institution, and that has been observed.

In my opinion (and I think this Parliament would agree) there is no reason why any employee should lose benefits. In fact, provision for the granting of long service leave rights to employees has been written into the Bill. I am grateful to the member for Whyalla for drawing attention to this aspect of the measure, and I completely agree with and support him in what he has said about that. In all other aspects, I think the Bill is admirable, and we support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Rights of certain employees."

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I understand that this is the clause relevant to the concern expressed by the member for Whyalla, and I ask that progress be reported so that I can find out from my colleague more detail about departmental intentions regarding this matter. I appreciate the support that the member for Whyalla has given to the present employees. However, I can hardly agree absolutely that this legislation should not be considered as being a factor in solving the problem at the hospital. I say that not in relation to any particular point in the Bill but as a general observation. If any of the problems that have beset the hospital for a long time can be overcome by this Bill, I would think there would be something to commend that action but, of course, the Government does not intend to be vindictive or to push out into the cold people who have served the hospital and the district loyally. I ask that progress be reported so that I can get further information.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Two members voiced the opinion that I should state that, if this Bill passes, all staff now employed at the Whyalla hospital will automatically be employed by the Government when the hospital is taken over. I said then that I could appreciate the concern of those members concerning this phasing-in operation. After speaking to the Chief Secretary regarding this administrative detail, I cannot give a blanket assurance that everyone employed at the hospital will automatically be employed in Government service when the takeover is completed.

The reason for this is that the hospital will be under the administration of the Hospitals Department, and it will be up to the department and the Public Service Board to ensure that these positions are filled by people with the proper qualifications. If members opposite wish to be suspicious that is their affair, but I can assure them that the Government does not intend to carry out any witch hunt in this matter. In a situation such as has arisen at Whyalla it is not possible to lay down a blanket assurance that everyone will be employed as if there had been no trouble and as if there would be no difference in the type of administration.

This is a significant step for the hospital. It will be a part of Government administration under the Hospitals Department, and the staff will be under the control of the Public Service Board. The management of the hospital must have the right to prescribe qualifications necessary for the various positions. I assure members that the Government does not intend to suddenly change, in a large-scale measure, any of the staff. No mention of any person has been made to me, nor do I believe the Chief Secretary has any person in mind. He is unable (and I support him in this) to give a blanket assurance that in the changeover everyone will automatically go with it. This is not possible with the change of administration.

I hope members opposite will accept this assurance. As this hospital is to become a Government hospital, it is in the Government's own interest to have it running as smoothly as possible, and it would be a foolish Government indeed that set out to antagonize a hospital or a town that depends so much on its hospital. Therefore, it would not be within the Government's desire to cause any trouble at all at the hospital. It would not be in any way the Government's intention to attack any person. However, it must reserve the right to say that this hospital must be run by the Hospitals Department and that the appointment of staff must have the approval of the Public Service Board.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I appreciate the assurances the Premier has given. However, I draw attention again to the following remarks he made when explaining this Bill:

As honourable members may be aware, certain administrative difficulties have occurred in relation to the hospital at Whyalla.

Of course, this refers to the matron versus doctors dispute. Obviously, it cannot refer to anything else. The Premier went on to say:

Since these difficulties appeared in the circumstances to be insoluble, the previous Government decided that the hospital . . . should be taken over by the Government.

In other words, this is supposed to be an insoluble problem which is going to be solved by the Government's taking over. Bearing in mind the pressure being put on this situation by the doctors, I can only interpret this to mean that the matron will be dismissed or at least that she will not be accepted as a new applicant for the position if applications are called. I have heard it said that the doctors are already prophesying that in the event of this Bill going through it will be the end of the matron. I draw the Premier's attention to the past tense used in clause 9 ("Where any person was immediately before the vesting day . . ."). The inference is that after vesting day a person will not necessarily be employed, and that is made clear by what the Premier said in his explanation, namely:

However, I would point out that this section does not confer any right or entitlement to future employment with the Government.

If all those now employed are not employed on vesting day, applications have to be called about three months before vesting day for the relevant appointments. Further, if there is to be continuity in the running of the hospital, surely decisions will have to be made regarding appointments during that three-month period. There must be the machinery of appointing others if those who are already there are not going to be appointed on vesting day. All the senior staff will be in a position of complete uncertainty until vesting day concerning whether or not they are continuing, and that is quite undesirable and unfair. I said earlier that I had been informed by the Parliamentary Draftsman that it was impossible to bind the Crown in relation to the employment of these people and, unless I have other information, I have to accept that statement.

The only way I can see that protection can be given, if the information is correct, is for some form of preference to be given to the people concerned. For example, I suggest that preference be given to the extent that "where (*a*) any appointment is to be made, whether prior to or within a period of six months next following vesting day, to an office or employment under the Government of the State, in consequence of the vesting of the hospital; (*b*) any former employee applies for that appointment; (*c*) the qualifications of that former employee for that employment are not inferior to the qualifications of any other applicant for that appointment; the appointing authority shall appoint that former employee unless in the opinion of the appointing authority reasonable and substantial cause exists for not so appointing that former employee. That gives a degree of preference to the people concerned on the basis of their service to the hospital. In all fairness and justice, these people must have some sort of protection, instead of being left in a state of uncertainty for some months before vesting day and then possibly being cut off at the final hour, not knowing, except for what they may hear by rumour, what their position will be. I have said earlier today that we have provided, in other legislation providing for a takeover by a new administrative authority, that the people employed there had the right to expect that their standing would not suffer and that they would continue in employment.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: Can you cite some cases?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Clause 16 of the Public Examinations Board Bill, which was passed recently, gave protection to everyone employed previously by the Public Examinations Board. Further, I think a similar provision was made when the Electricity Trust became a Government undertaking. Whenever there is a change of this kind, the benefits of existing employees, such as their leave and superannuation, have always been protected. I repeat my earlier statement that the request that this hospital be taken over originated years before this dispute occurred. The basic reason for taking the hospital over is not this dispute at all, yet this has been mentioned in the second reading explanation as being the real reason. The doctors are looking to this Bill to get rid of the matron, as they have said publicly.

Surely we should not use legislation in this way to deal with what is termed an insoluble problem, because the present board has not been able to solve this problem.

If we permit this sort of thing to happen, any group of doctors that wants to get rid of a Government subsidized hospital, possibly for its own ends, can create local agitation for the Government to take over the hospital, and the group will have a precedent. I have been told that something similar to this is already happening at one hospital in this State. However honest the Premier may be in the assurance he has given this evening, I cannot be satisfied with that, because of the mechanics of the proposal. What has to be done in order to get continuity of appointment in hospital work is obvious. We cannot just have the people not working in the hospital. Emergencies can arise, and the hospital cannot be conducted on that basis.

Mr. Rodda: What would be the answer? Not to have a Government hospital?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: No, I am not suggesting that. I have suggested a solution. I have made a proposition that the Premier has perhaps had some little time to consider. I should like him to say, if he can, what his view would be of my suggested amendment before I say anything further on the matter.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe the stipulation that the honourable member is asking for is in fact what would happen in practice. In effect, he has said, "If there are any positions declared vacant, anyone already in them should receive preference for the position if he or she has equal qualifications with any other applicant." Surely he is not imagining that, all other things being equal, a suitable applicant with equal qualifications to those of any other people will be turned down after serving the hospital faithfully for many years. Surely the hospital is not run like that; surely the Minister does not administer his department like that.

Mr. Riches: It has been said that that is what may happen.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member is taking a very suspicious attitude towards the responsibility of the department. He appears to think that the department will attack the staff of the Whyalla Hospital as soon as it receives the chance. I am not saying that the member for Whyalla is saying it. He has raised a proper question.

Mr. Riches: Perhaps the Premier does not know what is the position there.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have two whole files here, most of which honourable members have read. The honourable member knows how difficult this question has been. I sympathize with him having had this on his hands as a local member and as a Minister in the previous Government. It is by no means a simple issue. The honourable member seeks to have a cast-iron assurance, but it ties the hands of the Public Service Board or the Hospitals Department to take on without question every person at the hospital who is in a senior position. That is something that this place should not tolerate. That does not mean that we are conducting a witch hunt of those administering the hospital; that is quite wrong.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: I am not looking for a cast-iron stipulation, but I want a comment on my foreshadowed amendment.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: If I heard the honourable member aright, I think that would be the practical result. If a person who has been in the hospital and reapplies for a position declared vacant has equal qualifications and is not a thief or completely obnoxious in his personal relationships (some line has to be drawn in these cases)—if all those things apply it is obvious that the person will go back; but I do not think it is possible to lay that down here; in fact, I am sure it is not, because we shall certainly have a law case on our hands about some provisions of the Act if some action results from the taking over in respect of someone on the staff. I cannot say much more than that. What interest would any Government have in dividing the town or the hospital? This is to become a Government responsibility and it is in the interests of any Government to see that this works smoothly. I cannot see there is any path of smoothness in adopting the attitude that honourable members are frightened we may adopt. I can give no greater assurance than that.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Premier has said that we cannot expect a cast-iron assurance in respect of everybody. I am not asking for that. When I read out the suggestion I put forward, I think it was plain that it was not a cast-iron assurance that I wanted. I think I am right in saying that the Premier went on to say that he thought that, provided the qualifications were equal, it would naturally follow that the people would be appointed. If that is so (I think it should be the case, anyway) surely there is no harm in expressing it in the Bill by way of an amendment. I will read out again what I suggested:

Notwithstanding in any Act, where—

(*a*) any appointment is to be made, whether prior to or within the period of six months next following the vesting day, to an office or employment under the Government of the State in consequence of the vesting of the hospital in Her Majesty the Queen;

(*b*) any former employee applies for that appointment;

(*c*) the qualifications of that former employee for that employment are not inferior to the qualifications of any other applicant for that appointment;

the appointing authority shall appoint that former employee unless, in the opinion of the appointing authority, reasonable and substantial cause exists for not so appointing that former employee.

My suggested amendment would ensure that these people would have the protection of what the Premier is saying should be given to them. No-one can object to these people being given preference, assuming that their qualifications are not inferior to those of other applicants. We cannot protect them in any other way, and every takeover has invariably included a clause protecting the benefits and the employment of the employees concerned.

Mr. RICHES: This foreshadowed amendment is common sense and will do much good. The Premier has said that this is the kind of procedure he would expect the Government to take, and I accept that. He has assured us that there is no head hunting, and I accept that statement from the Premier on behalf of the Government. However, there is an uneasy feeling amongst others (and with justification), because statements have been published by parties to the dispute that a part of the deal is to sack the matron. The matron cannot be blamed in this matter. If someone with better qualifications applies and can serve the hospital better, the Government is justified in appointing the best qualified person, but before I vote on this, or any other similar measure, I want to be assured that there is no suggestion of a deal or an understanding that that is one way of solving the problem referred to by the Premier.

If the Premier had not said that this step was being taken to solve a problem that was considered insoluble we probably would not have paid much attention, but every statement since then has been made guardedly and no reliable assurance has been given that those who signed the petition and those whose future depends on this Bill will have any security. That is not the deal people wanted when they asked for a Government hospital at Whyalla,

and they did not expect that those who have served the institution loyally for many years should pay a price. Apparently, the Government does not intend that they should. The Bill would be strengthened if the Premier accepted this suggested amendment, which would indicate that members consider that there should be no witch hunt in this matter. Everything done by way of appointment and takeover should be done with a view to giving the best service to the community. We want to ensure that those who have served the institution loyally over the years are not subjected to any injustice.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member has referred to a dispute and to the good of the district. Are we, therefore, to lay down some condition that adds to one side of the dispute?

Mr. Riches: This kind of provision is in other Acts.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It may be, but that does not alter the fact that there is absolute discretion: the authorities can please themselves completely. If they see any reason why they should not appoint an applicant they need not do so. Why tie the hands of the Hospitals Department? Surely it is a responsible authority.

Mr. Riches: There is no assurance at all regarding staff.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is not possible to give that assurance. The net result of the honourable member's foreshadowed amendment could be a legal challenge, and we could then have a continuous dispute. I cannot see any point in it.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: What the Premier said is to some extent a contradiction in terms. He said that if my amendment was inserted it would leave a loophole for the appointing authority to do as it pleased, and then he said that he could not see why the hands of the Public Service Board should be tied. He cannot have it both ways: either the hands of the board are tied or they are not. The Premier emphasized that the following words in my suggested amendment meant nothing:

. . . the appointing authority shall appoint that former employee unless, in the opinion of the appointing authority, reasonable and substantial cause exists for not so appointing that former employee.

As the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) has said, if there was an applicant with superior qualifications and there was some reason for the former employee not being further employed, this would give the appointing authority the power to act. If these words mean nothing, why do we bother to frame legislation along these lines? I remind members that clause 16 (2) of the Public Examinations Board Bill, which we passed recently, provides:

Without limiting the powers of the board . . . every person who, immediately before the commencement of this Act, was employed by the University of Adelaide . . . shall, upon the commencement of this Act, become an employee of the board on such terms and conditions (being not less favourable, unless the Minister in writing otherwise determines, than those upon which he was employed immediately before the commencement of this Act) as the board may determine.

In other words, here we are expressing in legislation what we wish to be done in respect of the employees and, recognizing the difficulties of the appointing or controlling authority, we give the Minister this power. All I suggest is that the appointing authority should have a similar power for similar reasons. In other words, it is perfectly consistent with other legislation in similar situations, and no-one yet to my knowledge has contested that what we have been doing in regard to the Public Examinations Board Act or similar legislation has been wrong or fruitless or stupid. Everyone has said that it is a good thing, and they have voted for it time and time again.

The situation I have described is unusual inasmuch as we cannot bind the Crown in respect of present employees, and surely in this situation we should at least endeavour to give those employees, as expressed in the Bill, whatever protection we can along similar lines. In asking for this, I am only asking for adherence to the general principles that this Chamber has supported and adopted in many instances of similar legislation. Surely the Premier will admit that there is similarity and will not say that the relevant provisions in all the previous legislation have no value. I ask him to reconsider his statement in the light of what I have said because, obviously, we are merely following the principles that have been adopted for so many years in this place.

Mr. RICHES: The amendment seeks to recognize loyal service over the years and to ensure that employees who have given such service, all other things being equal, will receive a preference, and that is more than they will receive under the present provision. The amendment will not tie the hands of the administration where good cause can be shown for not continuing an officer in his present

status when the hospital is taken over by the Government. But to leave the Bill as it stands will indicate that there is no protection at all for the employees concerned and that the Government is not much concerned about loyal service given and sacrifices made in the past. It seems to add colour to the statements that have been made to the effect that part of the deal is that the matron shall be dismissed when the Government takes over the hospital. That will be one way of dismissing her when no other way can be found, even though her service cannot be faulted, and when members of the board are satisfied (and members of the public generally are also satisfied) with the service given by the matron who, in difficult times, managed to hold her staff.

I had hoped that the Premier would agree to what is a perfectly reasonable amendment. Although this place should not enter into any controversy, I suggest that the request for the hospital to be taken over as a Government hospital has nothing to do with the dissension that was evident last year. When Whyalla was in my district, representations were made about the possibility of a Government hospital being established in preference to a private hospital, and matters such as the fees charged and the concessions granted to pensioners were raised in those early days, when there was a real difference between the facilities rendered in a Government hospital and in a private hospital. How can the Bill solve the problem, unless substantial staff changes are made? I do not accept that changes in the medical staff will be made. We know to whom the attack is directed, and I think that is unfair. No-one would argue against the employment of persons with qualifications greater than those of staff already in the hospital, but there should not be any witch hunting or head hunting. If the member for Whyalla moves his amendment, I will support it with the utmost vigour.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 13. Page 3612.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the Bill. I have a vested interest in it, because the removal of the winning bets tax was a matter of some moment during the last election campaign, particularly in my district, and many efforts were made by certain people to get electors to swing their support away from me to the Liberal and Country League candidate because of the promise made by the L.C.L. to remove the winning bets tax. I consider that the L.C.L. made that promise only in the hope of winning the Glenelg seat. As I regard the tax as being unsatisfactory and iniquitous, I am pleased that, for once, the Government is honouring a promise. If it had shown any sign of weakening its resolve in this matter, I and other members on this side would have done our best to ensure that it kept fully honest in the matter.

Mr. Riches: Even though, to gain revenue, it is taxing people in mental institutions?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. I think many members find it peculiar that the overall effect of the actions of the present Government is to provide the punters in this State with a net relief of about $500,000, whilst the vast majority of the people will be heavily levied with extra taxation. I remember, and you would, too, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that when Governor Al Smith stood for the Presidency of the United States of America the Democratic Party in the U.S.A. was nicknamed the Party of gambling, rum and rebellion. Certainly, one of the main achievements of the present Government, if it has achieved anything, will be in connection with popularity of racing as a result of the removal of this tax.

The winning bets tax is, I think, objectionable because it is politically unsatisfactory. It is the kind of tax that is paid by the punter whenever he has a winning bet. He is fully aware that he is paying it and, for the most part, he objects to paying it. The 2½ per cent winning bets tax, which was introduced by a previous L.C.L. Administration, is roughly equivalent to a 2 per cent turnover tax on bookmakers and, as a purely practical point, I am sure that a 2 per cent tax on turnover, when passed on by the bookmakers to the punters, is effectively paid by the punter, although he is rarely aware that he is paying it.

In this case I think some of the benefit (probably up to 50 per cent of it) will go not to the punter but to the bookmaker. Once the winning bets tax is removed it gives the opportunity to the bookmaker to shave his odds to some extent, thus getting some share of the handout that has been provided on this occasion by the Government. I believe that will occur to some extent.

Mr. Broomhill: You think the punters are really paying it?

Mr. HUDSON: No. With the removal of the winning bets tax and the benefits of the $750,000 given to the punters some part of

that will disappear because the bookmaker will tend to shave his odds, and the average odds that the punter obtains for his bets will be slightly reduced, thus offsetting the benefit the punter would otherwise get. This will be the case because the turnover tax on bookmakers has been increased, as a result of which they will be worse off, whereas the punter will be better off. I am sure that the bookmaker is sufficiently knowledgeable of his trade to ensure that he does not stay worse off as a result of the changes being made. I was surprised to find that the Government had increased the turnover tax on bookmakers to only 1.8 per cent instead of to 2 per cent, because the rumour around the town (which is usually reliable, particularly when it comes from sources "close to the Government") was that the turnover tax would be increased to 2 per cent but, apparently, the Government weakened at the last moment and increased it to 1.8 per cent. I hope that now the Government has made the decision to stay with a turnover tax of 1.8 per cent it will stick to it.

We are in grave danger at present of panic attitudes toward the position of clubs. I, together with just about everyone else who is interested in the racing industry, agree that until such time as the clubs can effectively raise stake money by some 50 per cent there will be further and continued difficulties with racing in South Australia. The problem can be seen readily when one examines the average number of runners in a field in a South Australian race, whether it be in the metropolitan area or on a country track, compared with the average number of runners in other States. In South Australia the number is much lower, and this tends to keep people away from the race track and to affect adversely the economics of the racing clubs. The reason why this is so in South Australia is that the return from owning a horse is so much lower here than it is in other States, although the costs of training the horse and of ownership are not significantly lower. The net return from owning a horse in South Australia is significantly lower than it is in the other States, unless one has a horse of such quality that it can be taken to other States and raced there.

Mr. Broomhill: And it could well break a leg!

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. The problem is acute at present because in this connection we are still feeling the effects of the 1967-68 drought. Many people say (and I think they are right) that where there is a drought the economic consequences are felt more in subsequent years than in the actual year of the drought: it is in the year subsequent to the drought that the farmers in the community feel the full impact of the reduced returns in the drought year. As this is an important section of the community, so far as the owning of race horses is concerned, I am sure that the drought is one cause of the severe reduction in the average size of fields in South Australia.

However, that is not the main reason. As I have already indicated, the main reason is that stake money, on average, is so much lower here than it is in other States. The first job that T.A.B. must do, therefore, for the racing industry in South Australia is to return sufficient to the clubs to enable them to raise stake money substantially. I believe that the kind of increase in stake money that is necessary is one that will raise the average stake money for the ordinary race at metropolitan race meetings to $2,000. When that kind of change occurs, I believe we will see a big improvement in the quality and number of horses racing in South Australia which, in turn, will lead to increased attendances at race meetings.

The willingness of the public to go to a race meeting on any Saturday is governed partly by the nature of the fields on that day. Certain punters, part-time punters particularly, do not go to meetings if they are faced with a series of races most of which will be dominated by short-price favourites. This has been the typical pattern at South Australian race meetings for some time. The removal of the winning bets tax should have some effect on the attendance at race meetings, but how big that effect will be remains to be seen. It already seems to be the case that the initial impact T.A.B. had in reducing attendances at race meetings has been held. For the initial period this has meant that the economics of racing clubs and of running race meetings have been affected adversely and that the increased amount the clubs are receiving from T.A.B. over and above what they received from the winning bets tax when they had a share in the tax has been offset by reduced attendances.

The T.A.B. so far has not resulted in any financial improvement to the clubs to enable them to raise stake money. I do not believe that the removal of the winning bets tax will lead to a sufficient increase in attendances at race meetings to enable clubs to be sufficiently better off financially to raise stake money from that source alone, although there will be some improvement in the financial position of clubs as a result of this legislation. Clubs can stand

to gain from the removal of the winning bets tax for two reasons: first, if there are increased attendances their gate receipts will rise (and they are an important part of the total receipts of any club); secondly, the removal of the winning bets tax, even if there is no increase in attendance, should mean an increased turnover with bookmakers, and as the clubs share in that they will get an extra return. How big this effect will be is impossible to say. I believe the clubs stand to benefit at least to a minor extent, if perhaps not a significant extent, as a result of this change.

I think it is reasonable for someone to ask: why raise the turnover tax on bookmakers at all? It is clear that removing the winning bets tax without raising the turnover tax will involve a loss to the Treasury of $750,000 in a full year. What the Treasurer has done has been to try to modify the loss of revenue by raising the turnover tax on bookmakers from 1.5 per cent to 1.8 per cent and by increasing the tax on betting tickets. I do not think the Opposition will complain about the increase in the turnover tax, because the punter stands to gain such a substantial amount from the change. However, we do not fully agree with the proposal concerning the tax on betting tickets. I do not think this point mattered much when the tax on betting tickets stood at two-fifths of 1c a ticket, but it counts substantially when the tax on a ticket is raised to 1c or 2c. The Treasurer proposes 2c for the grandstand and 1c for derby and flat enclosures.

We have to take into account the fact that the minimum bet in the grandstand is significantly greater than that in the derby and greater again than on the flat. The minimum bet is 20c on the flat, 40c in the derby enclosure, and $1 in the grandstand, and on any minimum bet (although this is not a completely realistic way of looking at it) the tax on the flat of 1c on 20c is equivalent to a turnover tax of 5 per cent. On a minimum bet of 40c in the derby, a tax of 1c is equivalent to a turnover tax of 2½ per cent, and on a minimum bet of $1 in the grandstand a tax of 2c is equivalent to a turnover tax of 2 per cent. Considering it that way, it seems that the flat enclosure is being treated relatively more harshly, and when we consider the average size of a bet made in the various enclosures this view is confirmed.

From figures released in the recent report of the Betting Control Board relating to the 1966-67 financial year, the average bet on metropolitan race meetings was $2.21 in the flat enclosure, and a tax on a betting ticket of 1c would be equivalent to a turnover tax of 1c to 221c, or effectively .45 of 1 per cent. In the derby, the average bet with a bookmaker was $3.54, and the tax on a betting ticket of 1c makes the betting ticket tax equivalent to a turnover tax of .28 of 1 per cent. In the rails part of the grandstand enclosure, the average bet is $15.52 and a tax on a betting ticket of 2c means the equivalent of a turnover tax of .13 of 1 per cent, whilst in the grandstand betting ring, other than the rails, the average bet is $7.23, which means that the betting ticket tax of 2c would give an equivalent turnover tax of .28 of 1 per cent.

These are the 1966-67 figures, and I suspect that the 1967-68 figures would involve a slight increase on these figures and the equivalent turnover tax, because there was a decline in the holdings of bookmakers and probably a decline in the average size of a bet. With expanding turnover in future and probably some inflation in the community, the average size of a bet would increase in time so that the turnover tax equivalent would decline. I point out to the Treasurer that the turnover tax equivalents are pretty much in line for the grandstand and derby but almost double for the flat, and this seems to be a little harsh on bookmakers operating on the flat and also on the public that attends that part of the racecourse. Most people who go to the flat at race or trotting meetings are those who are the least well off in the community, and they do not want to pay more than the 20c required to get in.

As we know that some part of any tax placed on bookmakers will be passed on to the punter, we threw this relatively heavier imposition on the flat, imposing a heavier burden on that section of the punting community who can least afford to bear it or at least to lose. Many pensioners go to the flat because that is the only place at which they can have a 20c bet, but with this change being introduced in the way it is there will be great pressure from bookmakers in the flat to raise the minimum bet. They will not want to write out 20c bets, when for each 20c they take they pay 1c to the Treasurer. If this legislation passes in its present form it will not be long before the minimum size of the bet will be increased or there will be pressure for that to happen. This action will be to the further disadvantage of those in the community (pensioners, and the like) who enjoy going to the races, because although they cannot have a 20c bet on the totalizator (they

used to be able to have a 25c bet but cannot now) they can bet 20c with a bookmaker.

The Opposition intends to amend clause 4 to provide that the betting ticket tax in the flat enclosure shall remain unchanged at two-fifths of a cent. I ask the Treasurer to favourably consider this proposal, particularly as it can be clearly demonstrated that the weight of a betting ticket tax is so much greater in the flat than in the derby or grandstand. We propose to insert after line 21 in clause 4 a new section to provide that, on each betting ticket issued by a bookmaker on or after July 1, 1969, at a flat enclosure at any racecourse or trotting ground that lies within a radius of 20 miles from the General Post Office at Adelaide the betting ticket tax shall be two-fifths of 1c. This will maintain the current rate of tax for these enclosures. To my knowledge this only affects the metropolitan area, because at country race tracks there is no flat enclosure, only a general enclosure.

The Treasurer said in his second reading explanation that the 1.8 per cent turnover tax he is proposing is in line with that in the three Eastern States, and he pointed out that the amount of this tax that will go to the clubs will be higher than in any of the three Eastern States. It is recognized that it has always been higher than in any of those States. I think people need to recognize that this has been essential in the past, because any industry in South Australia such as racing cannot be operated on the same scale as it is in the other States. Without the support the clubs have received in the past, South Australian racing would be in an even worse condition than it is at present.

There have been substantial changes in the Eastern States in recent years brought about by the introduction of the Totalizator Agency Board, an innovation that occurred much earlier there than it occurred in South Australia. South Australia is still in the preliminary stages of T.A.B. In its first year of operation, T.A.B. was able to make a payment to the clubs of about $300,000, and it will not, I think, be many years (say, four or five years) before this payment will be about $1,000,000 a year. Such an increase will certainly place the clubs in a much better financial position than they are in today, so that clubs will be able to match the stake money that is paid in the other States, at least in regard to the average races.

We must realize that the clubs in South Australia are starting from behind scratch and that little has occurred so far since the introduction of T.A.B. to close the gap that exists between South Australia and the other States. The clubs have gained a substantial sum from T.A.B. but, on the other hand, they have lost the revenue that they previously obtained from the winning bets tax and have experienced a reduction in gate receipts. Therefore, little change is apparent so far on any South Australian course in terms of improved amenities or stake money. I ask the Treasurer to keep a fairly close watch on this situation, because I do not think the local racing industry can tolerate for too much longer a situation in which the gap between South Australia and the Eastern States remains as large as it is at present.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Do you think it will ever be able to compete?

Mr. HUDSON: Not completely. At present an owner can take a horse and run it at a Victorian country meeting and quite often, if he wins, he will gain as much as if he had run the horse at an Adelaide metropolitan meeting. He can certainly expect to gain double if his horse can win a race at a Victorian metropolitan meeting. We know it is more difficult to win a race in Victoria at the metropolitan meetings, but it is not necessarily more difficult in respect of country race meetings. However, regarding Victorian metropolitan meetings, it is probably not twice as difficult. The standard of racing in South Australia is, after all, fairly high in terms of the quality of horse that we have here. I should think that if the prize money, as a result of taking a horse to Melbourne for an ordinary race, was about 30 per cent greater than it was in Adelaide the extra costs associated with taking the horse to Melbourne and with finding additional accommodation for it, and so on, would not be worthwhile. Probably the only horses travelling to other States are those whose owners and trainers have set their sights on the big races which obviously carry prize money that we can never match. I do not think the local racing industry can tolerate for much longer a situation in which one gains twice as much from winning a race in Melbourne as one gains in Adelaide. I think that in the next two years we need to see substantial progress being made towards the closing of that particular gap. I do not expect it will ever be completely closed but we certainly need to be in a position where in South Australia the average prize money for an

ordinary race in the metropolitan area is only, say, 30 per cent below the average prize money for an ordinary race in Melbourne. When we have only that kind of disparity, we will have a situation in which racing can continue to prosper with the result that members in this House will be less concerned with the problems of the racing industry than we have been over the last few years.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Do you think there is any point in what you say about the average increase in prize money? This matter is not determined by anyone other than the clubs themselves, and there is a tendency to specialize in big races rather than spread prize money over the ordinary races.

Mr. HUDSON: I should think that a gentlemen's agreement was entered into with the racing clubs under Sir Thomas Playford's Government, when the turnover tax was raised from 1 per cent to 1½ per cent, the clubs being given half of that. The agreement was that this extra sum was to be used as additional prize money for feature races. I think that that agreement was probably not helpful to racing in South Australia, because I think one must examine the position from the point of view of the economics of owning a horse. Those who own horses have to be able to get some sort of return out of their efforts, or there will be declines in the size of fields. The training costs in South Australia are not half the training costs in the Eastern States: although they are lower, they are not more than, say, 10 or 15 per cent lower than the costs in Victoria. Although I cannot be sure of this, I suggest that, in respect of a top trainer with a horse in training for a reasonable period during the year, combined with all the requirements associated with starting a horse, it probably costs about $3,000 to keep a horse in training for one year. Unless an owner is reasonably certain of winning at least two races a year (and that is, of course, far higher than the average that any owner can expect) he will be well and truly out of pocket.

Although most owners expect to be a little out of pocket, I think that if they are completely out of pocket as a result of owning a horse they will drift away from owning one. That is tied up, again, with the economics of the trainer. The trainer has a stable of a certain size and, if there are fewer horses in training and he is not using his establishment to the full extent, the average cost of training a horse increases. There can be a substantial benefit to trainers and to owners in the long run from an increase in the number of horses in training and from a resultant increase in the use of the training stable. This increased activity will enable the average trainer to get by more efficiently than he can in present circumstances, and it may mean that some of the increased wage costs that have occurred can be absorbed by the average trainer without passing on the full increase to the owner in the form of higher training fees. These important points are all tied up with the number of horses in training and get back, as I have said previously, to the prize money that is offered. Since the introduction of T.A.B., the clubs have not been in a position so far to make any substantial change at all in the way of increased stake money. This factor, together with the drought that has been experienced and with the reduction in attendances at race meetings, has led to certain difficulties which cannot be allowed to remain without having further adverse effects on the industry. We need to see a significant increase in the dividend paid to the clubs from T.A.B. this year and a significant increase again the following year. If the dividend from T.A.B. can be raised to $450,000 this year, to $600,000 next year, and to $750,000 in two years' time, I believe the clubs will have little to complain about. However, if that does not happen and the T.A.B. is not able to do that job, I am sure the Treasurer will be faced with applications from the clubs for further assistance. We on this side support the Bill. I am delighted that the Liberal and Country League has seen fit to honour the promise it made about the winning bets tax even though it was not successful in getting rid of the reason it had for making the promise in the first place.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Stamp duty on betting tickets."

Mr. HUDSON: I move:

In new subsection (1*a*), after paragraph (*b*) to insert the following new paragraph:

(*ba*) on each betting ticket issued by a bookmaker on or after the first day of July, 1969, at the "flat" enclosure of any racecourse or trotting ground that lies within a radius of 20 miles from the General Post Office at Adelaide shall be two-fifths of a cent;

The distance of 20 miles is used so that a flat enclosure at Bolivar, should there be a flat enclosure there, would be covered by the new section. As far as I know (and I am subject to correction), there are no flat enclosures outside this 20-mile radius. After July 1, 1969,

the rate of tax on betting tickets in the grandstand will be raised to 2c a ticket, in the derby to 1c a ticket, and in the flat it will remain at two-fifths of 1c. The figures I gave during my second reading speech demonstrate that, with the proposal as it stands, the equivalent turnover tax in the flat area on betting tickets is about double that in the derby or grandstand. Therefore, the impact made by the betting ticket on bookmakers and other people attending the flat enclosure is so much greater. After all, people and bookmakers who attend the flat are the least able to afford to pay. According to the Betting Control Board report of June 30, 1968, the number of bets laid in flat enclosures at metropolitan racing and trotting meetings during 1967-68 was 1,377,000. If the Treasurer accepts the amendment, he will lose three five-hundredths of that sum, and that works out to about $8,200.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Is it all right to use "(*ba*)" for this new paragraph?

Mr. HUDSON: The letters do not mean what the honourable member thinks they mean. It is all right to use them, as there are many other examples of their use in the Lottery and Gaming Act, which I hope one day will be rewritten.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): One could not say there was not some reason behind the amendment. Of course, the honourable member has chosen to work it out somewhat ingeniously in that he has related the effect of this charge on tickets to the turnover tax and has produced an argument which, from his point of view, is valid. He stated clearly his purpose for the amendment: he does not want people who lay modest bets to be discouraged. He said that these people congregated largely in the flat area, and I think that is a reasonable assumption. However, he did not talk about average bets placed in the various enclosures.

Mr. Hudson: I gave them all.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sorry; I thought the honourable member talked only about minimum bets. I point out, as can be seen from new subsection (1a), at present it is intended to retain the present ticket tax of two-fifths of 1c on all tickets.

Mr. Hudson: Until July 1.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. Operating on that basis, the honourable member's analysis of the ticket tax in relation to the turnover tax is just as much a disparity under the present operations of the ticket tax as it would be under the new proposal. To my knowledge, the honourable member has never objected to the present ticket tax, because of the inequities that exist between the various parts of the racecourse, with a ticket tax of two-fifths of 1c applying generally over the area. I think this introduces a new factor into the consideration.

Mr. Broomhill: But this will worsen the position.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Any inequality already exists. The honourable member is introducing a new principle, by saying that the ticket tax should have equal incidence with the turnover tax on each section of the racecourse. As I want to consider the proposed amendment, I will ask that progress be reported.

Mr. HUDSON: The average amounts of bets in the various enclosures, as given in the annual report, are: in the grandstand, other than with rails bookmakers, $7.23; with rails bookmakers, $15.52; in the derby, $3.54; and in the flat, $2.21. The proposed betting ticket tax, expressed as a percentage of the average bet in the various enclosures, is: with non-rails bookmakers in the grandstand, .28 per cent; with rails bookmakers in the grandstand, .13 per cent; with bookmakers in the derby, .28 per cent; and with bookmakers in the flat, .45 per cent. This is where the big discrepancy is. I admit that the current rate of tax of two-fifths of 1c in all enclosures leads to the discrepancy but, because it is a much lower rate of tax on the betting ticket, the discrepancy is nowhere near as great absolutely as it would be under this proposal.

At present the bookmakers in the grandstand pay a turnover tax of 1.5 per cent and a betting ticket tax of two-fifths of 1c. For non-rails bookmakers, it is equivalent to .06 per cent on turnover. Grandstand bookmakers pay what is effectively 1.56 per cent on turnover, rails bookmakers pay 1.53 per cent, derby bookmakers pay 1.61 per cent and bookmakers in the flat enclosure pay 1.68 per cent. To compare that position with the proposed changes, the non-rails grandstand bookmaker's payment will go from 1.56 per cent to 2.08 per cent and the derby bookmaker's payment will go from about 1.61 per cent to 2.08 per cent. However, the flat enclosure bookmaker, who is already higher, at 1.68 per cent, will have an increase to 2.25 per cent. The increase effectively on turnover will be greater for the flat enclosure bookmaker than

for the others, and this will affect the patron in the flat enclosure much more than in any other enclosure.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I asked earlier that debate on this Bill be deferred so that I could consider the matters raised by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson). I have now had an opportunity to examine these matters and also the grounds on which the honourable member based his amendment. I think I should congratulate him on the ingenuity he displayed in trying to find a base on which to rest his argument. He based it on the relationship between the winning bets tax and the ticket tax as it would have incidence in the various areas of the race track, in the terms that the Government had proposed it in the Bill.

I do not find that this is a valid ground on which to base an argument. In any event, I do not think the honourable member's argument has any material weight, and although I commend him from the point of view of debate and admire him for his effort in attempting to find some grounds on which to rest it, I am afraid that I cannot accept his amendment. The question of the incidence of the measures contained in this Bill has been exhaustively considered by Cabinet, and representations have been made to us as a Government by the various interests associated with racing. We have fully canvassed opinion on this matter, and I consider that what we have proposed is generally accepted, albeit perhaps with reluctance on the part of some people concerned in the racing industry. However, I see no reason to depart from the proposals the Government has set out in this Bill, and I therefore ask the Committee not to accept the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: I am disappointed that the Treasurer has seen fit not to accept my amendment, particularly as the revenue involved to the State is not great. The ticket tax has a much greater incidence in the flat enclosure than in any other enclosure, because the average bet is so much smaller. I pointed out this afternoon that on a bet of 20c, which is the minimum bet in the flat enclosure, a ticket tax of 1c amounts to a 5 per cent turnover tax on the bet. With an average bet of $2.21 on the flat, the effect of this ticket tax on the flat is about .45 per cent of turnover, so the general effect of the proposals to raise both the ticket and the turnover tax will be to raise the effective amount that the flat bookmaker (and, therefore, ultimately the flat punter) has to pay to a much higher percentage on turnover than applies in the derby or the grandstand. This is the basis of my moving the amendment, and I think it is a sound basis.

I think people who go into the flat at a race meeting contribute in a number of ways to the economics of that meeting and are the people who can least afford to pay taxation and who should get the greatest consideration rather than the least consideration in these matters. I believe exactly the same applies to the flat bookmaker who, after all, will not only now experience higher taxation as a percentage of turnover than the grandstand or derby bookmaker will experience: his wage costs represent a greater percentage of his turnover than in the case of the grandstand bookmaker. The grandstand bookmaker is able to build up his turnover on each race and to get his costs down to a much lower percentage of turnover. I ask honourable members to support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson (teller), Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe, Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson (teller), and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott, Venning, and Wardle.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote in favour of the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 12. Page 3551.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): As the Premier has said in his explanation, this Bill has two main objects. First, it extends the powers of the Totalizator Agency Board to enable the board to conduct betting on any event within or outside Australia. This increases the scope of the principal Act beyond what was approved by Parliament originally. Secondly, the Bill enables the T.A.B. to act as an agent and operate the on-course totalizator for any club at present licensed to operate a totalizator. I think this involves important changes that every

member will support. True, on-course totalizators operated in many of the country clubs in South Australia could do with much improvement.

Further, many improvements to the city totalizators could be made. The facilities offered to the on-course totalizator patrons, even in the metropolitan area, are not satisfactory: the totalizator indicators are not sufficiently up-to-date or accurate to provide a reliable guide and cannot be seen from many parts of the betting ring. At many country race tracks, of course, there are no totalizator indicators, so the punter is betting blind. In effect, very little is done at any of the race tracks, either in the metropolitan area or in the country, to encourage business on the on-course tote, even though the clubs get a much better percentage from the on-course tote for every $1 invested than they do for every $1 invested with the bookmaker. For every $1 that the clubs switch from the bookmaker, from the on-course tote they can expect to gain about 4c. If they switch $1,000 at a particular meeting, they can expect to gain $40; if they switch $10,000 at a metropolitan meeting, they will gain $400. Clearly, revenue from the on-course tote can be of great significance to the clubs concerned, and anyone who ever attended a race meeting in the metropolitan area would be aware of the tremendous improvement necessary. This will enable the Totalizator Agency Board to move in, where necessary, and run the on-course totalizator itself as an agent for the club.

Having seen a little of the existing facilities, one would hope that, if the T.A.B. moved in, it would demand changes that would enable the ordinary racegoer to receive a much higher standard of service than he gets at present. I do not think the Opposition could find any reason for opposing either of the two amendments in this Bill, and it does not intend to oppose them. However, I point out one drafting error that may be relevant. It concerns clause 10.

The SPEAKER: Order! This should be discussed in Committee.

Mr. HUDSON: It is something in the Bill that I do not understand. Clause 10 (*b*) amends section 31j of the principal Act "by striking out the word 'off-course' wherever it appears in subsections (1c) and (2)". I could not find subsection (1c) in section 31j. I suspect that the reference to (1c) is a printing error. I mention it at this stage only for the convenience of those concerned. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Conduct of totalizator betting by the Board."

Mr. HUDSON: I have just been informed that there was an amendment in 1967 that introduced a new subsection (1c) to section 31j. It would help members if a consolidated version of the Lottery and Gaming Act could be produced or if the Government could undertake a complete re-writing of the whole Act, because when any amendments are considered the Act is such a mess that we are almost bound to miss something, and with technical amendments it is not possible to follow what is going on.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): The honourable member is trying to cover up his mistake by referring to the need for a consolidated Act. To facilitate the honourable member's study of other amendments that this Government will bring in over the years, I will do my best to meet his request.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 19) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message intimating that it had disagreed to the following amendment inserted by the House of Assembly:

Insert new clause as follows:

Page 2—After line 10 insert the following new clause:

3. Amendment of principal Act, s. 39—Permits to bet at race, trotting and coursing meetings.—Section 39 of the principal Act is amended—

(*a*) by inserting after the word "fit", being the last word in subsection (3), the passage "including the payment of fees by them for carrying on the business of bookmaking at the racecourse, trotting ground or coursing meeting, as the case may be;

and

(*b*) by inserting after subsection (3) the following subsection:

(4) Where a bookmaker is aggrieved at the amount of a fee the payment of which is required as a condition subject to which a permit is or is to be granted under subsection (3) of this section, he may make

representations to the Auditor-General who shall, after considering the representations and other matters which he considers relevant, confirm or vary the amount of the fee and the amount as so confirmed or varied shall thereupon be the amount of the fee payable by the bookmaker.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): The Bill, which was debated before the Christmas recess, provided for additional days to be allotted to trotting in South Australia, but an amendment was added that dealt with arbitration between bookmakers and racing clubs. The Legislative Council has rejected the amendment made in this Chamber, so it is up to the Committee to decide whether it will insist. I believe it would be better not to insist. I hope the honourable member who originally moved the amendment realizes that he may be holding up a matter quite divorced from the subject of his amendment. If this Bill is not passed, great inconvenience will be caused to those interested in trotting in South Australia, so the honourable member should seriously consider attempting to achieve his aim by introducing a Bill next session. The issue is not currently urgent because, in the last dispute involving a racing club and bookmakers, both sides accepted arbitration.

Mr. VIRGO: I move:

That the Assembly insist on its amendment.

I do not appreciate the threat, by innuendo, contained in the Premier's remarks. In the early hours of the morning during a sitting just prior to the Christmas recess he asked me very respectfully whether I intended to insist on the amendment, and I told him that I did. He hastened to point out that the responsibility for holding up development at Bolivar would be mine, and that I had to accept it. That is utter rubbish, and the Premier knows it. Actually, the hold-up has been caused by the august gentlemen in the Upper House. Furthermore, we are in the third week of our sittings after the Christmas recess, yet this Bill, which the Premier had earlier said was urgent, did not see the light of day until last week: it was always on the bottom of the Notice Paper. So, let us have no threats concerning where the responsibility lies for any hold-up.

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

Mr. VIRGO: The Opposition is not the hold-up; it is the Legislative Council's insistence on refusing to accept what can only be described as a reasonable amendment. The delay is also the result of the Premier's ensuring that this item remain on the bottom of the Notice Paper ever since we resumed over a fortnight ago. The Legislative Council's reason for disagreeing to the amendment is completely off the track and has nothing to do with the administration of racing. On December 12 last the Premier said:

Both parties—

referring to the clubs and the bookmakers—to the recent dispute have demonstrated their ability to recognize the need for arbitration, for when they came to see me they agreed promptly to arbitration. I had not the slightest doubt that the parties would accept arbitration. It is unnecessary to include in the Bill something that could be regarded by some people on one side or the other of the matter as a somewhat harsh clause hanging over their heads.

Does the Premier regard arbitration for the worker as something harsh and hanging over his head? When there is a dispute, the Premier is the first person to say, "Go to arbitration." This applies also to members of racing clubs who themselves are employers of labour. How anyone can legitimately and logically argue against arbitration is completely beyond me. The Premier asked:

Why, then, put in something in the nature of a big stick?

Arbitration is now a big stick! I hope the Premier and his little colleagues will remember this in future. The Premier seems to have completely overlooked the fact that this matter did not arise merely because there was a dispute late last November over whether the bookmakers would or would not field at Victoria Park. To claim that the bookmakers boycotted the Victoria Park meeting is to tell a deliberate lie. The bookmakers offered to pay their fees, but the fees were not accepted and the bookmakers were locked out. It was estimated (and the figure has not been denied) that the Government lost $10,200 in revenue on that Saturday. The Premier and the Treasurer have been complaining about the lack of finance, but they threw money away because of stubbornness and the Premier's refusal to call the parties into conference before the racing clubs found out that what had been done had been a howling failure. The Port Adelaide Racing Club called a special emergency meeting after the race meeting at Victoria Park and decided not to participate in the dispute.

Our amendment was mildly opposed by the Premier: he said that he opposed it, but not vehemently. No other Government member

spoke in the debate until the member for Chaffey put the interests of the Murray River district racing clubs to the fore and supported our proposal. Our amendment had the unanimous support of every member and it was defeated in the Legislative Council by, I think, 11 votes to seven; certainly not an overwhelming majority. There is an unanswerable case for telling the Legislative Council that we insist upon this amendment as something highly desirable and in keeping with the general attitude of the people that conciliation and arbitration should always prevail.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member's speech reveals the bitterness of his political beliefs and his hatred of the Legislative Council. He uses the cause of trotting in South Australia to try to turn the knife in the Legislative Council, and he knows that the object of the amendment is completely different from the purpose of the Bill. In the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill one of the conditions laid down by the Australian Labor Party was that consideration of the two major aspects had to be separate; but in this Bill all aspects had to be considered together. What has happened to the prime purpose of the Bill? The Bill passed through another place and has been approved here but, because my stubborn friend from Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) on behalf of the South Australian trotting fraternity attacks the Legislative Council, the purposes of the Bill are at risk. The honourable member deals at length with his amendment knowing full well that he is jeopardizing the purpose of the original Bill. Why does he do this? Have the managements of South Australian trotting and racing approached him to do this to the Bill? He has no support from either body. He is jeopardizing the 10 days' trotting asked for.

I heard this morning from a usually reliable source that the honourable member would not insist on his amendment and that the Bill would pass. Although I said I did not believe that would be so, the person informing me said it would be. I am sorry that information was not correct and that the honourable member will insist on his amendment. We know that if he does he will receive the same support as previously.

Mr. Hudson: How do you know he is jeopardizing the Bill?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is not certain what the result of a conference between the two Houses would be. The member for Glenelg knows how fortunes see-saw at a conference; there is no knowing what its outcome will be. Who will be responsible if we see the failure of the original purpose of allowing another 10 days' trotting, which has been approved by both Houses? It will be the honourable member, who is airing his own personal views and who does not seem to understand the needs of various groups that approach both the Opposition and the Government asking that legislation be introduced to enable them to operate properly in this community. Any dispute between bookmakers and racing clubs will be subject to arbitration, if necessary.

Mr. CORCORAN: The member for Edwardstown, exercising what I believe to be his right, suggested a method of resolving a difficult situation in the racing world. Although he had a perfect right to do what he did, the Premier has said that he should not have done this, because this aspect was not allied to the provisions of the Bill as introduced. The member for Edwardstown's move was supported by all members. However, it seems that the Council has a motive for interfering, and the Premier is trying to protect that autocratic institution and trying to blame the member for Edwardstown because the Council has disagreed to a unanimous decision of this Chamber. The Premier is using the method suggested by the member for Edwardstown in order to solve the problem now, but he is not prepared to include this amendment in the legislation. So, it is all right to do it but it is wrong to write it into the Act. I do not think that, if we insist on our amendment, the people will agree with the Premier that the blame for any delay in the Bolivar development lies squarely with the member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo). I believe the blame will be placed where it rightly lies—with the members of another place.

Mr. HUDSON: True, this amendment was earlier agreed to unanimously by members in this place. However, I point out that this agreement was reached only after the Premier had spoken volubly against the amendment. Then, when he discovered the grim news that he could not command the support of all his own members, he did not call for a division. Here we have the Premier of the day, presumably in control of this place and with a majority of 16 to 4 in another place, in a position where he cannot stand over the Legislative Council or even, apparently, over his own colleagues here. Yet he is trying to tell the people of this State, and particularly the trotting people, that it is all the fault of the member for Edwardstown if the Bill is not passed! I have never heard so much rubbish

in all my life. Why does the Premier not tell the Speaker it is a matter of confidence? Why does he not line him up? Why does the Premier not line up the member for Chaffey (Mr. Arnold)? I challenge the Premier to get the numbers.

Certain Legislative Council members have been sounding off about the amendment, but no-one is going to stand over us, least of all a member of the Legislative Council. If the Premier had not cut off private members' time we would not have had to amend the Bill in this way, because a private member's Bill could have been introduced. Under the circumstances we had no alternative but to insert a perfectly reasonable clause in this Bill. It provides statutory backing for what the Premier forced on the bookmakers and racing clubs anyway. The Premier tells us that we must not interfere with racing clubs. Is he really trying to tell this Committee that he had nothing to do with what happened in connection with the dispute last year? If he is, I do not believe him.

In this matter we are demonstrating to the Legislative Council that in any bargaining matters we are such a supine lot that we will back down. Is this the way we are going to bargain for South Australia's rights over the Chowilla dam, for instance? This seems to be similar. I appeal to members to provide for arbitration so that we are not faced in the future with the kind of debacle that occurred last year. If we want to avoid that, we should stick by the amendment and force the Legislative Council to go to a conference on the matter.

Mr. LAWN: I protest against the Premier's action this session in kow-towing to the Legislative Council and letting the Government of this State come from that Chamber. This is not the first time the Premier has supported the Legislative Council's actions regarding an amendment. It has been said in this place during the last 12 months that, when the present Ministry took over, members of the Legislative Council made clear that the Government would do what the Council told it to do. It is now about 12 months since this Government took office on the casting vote of the Speaker.

The disagreement between the Houses that has arisen in that time has arisen often in the history of other Parliaments in this country, and what usually happens is that the Leader of the Government goes to the Governor or the Governor-General, as the case may be, explains the position, and asks for a dissolution of Parliament. In fact, during the life of the Chifley Government there was a double dissolution in the Commonwealth sphere. I say most emphatically that instead of accepting the domination of the Legislative Council the Premier would be well advised to see His Excellency the Governor, explain the position to him, and then go to the people.

Mr. RODDA: I never thought I would live to see the day when the light harness sport would become the whipping boy of the unicameralists in order to give the Legislative Council yet another bash over the head. The member for Edwardstown has tagged the amendment on to the Bill in order to have a slap at the other place. The Premier was endeavouring to make a concession to the light harness sport at Bolivar. If the member for Edwardstown really wished to achieve what his amendment seeks to achieve he would have introduced his own Bill.

Mr. Virgo: How?

Mr. RODDA: The unicameralists opposite have received their instructions from the Trades Hall.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RODDA: I protest at the action of members opposite in having another of their demonstrations against the Legislative Council.

Mr. VIRGO: We have witnessed a great change in the member for Victoria since he received this tag of "Under Secretary" or "Over Secretary", or whatever the title is, as a result of which he now has to carry the bag for the Premier and do as the Premier says. I do not hide my absolute distaste and hatred for the Upper House. They are parasites and hypocrites of the worst order.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is out of order in referring to another place in those terms.

Mr. VIRGO: I will call it the "other place" instead of the "Legislative Council" in deference to your ruling. The Premier, as well as everyone else here, knows that there was no argument when the amendment was first moved in this Chamber, so why has he now suddenly adopted this attitude in respect of an amendment which, according to *Hansard*, was carried with the unanimous support of the 39 members of this place? It is because he is unable to control the uncontrollable. How could I have introduced a Bill of my own to give effect to this amendment when the Premier himself had already moved a motion that private members' business be dispensed with and that Government business take precedence?

Many items of private business are still unresolved. The member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) said that I could have gone to the Bar and introduced a Bill. How stupid can one get! To say that is just as utterly ridiculous as for members opposite to talk about orders from the Trades Hall. I suggest that orders have come on this Bill from a very sombre looking building on North Terrace, next to the Bank of New South Wales. That club is not even prepared to put its name on the building: all it has is a brass plaque reading, "Non-members must ring bell."

One member of the Legislative Council (Hon. A. M. Whyte) said, "I disagree with the amendment inasmuch as these two bodies could have appointed an arbitrator, in any case." He was referring to the clubs and the bookmakers. Have you ever heard so much rubbish in all your life? How could the racing clubs and the bookmakers have appointed an arbitrator, when there was no machinery for doing so? I assume that members opposite who have not spoken still support us, but I think it has been made clear that those who have spoken are opposed to arbitration. I hope that the members who have not spoken will persist in what they consider to be right and that they will dismiss as absolute rubbish the statement that, merely because the Legislative Council has rejected our amendment, we are insisting in order to embarrass that place. The Legislative Council members were not in the discussion at the beginning and they have nothing to do with the present position.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I hope that the Committee does not insist on its amendment. If, every time our amendments are rejected by the Legislative Council, we act as though the whole political structure of South Australia is in jeopardy, we shall have a conference on every point of disagreement during a session. That takes this matter out of proper proportion, having regard to relative importance. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) moved an amendment that dealt with a matter entirely unrelated to the purpose of the Bill. That amendment was not carried unanimously, although the honourable member has said it was.

Mr. Virgo: Did you vote against it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am sick and tired of the arrogance and buffoonery being displayed by members of the Opposition by way of insult to members of the other place. Their attitude is worsening. I should like to add a little more about what I just heard. I heard the member for Glenelg complain that, if the Premier had not terminated private members' business, this amendment could have been brought in as a private member's Bill, but private members' business was not terminated until November 19, which is later than usual. This Government has provided far more time for private members' business than has any previous Government. Indeed, by November 19 in other years Parliament has often been prorogued, with private members' business being terminated weeks before that. Perhaps the honourable member who insists on making these stupid statements will agree there is a time for serious discussion and perhaps a time for buffoonery. This is not the time for that.

This is not an important amendment. It had no relation to the original Bill and was taken out by the other place. Why should we suddenly insult that place and pretend that the whole structure of our political society is in danger and that we should insist on this amendment? If we insist on a conference for every little amendment in dispute, we demean ourselves. Why not keep conferences for important measures? In this case the vote was not unanimous, as the honourable member tries to claim it was. There was no division but there was plenty of opposition to it. This is just a childish quibble. This place should remember its own dignity and not quarrel over minor matters.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Minister makes that sort of speech, one of these days he will get himself elected to the Legislative Council. Why should we back down if we think we are right? Why do we have to be dignified when the other place insists on its disagreement to our amendment? Why should it be we who have to be dignified? What basis has the Minister for his suggestion? Is he telling us that we have had more time for private members' business than in 1965, when Parliament started its sittings earlier and the closure of private members' business came no earlier than it did last year? The member for Edwardstown had no opportunity to do anything but move this amendment, and the Minister of Lands knows that is so.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The honourable member has moved an irrelevant amendment.

Mr. HUDSON: If the Minister does not take the opportunity of moving an amendment to a measure by means of a contingent notice of motion if he thinks something is wrong that

ought to be rectified, or that some change is necessary, he is not doing his job. Has he no sense of responsibility? Is his dignity too important for him never to introduce a contingent notice of motion? The member for Edwardstown introduced a successful amendment, but when members of the Council refused to accept it are we to take it, and not proceed with something that we believe is correct? I have heard the Minister of Lands moralizing often enough and asking members to be dignified, but I do not know what he expects us to do in relation to this matter.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I suggest we drop it.

Mr. HUDSON: Why?

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Because of the trotting interests.

Mr. HUDSON: Apparently, the Minister of Lands is arguing that because trotting at Bolivar is such an earth-shattering issue compared with the arbitration of a dispute between racing clubs and bookmakers that the latter question must be dropped because it is trivial.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Is the Bolivar question important or not?

Mr. HUDSON: It depends on one's attitude. I should think that the member for Stuart would say that it did not matter at all.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What is your attitude?

Mr. HUDSON: I should like to see trotting at Bolivar: I voted for it and will continue to do so. Does not the Minister of Lands want to have a conference? Does he think that Council members will not ask for one? Has he been given information similar to that which the Premier got this morning that members of another place will not ask for a conference but will let the Bill lapse?

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why do you keep talking about the Legislative Council?

Mr. HUDSON: Because they are an incompetent lot of boobs.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I consider that that statement is entirely unparliamentary and that the honourable member should be brought to order for saying it.

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the attention of the member for Glenelg to Standing Order 150, which states:

No member shall use offensive words against either House of Parliament, or, unless moving for its repeal, against any Statute.

Exception having been taken to his words I ask the honourable member to withdraw them.

Mr. HUDSON: Do you rule my words out of order?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, they are a reflection on the other Chamber.

Mr. HUDSON: What words are being objected to?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member said, "They are an incompetent lot of boobs".

Mr. HUDSON: That is an apt description.

The CHAIRMAN: As an objection has been raised I ask the honourable member to withdraw those words.

Mr. HUDSON: Are you ordering me to withdraw?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I regard them as being a reflection on the other place.

Mr. HUDSON: Are you objecting to the word "incompetent"?

The CHAIRMAN: I am objecting to the words "They are an incompetent lot of boobs", and I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. HUDSON: I withdraw the words "They are an incompetent lot of boobs" and substitute "They are incompetent".

Mr. McANANEY: I cannot understand why the member for Edwardstown is becoming steamed up. He was given a reasonably good go, because the Government, in the first place, agreed to his contingent notice of motion and it did not have to do that. When the Labor Party was in Government the then Minister of Agriculture refused to accept such a notice from me after he had told me that he would do so. The member for Edwardstown (Mr. Virgo) was not refused this time. He had a case and it was agreed to on the voices. It went to another place, which had a perfect right to reject it and refer it back to us. The Legislative Council has performed a very useful function in this way over the years. The honourable member must now decide whether he will risk losing the important part of the Bill that would be advantageous to the sport of trotting or whether he will forgo his amendment for the time being and introduce a Bill incorporating it in about six months' time. I admit that the Upper House is unpredictable and, if this place insists on its amendment, the Legislative Council has a perfect right to take whatever action it likes to take. The member for Edwardstown should realize that there must be give and take in these matters.

Mr. VIRGO: I am touched by the honourable member's advice, but it has left me completely unmoved. Frankly, the only true statement he made was that the Legislative

Council is completely unpredictable: with that statement I completely agree. I am sure the Legislative Council's unpredictability must be a continuous source of worry not only to the back-bench members of the Government but also to the Ministers, including the Premier, who find every now and again that the ringmasters up top crack the whip and the Ministers must dance to their tune. We see this situation now. The ringmasters have cracked the whip and the Premier is dancing to their tune, aided and abetted by the Minister of Lands, who complained about the Opposition's arrogance but displayed that same quality himself. Therefore, I think we should dispense with this self-righteous attitude.

One or two of the comments of the member for Stirling deserve some consideration, particularly in the light of what some other speakers have said. I refer particularly to the Premier, who launched a bitter attack on me for moving this amendment. It was not until my Deputy Leader lined the Premier up that he desisted in his claim that I had no right to do what I did. Only a few moments ago the member for Stirling said that the Legislative Council had a perfect right to disagree with this amendment, so it seems that on the one hand the Legislative Council has the right to do something and, on the other hand, members of this Chamber do not have the right to do it.

The member for Stirling said he hoped that I was a practical person. He went on to say that this amendment was relatively unimportant and that in six months' time I could introduce an amending Bill on this subject. Surely the honourable member would have enough intelligence to realize that I would be completely unjustified in wasting, first, the time of the Parliamentary Draftsman and, secondly, the time of this Chamber in debating a Bill when we all know that the Legislative Council would reject it. Therefore, I ask the member for Stirling to be a little practical in his contributions. I believe that before Christmas he had the view that my amendment was a desirable one, otherwise not even the Legislative Council or the Premier would have been able to keep him on his seat. He did not vote against the amendment or even speak to it: he supported it then, and one can only say that as he has changed his mind he must be looking for the job of Parliamentary Under Secretary to the Treasurer.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): As a new member, one or two points come to my mind. I believe that the other Chamber has a perfect right to amend any Bill and to refer any amendment back to us. Also, we have a right to change our minds if we think it is necessary or desirable.

Mr. Virgo: Particularly when pressure is put on you.

Mr. EVANS: I think the member for Edwardstown is probably used to pressure being put on him. However, it is something I am not accustomed to, and I do not intend to become accustomed to it. I am sure my own colleagues realize that I have thoughts of my own and that as far as possible I act according to my own line of thought.

Mr. Virgo: You could have fooled us.

Mr. EVANS: That may not be very difficult to do, either. Even in the short time I have been here, the other Chamber has amended Bills and referred them back to us. I point out also that the Legislative Council agreed to the electoral redistribution legislation, which is something on which we would not give in. This means that members of that Chamber will give way when they think fit and that they will give any matter fair consideration, even if it has to go to a conference.

I believe the Legislative Council had a perfect right to do what it did. I believe also that we in this Chamber have the right to change our minds if we deem it necessary and desirable. I intend to exercise that right. The Legislative Council is part of the Parliamentary institution of this State, and I have no objection at all to its making a suggestion to this Chamber. We should look up to that Chamber and not condemn it all the time, as the Opposition does.

Mr. EDWARDS: I support the statements made by members on this side, and I cannot understand why the member for Edwardstown has carried on in such a way. The way in which members opposite have denigrated another place in this debate is disgraceful. The approach to legislation in another place is not detrimental to this place or to the State as a whole. In most cases members of another place merely make what we think is good legislation better legislation.

Mrs. Byrne: That's a matter of opinion.

Mr. EDWARDS: That may be so in the case of the honourable member, but if she looks through the records she will find that my remarks are not based purely on an opinion. The member for Edwardstown seeks to deny trotting people something for which they have asked.

Mr. Casey: What do you think the trotting people want?

Mr. EDWARDS: They want the Bill to pass so that they can hold trotting meetings in this State as they wish to hold them.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Stott, and Virgo (teller).

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

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from February 13. Page 3607.)

Clause 38 passed.

New clause 34a—"Court of summary jurisdicton."

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move to insert the following new clause:

34a. The following section in enacted and inserted in the principal Act after section 126:—

126a. (1) The Governor may appoint any person to be an industrial magistrate.

(2) A person appointed as an industrial magistrate shall be a special magistrate and the Justices Act, 1921-1965, shall for all purposes apply and have effect in relation to his office of special magistrate as if he had been appointed as a special magistrate under and in accordance with that Act.

This amendment takes the place of the foreshadowed amendment of the member for Edwardstown: it will achieve the same purpose, but in a better manner. The Government recognizes there is merit in appointing a person a special industrial magistrate. I intend to recommend that Mr. Hilton, the present Industrial Registrar, shall be appointed to the new position of Industrial Magistrate. He is qualified at law and is carrying out his present duties most capably. However, in future the Industrial Registrar may not have the qualifications necessary to be a magistrate. The Government desires that the Industrial Magistrate should hear cases normally heard by a special magistrate concerning Commonwealth awards. The Government agrees that an Industrial Magistrate should be appointed, and Commonwealth and State matters will be heard by this officer.

Previously, many cases under the Industrial Code have been conducted before a special magistrate in courts of summary jurisdiction, but because industrial jurisdiction is foreign to some of these magistrates, who are not conversant with industrial matters of this type, delays have been caused. I am not reflecting on the ability of any magistrate, but the Industrial Magistrate will be well versed in industrial jurisprudence so that cases will be heard more expeditiously. I have suggested to the Attorney-General that, where cases have to be heard outside the city of Adelaide, arrangements be made for the industrial Registrar, as the new Industrial Magistrate, to use the normal courts of summary jurisdiction. I suggest that my amendments will achieve the same result as will those of the member for Edwardstown, but in a better way.

Mr. VIRGO: I commend the Minister for the consideration he has given this matter and for the action he has taken since this matter was raised last Thursday. I am sure the industrial movement will fully appreciate his action in virtually agreeing to the Opposition's amendment. The Minister has assured the Committee that, although he has altered the verbiage of the Opposition's amendment, in fact the aim of our amendment has been given effect to. Without detracting in any way from my statement of appreciation, I point out that the Minister's action shows that, contrary to what has been said during the last hour, the Opposition does bring forward matters that improve legislation.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PHYLLOXERA 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 read a second time.

It is short and makes two amendments to the Phylloxera Act that have been recommended by the Phylloxera Board. The first amendment is made by clause 2 and re-enacts the definition of disease in section 5 of the Act. The new definition is scientifically more correct than the existing definition. The second amendment is made by clause 3, which amends section 38a of the principal Act so as to extend the board's powers in relation to research. The principal

purpose of the Phylloxera Act is to safeguard the viticultural industry against invasion by the root-feeding insect, *viteus vitifoliae* (Fitch).

In places where this pest exists, the protection of vines is dependent on the use of disease-resistant root stocks and, in order to be fully prepared for the possibility of an outbreak of the disease, it is essential that there should be in this State a reserve of root stock vine varieties that have been tested under South Australian conditions. Research into root stocks in 1948 was thwarted by the discovery of virus disease in introduced vines. It became obvious, therefore, that an assessment of virus infection is a prior requirement to root stock investigations and that a local virus screening service is required in South Australia to test the necessary introductions of root stocks. Associated with this scheme is the improvement of grape varieties, which are called scions to differentiate them from root stock varieties. Improvement can be achieved either by selection of better performing clones from plantings within the State (vine selection) or by introducing new varieties, or clones of varieties, from other regions.

In order to avoid the risk of introducing pests and diseases, all vine introductions, both of root stock and scion varieties, must be made by a State authority. It is considered that the Phylloxera Board, acting in conjunction with the Agriculture Department, is the most appropriate authority to carry out this function. Under section 38a of the principal Act, the board is already given power to "conduct research into disease and problems connected with disease". However, there has been some doubt whether at present the board's powers extend to vine selection and incidental matters. Clauses 3 brings all these functions within the board's activities. When this legislation was introduced in 1948, there was some anxiety that there might be a risk of introducing phylloxera by the very precautionary measures that were to be taken. I can only add that all the forecasts of the authorities about the safety of this legislation have been fully justified. The main reason why further progress was not made was this problem of virus infection, which assailed the root stocks that were introduced.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I have examined this Bill. Most honourable members know the interest I have taken in this preventive measure. We must realize that in South Australia at the end of March, 1968, there were some 58,129 acres of vines, a large and good revenue-producing area. While I could not obtain the actual figures for 1968, I understand from the viticultural production of this State that it meant some $16,000,000 to South Australia, so it is an industry in respect of which we must take preventive measures to ensure that no pests affect it, thereby creating hardship to the people on the land and ruining production. It was only a week ago that we read in the press that it was intended to plant some 10,000 more acres of wine-producing grapes in this State to try to meet the daily requirements of the average person.

Because of the value of the viticultural industry to the State and of the need to take preventive measures, the Phylloxera Board has taken action to keep the industry free from this disease. "Phylloxera" is a loose expression used by laymen and is not the correct term to describe the insects that attack the roots of the vine and the scions, which are planted in order to develop this industry. The Viticultural Research Officer and the Chief Horticulturist agreed that this was a necessary amendment in order to define the word properly.

The other amendment gives the board power to undertake reasearch that is not undertaken at present. The Opposition supports research in these matters because we believe that research and preventive measures are better than trying to cure the pest once it has become established, because by then it may have caused thousands of dollars worth of damage to this important industry, which is such a good revenue producer for this State. We support the Bill, and would like all members to give it a quick passage because of its importance to the State and to the man on the land.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I, too, support the Bill. Legislation of this type is tremendously important to this State, particularly, as was emphasized by the member for Semaphore, as this State has more than 50,000 acres of vines. Those interested in the viticultural industry who have spoken in the past to legislation dealing with phylloxera are aware that this disease can do a tremendous amount of damage and can wipe out thousands of acres of vines in one fell swoop. In the last century a major acreage of vines in France was destroyed by this disease, to the detriment of the wine industry in that country, and in Australia in the 1890's, I think, at Rutherglen in Victoria, a considerable acreage of vines was annihilated. Therefore, any legislation, the purpose of which is to counter this disease or facilitate further research, is to be commended.

One of the principal objects of this Bill is contained in clause 3, the purpose of which is to enable the board (which is constituted under the Phylloxera Act) to extend its powers in relation to research. Indeed, as the Minister has said, the main purpose of the legislation is to safeguard the viticultural industry against invasion by this root-feeding insect. The importance of the viticultural industry to Australia is well known, so it is highly desirable that everything possible should be done to improve the resistant stocks that are necessary, in case a phylloxera outbreak occurs in this State. I trust that, as a result of the further extensive research into phylloxera that will be made possible, additional phylloxera-resistant root stocks will be introduced to enable this State to deal with the problem whenever it becomes necessary. In view of this Bill's importance and since I represent a very important viticultural area in South Australia, I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I, too, wholeheartedly support the Bill. As a member of the Phylloxera Board, I regard it as vitally important that this Bill should be passed. Although the principal Act enables the board to carry out the work it is doing (with the blessing of the Minister of Agriculture and the Crown Law Office), this Bill broadens certain provisions of the legislation so that there will be no doubt in anyone's mind as to whether the board is within its powers in carrying out this work. The board is actively propagating new and improved grape varieties of all types. This involves considerable capital outlay on temperature-controlled glass houses, on autoclaves for soil testing and on the installation of heat therapy treatment cabinets. All this equipment is essential if we are to propagate new varieties at a high rate and if we are to supply the type of vine that the wine industry is demanding. The board's activities have the wholehearted support of every vine grower in this State. The project has been delayed far too long.

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

POULTRY PROCESSING 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 read a second time:

For some time this Government, in common with the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria, has been concerned with reports that poultry, particularly frozen poultry, is being sold containing what are clearly excessive amounts of water. It follows that, if the housewife bought a bird that contained, say, 10 per cent to 15 per cent water (and such percentages are not uncommon) she would, in fact, be buying less chicken meat than she thought she was buying. Also, a processor who includes an excessive amount of water in his product can sell his product at a lower price than his competitors can and still retain his acceptable margin of profit. It seems then that two classes of person deserve protection in this matter—the housewife, and the processor who is producing a good standard of product.

When this question was first considered, the amount of water in the product was determined by allowing the bird to thaw out under controlled conditions and then comparing the weight of water expressed with the weight of the bird after thawing. This test could be described as the "thaw test". However, it was noted that on the thaw test not all the water in the bird was recovered and that a certain significant amount was actually retained in the tissues of the bird. This fact alone renders the thaw test unsuitable for the purposes of determining the amount of water taken up.

After intensive investigations by officers of the Agriculture Department and the Chemistry Department a suitable test has been designed. It entails weighing a representative sample of birds before they are washed after eviscertion and again after they are drained prior to freezing or chilling. The difference in the weights is then expressed as a percentage of the first weight and called the "weight gain". This weight gain test is acceptable to the authorities in New South Wales and Victoria.

Of its nature, this test can be applied only in a plant, since it must take place during the processing and, since there is a considerable interstate movement of birds for sale, it follows that each major producer State must have legislation that is broadly similar. This State was given the task of producing a model Bill embodying the test, and this model has been accepted in principle by New South Wales and Victoria. In fact, Victoria has already enacted legislation substantially the same as this measure. When the principal producer States have enacted appropriate legislation, a uniform commencing date will be decided upon. This measure recognizes that some take-up of water is inevitable, but it is intended to ensure that this take-up is kept to the acceptable figue of

8 per cent, a figure that has been accepted by the industry generally. Its enactment should result in more orderly marketing and a better product being placed on the dining table.

I will now discuss the Bill in detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 will allow for the fixing of a day of commencement after consultation with the other producer States. Clause 3 is formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the Bill, the most significant being the "weight gain" formula. Clause 5 makes provision for any exemptions from the Act that may be found to be necessary. Clause 6 provides for the appointment of inspectors, and clause 7 provides for the issuing to such inspectors of certificates of identification. Clause 8 sets out the powers of inspectors, and is generally self-explanatory. Clause 9 prohibits the processing of poultry in other than registered plants. Clause 10 provides that any change of control of a registered plant shall be notified to the Minister.

Clause 11 provides for the registration of plants and for the registration of two or more plants as one plant. This is to cover the situation where part of the processing is carried out in one set of premises and part in another set of premises. Clause 12 is the key clause and, in effect, provides for a substantial penalty for processors who process birds having a weight gain of more than 8 per cent. If the penalty of $2,000 seems excessive, it must be remembered that an average of 5 per cent excess water in a day's run of 45,000 birds represents a weight of water equivalent to the weight of more than 2,000 birds each day. Clause 13 will allow a court before which an operator is convicted to suspend the registration of the plant, in respect of which the breach occurred, for up to six months.

Clause 14 is designed to prevent the application of processing methods that would cause to be retained in the tissues water that could not be detected by the application of the test—for instance, the injection of water into a bird before it was first weighed. Clause 15 empowers an inspector to give reasonable directions so as to avoid excessive water take-up, and clause 16 provides for an appeal against those directions. Clause 17 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 18 extends the liability for an offence to those members of a body corporate who permitted the offence to occur. Clause 19 provides for summary proceedings for offences—that is, for proceedings to be conducted under the Justices Act. Clause 20 provides for the necessary power to make regulations.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 19, at 2 p.m.