# HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, December 2, 1970

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

## QUESTIONS

### ROAD SAFETY

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Pak Poy committee's report on road safety has been made public or whether it is still confidential? Today I received from the Minister's office a copy of the report (and I thank him for that) in an envelope marked "confidential". I have read in today's *News* that part of the report has been published. Will the whole of the report be made public or will it be confidential except for that part which was disclosed in today's newspaper?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what part of the report was marked confidential.

Mr. Evans: The envelope.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously, then, if that is marked on the envelope, that is a different situation altogether. The report is not marked "confidential". It was confidential before it was released. It has been publicly released following a discussion I had this morning with a group of people in Government circles who are considering the implications and the implementation of the recommendations in the report. The report has been publicly released but, in the first instance, it was made available to members as an act of courtesy.

### MARRIAGES

Mr. RYAN: Can the Attorney-General say whether the services of officers of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Branch registered to perform marriages are freely available to the general public? This morning one of my constituents telephoned me about a report in yesterday evening's *News* that two well-known Adelaide citizens (the names do not matter for the purposes of the question) were married in a private house at Leabrook by the Deputy Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages (Mr. E. D. Byerlee). My constituent asked me whether the services of officers of the branch registered to perform marriages were freely available to the public. I could not answer the question because, like my constituent, I thought that, if people wanted to avail themselves of these facilities, they had to go to the branch.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am not aware of the circumstances of the incident that the honourable member has mentioned and, without obtaining a report, I cannot say what is the practice of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Branch in this regard. However, I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

### PASTORAL AREA COUNCILS

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government intends to act on the comments of the Local Government Act Revision Committee regarding the extension of local government to the pastoral areas? I understand that the Government intends to introduce local government legislation providing, amongst other things, for compulsory voting and universal franchise, and I am asking whether the extension of local government to the pastoral areas will be included. I know that a special committee headed by Mr. Bray was appointed to examine this proposal, but I do not think that this committee has submitted a report. The Local Government Act Revision Committee reported on the matter and it could be that local government for these areas is intended. If it is, I can only say that the special committee appointed met no-one in the pastoral areas, as far as I know, who favoured having local government there. Also, it seems that this northern part of South Australia, which is by far the driest part of the continent, would have to have such huge areas incorporated in council areas that an onerous burden would be placed on ratepayers selected as members of councils within those council areas. Further, the council rates could amount to many times the amount of the rents that the lessees concerned now pay. In view of the continuing drought in that part of the State and the extremely increased costs of production, the introduction of local government there could break down the whole system that has been built up over the years. The Minister will be aware that I am concerned about this matter, because I believe that no body of opinion in the areas concerned is in favour of this. I should like to know whether or not the Minister intends to give effect to the recommendation or whether he intends to await the report of the special committee set up to examine the matter.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When the Local Government Act Revision Committee's report was released, I said then (and I stand by it now) that it was released for the information of local government and that no action would

be taken to implement any of its recommendations for at least six months, in order to allow local government bodies to consider the recommendations and to comment on them to me and that, after the committee's recommendations had been considered and comments made, work would commence on the drafting of the new Local Government Act. I do not think that many people, including the member for Alexandra, would quarrel about our needing a new Act. The Local Government Act Revision Committee has recommended that local government be extended throughout the length and breadth of South Australia, and I agree with that view. However, a committee headed by Mr. Bray has been examining this matter, and there is no doubt that the reaction this committee has received is not in keeping with the recommendation of the Local Government Act Revision Committee. I cannot see why this is so, because, as local government extends throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia, an area far larger than the northern parts of South Australia that are not covered—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: But they are not as dry.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether they are as dry or not as dry; indeed, I do not know that dryness or wetness has anything to do with the benefits of local government. However, I should think that the people concerned ought to appreciate what benefits have been derived from local government in other areas of South Australia currently under local government jurisdiction. This matter will be resolved at some time in the future, and the views of the people concerned will, of course, be taken into account. If people do not desire to have local government, they will possibly have to suffer the disabilities of not having it. Decisions will be made in future in the light of any considerations of the matter, particularly in the light of any submissions that may be made to the remote areas committee headed by Mr. Bray which is currently conducting its investigations.

## DUST NUISANCE

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on October 20 about the dust nuisance emanating from the Bradford Kendall factory at Kilburn?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Further investigations have been made into the question of dust nuisance to tenants of Housing Trust rental houses at Kilburn. The main source of dust from the factory of Bradford Kendall Limited, Cromwell Road, Kilburn, is from the extractor fan in the foundry roof above the electric steel furnace. Between five and 20 times a day oxygen is injected into the molten steel in the furnace to extract carbon. When this is done, red iron oxide dust is emitted through the exhaust fan outlet for periods of between two minutes and 3½ minutes on each occasion. The cost of installation of dust extraction plant would be about $65,000. However, the forward planning of the company is for a new foundry, which would incorporate a modern steel furnace, to be built.

Mr. Jennings: When will that be?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not been able to get a firm date on that. Conditions within the factory conform to the requirements of the Industrial Code.

## TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport further information to give the House regarding Dr. Breuning's report on metropolitan transport? When making a Ministerial statement on this matter a few weeks ago, the Minister said he had received a report from Dr. Breuning and his associates, that he, other members of Cabinet and his departmental officers were discussing it, and that when a decision had been made the report would be made available (I presume he meant by that that it would be tabled). Will the Minister now say whether this study by his departmental officers and Cabinet has been completed and when the report will be made available? If it is not to be made available by tomorrow, will the Minister make copies of the report available to members during the recess so that they may study it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When making the Ministerial statement, I referred to one important point the honourable member omitted: I said that the report was currently being printed. Regrettably, this took some time, as a result of which the period from the receipt of the report to the date of its release has been extended. When the report is released the Government will indicate clearly its attitude on the matters of policy involved therein. The report is currently being studied by Cabinet, and the Government is seeking the views of the various departmental officers associated with its various aspects. Our considerations have not been concluded, so the report will not be tabled in the House before Parliament rises. However, when the Government releases the report I will certainly make

copies of it available to members, the same as I did this morning in respect of the road safety report. There will certainly be no connotation of its being confidential; I do not know how that impression was gained in the case of the road safety report. As the Premier has already indicated, the Breuning report will be one of the matters to be debated by Parliament when it resumes next year.

## RURAL INDUSTRY FINANCE

Mr. CURREN: Has the Premier been informed by the Commonwealth Government of its proposals to implement a scheme for restructuring rural industry finances; will this Government co-operate in such a scheme; and, if it will, will it be necessary to introduce legislation to set up rural reconstruction boards? In Melbourne last week, the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony) made an announcement, which has been reported in last Thursday's *Australian* under the heading "Federal Scheme to Phase out 100,000 Farms" and part of which is as follows:

Assistance for uneconomic farmers to leave the land and move to new industries will be a major feature of a massive rural reconstruction plan to be submitted to the Federal Cabinet in the next three weeks.

After listing some features of the proposed scheme, the article continues:

The programme will be carried out in collaboration with the State Governments, three of which (Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria) have, or are setting up, rural reconstruction boards.

The need for such finances was emphasized by the Premier in the submissions he made to the Commonwealth Government in August on drought relief.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True, the South Australian Government pointed out to the Commonwealth Government the need for a rural reconstruction programme, but apart from newspaper reports I have had no advice from the Commonwealth Government about its proposals for reconstruction of rural industry finance. Consequently, the question of the co-operation of the South Australian Government in such a scheme cannot be decided until full details of the proposal are known. We wish to co-operate in a rural reconstruction scheme but we should like to know what the scheme is before we commit the State to it.

## MEDICAL TRAINING

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Minister of Education ascertain what has happened in respect of the training of medical laboratory personnel at the South Australian Institute of Technology, particularly in relation to the appointment of full-time teaching staff? Will he also obtain a full report on the training of part-time certificate and advance-certificate students? I am reliably informed that one student was accepted at the institute at the beginning of 1970 as a full-time student in the second year of the course for the Diploma of Medical Technology. He has now been told that full-time tuition will not be available in 1971, which would be his third and final year. Next year, the present part-time teaching staff is committed to teaching the Australian Institute of Medical Laboratory Technologists Diploma course in the areas of histopathology and haematology. Therefore, the appointment of full-time teaching staff becomes most urgent. If anything is to be done for the continuation of these courses next year, as time is running out immediate steps are necessary to ensure the training of personnel in courses that are necessary to the health of the community in South Australia, which is a matter of vital and immediate concern. I also ask the Minister, when he seeks this report, to obtain the views of all the bodies represented on the State Board of Study in Medical Technology, namely, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Children's Hospital, and Gribble and Partners.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to have the matter fully investigated. As the House will rise tomorrow, I will write to the honourable member when I have the information available.

## MARITAL TITLE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier consider, as a matter of Government policy, allowing married and unmarried women with dependants to be called "Mrs."? I have been contacted by a church representative who is concerned with the problem of single girls with dependants (I refer to illegitimate children) because, when they seek employment with a Government department, they must state their marital status. This gentleman has asked that consideration be given to such persons, whether married or unmarried, being called "Mrs.". He says this is the practice in some oversea countries, including Sweden, Germany and Austria, but I have not been able to check this information.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine the matter and discuss it with the Chairman of the Public Service Board to see whether something cannot be done to help in this matter.

## ROAD FATALITIES

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General say on what basis prosecutions are launched as a result of findings made by a coroner's court on inquests into road accident fatalities? Has consideration been given to legislation that would enable a coroner to commit a driver for trial if, in the coroner's opinion, the driver caused death through negligent driving? I have been approached by a constituent whose son died some time ago when he was the passenger in a car involved in a road accident. My constituent was forced into the position of attending the inquest and of providing counsel. In fact, he left the inquest satisfied with the findings arising out of the proceedings. However, even though there was a finding of negligence in respect of both the parties involved, as far as he knows no further police action has been taken. He is most upset about this, not from the point of view of retribution but obviously from the point of view that people who drove negligently have not had their offence sheeted home to them and perhaps been helped.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The former practice that operated in South Australia until a few years ago (I cannot pin-point the date of the change) was that the coroner's inquest proceeded even though the police might already have proceeded or intended to proceed with criminal charges arising out of an accident. If a coroner believed that a *prima facie* case for a criminal charge had been made out against a person, he had the power to commit, and commonly did commit, such a person for trial. Some years ago the law and the practice were altered. At present, where a coroner becomes aware that the police are proceeding with charges arising out of an accident, he desists from either commencing or, if he has commenced, further proceeding with an inquest until those charges are disposed of, and commonly in those circumstances he does not proceed with the public hearing of witnesses, as the facts have been fully ventilated at the trial of the person who has been charged with the offence. I believe that the general consensus is that that is a more satisfactory proceeding than was the former practice. An inquest is not the best type of preliminary hearing of a criminal charge. Generally speaking, if it is intended to proceed against someone involved in an accident, it is better to do so in the ordinary way so that the ordinary processes of the law may be carried out.

If the police have not laid a charge but evidence at a subsequent inquest discloses that there is evidence on which a charge might be laid, the police can at that stage lay charges. What transpires at a coroner's inquest is always known to persons concerned with the police and normally, if the evidence discloses criminal charges, one would expect that charges would be laid. I do not know what special circumstances applied at the inquest to which the honourable member referred. It sometimes happens (perhaps it often happens) that a coroner may conclude that a driver has been negligent, but those responsible for laying charges may consider that, in the circumstances, it is not desirable to proceed. It does not follow that, in every case where a driver has been guilty of a departure from the high standard of care that the law, particularly the civil law, exacts from a driver, criminal proceedings should follow. Each case must be judged on its own peculiar facts. I do not know of any difficulties that have arisen in respect of the present practice that would make it desirable to revert to a system that was well tried and discarded, namely, the system by which the coroner himself commits for trial.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider establishing permanent one-the-spot road-accident investigation teams, including doctors and engineers, to conduct research into the cause of road fatalities. The Minister will probably recall that a few years ago a team of investigators, including a doctor and a road engineer, operated under a grant under the direction of the Professor of Pathology at the University of Adelaide. I understand that the findings they made on a series of accidents threw considerable light on the underlying causes of road fatalities.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall have the matter investigated and give the honourable member a reply.

## BECKER LAND

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether there is before the State Planning Authority a further proposal to subdivide what is known as the Becker land in the hills face zone in the O'Halloran Hill area and, if there is, whether such a submission is in order under the Act, bearing in mind that the authority has already refused one such proposal to subdivide this land? The people who have approached me on this matter fear that, if both of those questions are answered in the affirmative, this may indicate a defect in the Act whereby subdividers can

continue to work away at the State Planning Authority over many years in respect of the same piece of land until eventually the authority gives in.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not aware of the current position regarding the Becker land, although I have a feeling in the back of my mind that the matter is currently before the Planning Appeal Board, but I am not sure enough of that to say it with much certainty. I will look into the matter and let the honourable member know. Regarding the honourable member's second question about people being able to wear away the State Planning Authority by making continual applications, my appreciation of the authority is such that I think that, if it rejected an application on sound grounds and if no further evidence were placed before it, it would not matter much whether another one or 100 applications were made because I do not think the authority would ever be worn down; when it makes a decision it always makes it on extremely good premises.

## SCHOOL TYPEWRITERS

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about providing typewriters at certain schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The facts concerning the provision of typewriters for the three schools referred to in the honourable member's question are that one school had an enrolment which entitled it to a typewriter, but the school had previously purchased one on subsidy. The second was not eligible for departmental provision but owing to an error was supplied with one. The third school which is now requesting a typewriter is not qualified under the existing policy. The policy has been that all schools having an enrolment of 50 students or more qualify for clerical assistance and flowing from that policy have been provided with a typewriter by the Education Department. Following the honourable member's question, I have reviewed this policy and have decided that secondhand typewriters will be provided as they become available in the Public Stores Department to each school having an enrolment below 50. This means that not all such schools will receive a machine immediately, but they will be provided as quickly as possible.

## LOTTERIES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary when regulations will be proclaimed authorizing the legal operation of raffles and other fund-raising lotteries as provided in the recent amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act? I have been approached by several charitable organizations which have in the past organized quiz competitions, offering a motor vehicle as the major prize. The organizations now want to know when regulations will be proclaimed and application forms made available to enable them to plan their fund-raising activities?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Although the regulations to which the honourable member refers are being prepared, I cannot say precisely when they may be proclaimed. I will refer the question to my colleague and see whether I can obtain further information.

## RAILWAY CLAIMS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether it has been decided that parts of the claims of the Australian Federated Union of Locomotive Enginemen that have been promised to be similar in South Australia to those that apply in New South Wales and Victoria are to be applied in South Australia? Recently a constituent of mine approached me about wages received by shunt drivers and acting drivers employed by the South Australian Railways. It appears that in other States, as a result of recent conciliation, after two years' service, on being appointed acting driver a shunt driver has the two years' experience counted and becomes a third-year acting driver, but that position does not apply in this State, although it has been promised. This means that extra wages are being lost by the person and I understand that this complaint is now being dealt with by the Railways Department Industrial Officer. Speedy action in the matter could result in harmony in the department.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The employees that the honourable member refers to operate under a Commonwealth award and, because of this, I am at a loss to understand how one set of conditions could apply to South Australian Railway employees and a different set of conditions could apply to railway employees in New South Wales. Of course, the matter may involve a difference in interpretation of the award, but I do not know whether it does and, as the matter has been brought to my attention, I will discuss it with the Railways Commissioner to find out what the difficulty is and try to overcome it.

## WATER CHARGE

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to my question about water charges?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not permissible under the provisions of the Waterworks Act for the rebate allowance in respect of one property to be applied towards the reduction of the excess water charges incurred on another property. Subsection 86 (2) of the Act provides:

The rebate allowance shall be calculated separately with respect to any land or premises supplied and the rebate allowance with respect to any other land or premises of which the same person is the owner or occupier shall not be taken into account for the purpose of such calculation.

The company may have a water service installed on the vineyard property at any time on making application and paying the required fee. This water, however, may be used only on the vineyard property and permission would not be granted for it to be piped under the road to the adjoining property, as this would circumvent the provisions and intention of the Act.

## BUTLER TANKS SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently regarding the establishment of an area school at Butler Tanks?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that it is intended to establish an area school at Butler Tanks but, as I said last week, it is not on the current design list, and I cannot state at this stage when the school will be built. When my predecessor wrote to the honourable member's predecessor concerning this matter in February last year, she said, "It must be clearly understood that no guarantee whatever can be given concerning the time of erection of this school." However, steps are being taken to acquire a site against the day when the school can be provided.

## VENUS BAY LIGHTS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Marine, a reply to my question about the provision of guide lights at Venus Bay?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Estimates of cost to install lead lights at Venus Bay are being prepared. When the estimates have been completed, further consideration will be given to this matter.

## MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my question of November 5 regarding the possibility of certain medical equipment being imported into Australia duty free?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If it can be established that the mother wishes to acquire an item of equipment on the advice of her medical adviser, it will be necessary for any request for relief from duty to be submitted to the appropriate Commonwealth authority, together with full details of the equipment required.

## MANNUM PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Education furnish me with a report on the resurfacing of the playing area at the Mannum Primary School? It seems that negotiations regarding this problem have been going on for a couple of years.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not furnish the honourable member with a report, but I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated and to provide him with one.

## RUTILE MINING

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understood that the Premier had a reply to my question about mining for rutile on Kangaroo Island. Although I was told yesterday that the Premier had the reply, I did not have the opportunity to ask the question then. Can the Minister of Education, in the temporary absence of the Premier, give me the reply now? The question related to the precise areas where mining is to be carried out and to the depth of mining inland from high-water mark. I explained that creeping plants might be removed and that the wallabies depended on these succulent plants growing on beach sands for their water supplies, having no other watering areas. Although I know that the company intends to replace plants that are removed, I point out that not all types of plant can be rehabilitated.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The location on Nepean Bay where proposed sand mining will be done is in the area known as Morrison Beach on Western Cove and more specifically a section running 3½ miles west of the part known as the Red Banks. This area is south of Kingscote, across Nepean Bay and distant five to six miles in a direct line. By road the mining area approximates 16 miles south-east of Kingscote. Mining will not be done below high-water mark but will extend from approximately high-water mark up to a distance of 70ft. to 80ft. inland. There are two main areas:

(1) The first of a length of about 1½ miles, which is one-half of the area, and mining will proceed from the sandhills between the cliff and the beach. At present the area supports little or no vegetation and regrowth in this area is not considered necessary. However, if it is decided that regrowth is necessary, progressive restoration will be undertaken. The mining depth in this area will vary from 6in. to 3ft. 6in. higher up the beach. It is expected that approximately 16 per cent of heavy mineral bearing sand will be removed, the remainder being returned to the beach.

(2) In the second area, west of the first area, the heavy mineral deposit tends inland under the adjoining sandhills. Dense vegetation is at present in the area and restoration is necessary. Mining will extend to a depth of over 10ft. as this is the depth of overburden. In this area contouring of the sandhill may be necessary. The width of densely vegetated sandhill area in this location is nearly one-quarter of a mile, of which only a 70ft.-80ft. width will be disturbed. The vegetation behind the beach and growing on the dunes consists generally of white, black and stringy-bark mallees forming a dense growth from 10ft. to 20ft. high. The narrow-leaf oil mallee and the large yacca or grass trees, eucalyptus, tea-tree and acacias, grasses and shrubs also grow in the area. Wallabies would feed on this material.

Particular points of interest include the following:

(*a*) A sample of 15cwt. of material was removed from the beach from a depth of 1ft. to 3ft. After about five weeks (September-October) the area had recovered both in sand deposition and regrowth had commenced.

(*b*) The area behind the beach area was once used extensively for eucalyptus oil production (an old still is yet in existence) and for yacca gum production. This area is now reafforested.

(*c*) The beach shelves rather steeply and the cut to 3ft. would fill quickly.

## PERSONAL SECRETARIES

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say what is the purpose of the notice in the *Government Gazette* of November 19 indicating that the Public Service Act is not to apply to a class of person termed "Personal Secretary to the Premier and Personal Secretary to the Deputy Premier"? Leaving out some of the formalities, the notice in the *Gazette* states:

Public Service Act, 1967-70: Non-application to class of persons—The said Governor's Deputy, with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, do hereby declare that the said Act shall not apply to the person for the time being holding appointment as Personal Secretary to the Premier and the person for the time being holding appointment as Personal Secretary to the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The exemption was recommended by the Public Service Board. In the view of the board, these were essentially personal positions to which people from the Public Service would be seconded. They would then still hold substantive positions in the Public Service but be seconded to positions not in the Public Service. The people concerned would be able (and are able) to apply for positions in the Public Service to which they may be formally appointed whilst still being seconded to these positions. This was the best arrangement that we were able to achieve with the Public Service Board. I had some lengthy discussions with the board before this recommendation was put to Cabinet. I would have preferred to see another procedure, but in the view of the Public Service Board this was the appropriate procedure to undertake, and that is why it has proceeded in this way.

## LAKE HAWTHORN

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I asked on November 24 about Lake Hawthorn?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The authority responsible for controlling the outlet gates of the Lake Hawthorn evaporation basin in the Mildura district is the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission of Victoria. Regarding the subject of precautions on the entry of European carp into the river from Lake Hawthorn, it is understood that no specific precautions are taken, and, in fact, during a high flood no preventative measures could be taken. This matter has been discussed with the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, who states that the European carp has been in the Murray River in South Australia for more than 12 months. He suggests that gill nets at the outlets to evaporation basins when water is being discharged into the river may prevent a few fish from entering the river proper but, as they are an edible fish, he suggests encouragement should be given to catching them.

## MURRAY SALINITY

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier, in his own right and in conjunction with the Minister of Works and the Minister of Irrigation, prepare for me a report on the River Murray Commission's report recently tabled in connection with the Murray Valley salinity investigation? At page 61 of the report the commission makes the following recommendations:

Greater encouragement for the improvement of farm management, the principal improvements being conversion of all spray systems to undertree sprays, continued expansion of tile

drainage, and increased water applications to horticultural crops; alterations to irrigation rosters to allow more frequent waterings; intensification of the investigations into the aspects of farm water management; initiation of a survey of the tile drainage effluents in the Renmark Irrigation District to determine the amount of salt entering through the bottoms of drainage caissons with a view to reducing it if it is found to be substantial; increases in the size of the holdings in some of the Government irrigation areas in South Australia and Victoria to improve the viability of the farm units; and provision of additional evaporation basin capacity for tile drainage effluents in South Australia.

I should think that the Premier would see the importance of these recommendations. Although this matter may involve the making of recommendations by the River Murray Commission, I ask the Premier whether he will take it up with his colleagues and, if necessary, with the commission to see whether these recommendations can be implemented for the benefit of South Australia generally while we are awaiting the outcome of other negotiations. Will the Premier inform me in due course what can be done and when these recommendations might be put into effect?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An application has already been made to the Commonwealth Government for assistance regarding salinity control undertakings on the Murray River. I will refer this matter to my colleagues, discuss it, and see whether we can supply the honourable member with the further information he seeks.

## KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Education, in the absence of the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I recently asked about the Lock-Kimba main?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Progress on the Lock-Kimba main is ahead of schedule, and unit costs are currently below estimate. When pipes are delivered, the unloading point is generally about two miles ahead of laying. Men are moved forward to unload and thus are not available to continue with pipelaying. If allocation of funds makes it possible to increase the rate of progress on the project, it may be necessary to provide a separate bedding gang ahead of laying. If this eventuates, a second crane will be desirable.

## LINE MARKING

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question regarding the cost incurred by the Highways Department in painting lines on our roads and highways?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department is constantly alert to take advantage of any opportunities to effect economies in works undertaken. With this in mind, the department recently obtained a quotation from a private contractor for a considerable length of road centre line marking, and this was found to exceed the departmental estimate, including overhead charges, by about 40 per cent. I hope those who advocate private enterprise will note that. Line marking is carried out departmentally in all other States, but the Commonwealth has insufficient work to employ a full-time gang and, therefore, engages private contractors. The honourable member also asked for the specific costs of this work. The Highways Commissioner informed me that this would entail a great deal of work and, with this and the impending close of the session in mind, I should appreciate it if the honourable member would write to me if he still requires these figures.

## CITY INTERSECTIONS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport refer to his departmental officers the possibility of installing remote control television cameras at major city intersections? I understand that, to control the traffic flow in peak periods, the New South Wales Government installed remote control television cameras at major city intersections some years ago. When a build-up of traffic occurs at an intersection at peak periods, the traffic lights can be operated by the person in charge of the television cameras, thus ensuring a continual movement of traffic at any one time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Intersections within the city of Adelaide are under the control of the Adelaide City Council, to which I will refer this matter. However, I recall some time ago reading that the council intended to install cameras at some Adelaide intersections and, as far as I know, it has already done so. However, I will ascertain whether this is so and let the honourable member have a reply.

## BUILDING BOOKLET

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what is the purpose of the 18-page or 20-page booklet regarding the Builders Licensing Act which has been circulated by his office to various sections of the community in the past few days? I understand that such a booklet, which relates to the registration of builders

by April, 1971, and which sets out many features of the legislation, has been received by some members of local government. Will the Premier say also what is the total distribution of this booklet and whether such booklets are to be made available to members, who will no doubt be required by constituents to give advice on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot say offhand what is the distribution list of the booklet. I will certainly see that it is made available to members, and I will ascertain the basis on which distribution has so far taken place.

## TAILEM BEND SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: After he has had an investigation made and consulted with his officers, will the Minister of Education say when it is likely that the renovations and additions to the headmaster's residence at the Tailem Bend Primary School will be made?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

## SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education say whether school welfare clubs are obligated to purchase reference books for new social studies courses? Yesterday I received a letter from a welfare club in my district that expressed concern at the high cost of reference books. I was surprised to learn that welfare clubs had to supply these books. However, the problem is not so much having to supply them as their high cost.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the books to which the honourable member has referred are textbooks used by every child, they would be on the primary school textbooks list and would be provided under the free book scheme. However, if they are reference books, in the sense that only one or two of them would be available in each school library for general use by students of that school when required, they would be available only on subsidy. However, I will investigate the matter raised by the honourable member, including the cost of these books, and, if I cannot obtain a reply for him tomorrow, I will write to the honourable member as soon as possible giving him the necessary information.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Education say whether Cabinet or the Education Department has considered providing for smaller schools at a reasonable price the standard set of reference books required for the new social studies course? Representatives of several smaller schools are worried that, to complete requirements for the new course, they must buy these books at a price which is considerable for a small school to pay. Some associations representing rural areas have passed motions to the effect that this matter be considered by the Government with a view to subsidizing the cost of the new books or in some other way making them available to the schools at a reduced or reasonable price.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have told the member for Rocky River that I will look into the matter and that I believe that the provision of these books is now being subsidized if they are library books. The member for Light's suggestion that the books should be provided free of charge to smaller schools will be considered at the same time as the other matter is considered.

## SCHOOL CLOSURES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked recently regarding school closures?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As soon as it was known that these 24 schools would close, each head teacher was asked to indicate his choice of appointment for 1971. In all cases it is, or will be, possible to meet the wishes of the teacher concerned by making either an assistant or rural school head teacher appointment. Loss of remuneration has occurred in the case of 16 rural heads who became assistants, as they will no longer receive a $237 allowance above assistant rates for being head of a school. However, all of these 16 rural heads could have continued to receive this allowance had they asked for rural school appointments. In fact, seven of the 16 had applied for an assistant appointment in 1971 before any announcement of the closure of their schools had been made. In the normal course of events, a headmaster at a rural school would ultimately move into the range of an assistant of a larger school. When that occurs, the special allowance he has been paid is no longer available.

## SAFETY HELMETS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry expedite the reply to a question I asked earlier in the session on whether a smaller safety helmet would be made to suit workmen in more confined areas of the building trade? When asking this question, I had on my head a bad cut, which would not have occurred had a smaller safety helmet been available. Saying that he would look

into the matter, the then Minister raised my hopes that something would eventuate as a result of my question. However, so far there has been no response to my plea.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I understand that difficulty is being experienced in finding a helmet that will fit the honourable member. However, I will look into the matter and obtain a reply for him as soon as possible.

## POLICE DRESS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to consider issuing members of the South Australian Police Force with a light-weight summer uniform? I understand that, for the comfort of the members of our Police Force, the issue of light-weight slacks and permanent-press non-iron shirts for the summer would be appreciated.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the suggestion to the Chief Secretary and obtain a reply for the honourable member.

## SCHOOL SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. EVANS: My question, to the Minister of Education, is supplementary to two questions I asked some weeks ago regarding the provision of swimming pools. Has any policy decision been made in relation to building swimming pools within the community combining the resources of the Education Department, local government authorities and local effort? I have received from the Blackwood Primary School Committee a letter that closes with the following remark:

Your assistance in gaining some policy statement on this matter would be appreciated.

The Minister has said twice that he believes it is a good idea, but the problem is that some people are now starting to raise funds and we may find small pools being built in some schools or schools will be asking for a subsidy from the Government to build the pools, and as a result we will have several small pools instead of one large Olympic-size pool in one area. I know the Stirling and Blackwood areas are not the only places involved, but I ask the Minister whether this request has been further considered.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter has been referred by Cabinet to a subcommittee of Cabinet consisting of the Ministers of Local Government and Social Welfare and me. I hope it will be possible to make a decision soon on the policy that the Government will follow. It is not intended at this stage to stop subsidizing the cost of learners' pools in primary schools. I think the honourable member will appreciate that there is a significant advantage in having these pools available within the schools, because regular lessons in swimming can be provided without any interruption in the school time table and the learners' pools are available for the learn-to-swim campaign in January each year. The problem concerns the provision of Olympic-size or half Olympic-size pools in secondary schools. I know there is much interest in this matter, and we are concerned to finalize it. As soon as I can make a statement, I will do so.

## WILMINGTON SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education give some assurance that painting of and repairs to the Wilmington school will be completed before the commencement of the school year in February, 1971? I have received correspondence from people in the Wilmington area stating that repair work and the patching of walls was carried out two or three years ago in readiness for painting, which has not yet been done. I have made several telephone calls to the Public Buildings Department on this matter, and I now believe that the department intends to have the work completed before the commencement of the 1971 school year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to investigate the matter and send a report to the honourable member.

## ANDAMOOKA ROADS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider upgrading the streets at Andamooka with a view to having them sealed eventually? It is evident to anyone visiting Andamooka that the streets are in a deplorable condition. Recently some of the residents tried to upgrade the streets themselves, but they were stopped from carrying out any further repairs.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the honourable member's question highlights the attitude I expressed earlier today on the advantage of having local government. If that applied in Andamooka and Coober Pedy (and other places in South Australia) I suggest that the honourable member would not need to have asked his question. I hope that he will be a strong advocate of having local government throughout South Australia. As it does not apply at the moment, the Highways Department is required to regard the main streets of country towns as if they were highways, and devote funds to them. I will discuss this matter

with the Highways Department to see whether it is practicable to do what the honourable member asks, and I will send a reply to the honourable member.

## TRADE DIRECTORY

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General say whether the relevant Statutes can be amended to make it an offence for organizations to send accounts to business houses soliciting payment for advertising? One of my constituents, who owns flats at West Beach, received recently from the Australian Trade and Business Directory a document which purports to be an account but which is not an account in actual fact. The document states:

It is proposed your entry appear in 1971 publication under classification "Flats" $10. Receive $1.05 discount if paid in 14 days. Pay only $8.95.

In very small print at the bottom of this document appear the words "Proposal only". I understand that many business houses in South Australia have received this type of account and that this matter has been raised in the House previously, but I wonder whether the Attorney-General could introduce some law to prevent this practice.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This most undesirable practice has been referred to on more than one occasion in this House. Whether it is practicable to amend the law in a way that would effectively prevent such practices is at present being considered.

## BREAD

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what the Government intends to do about regulations concerning the baking of bread? Bakers have spoken to me about the possible enlargement of the metropolitan area for the purposes of bread baking, and they have said that they have been visited by inspectors of the department who have implied that a regulation will be made, but I do not know what stage this has reached. I am informed that some city bakeries have made arrangements with country bakers to sell portion of their bread and at the same time they have informed their former clients in those country towns that they are no longer to be supplied. This has caused dislocation in the industry. I ask what the Government has in mind regarding regulations and what part, if any, the Government has played in the arrangements dealing with city bakeries?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Both matters raised by the honourable member are being considered by the Government and discussed with people associated with the industry. Legislation that is being prepared will be introduced during the February session.

## LAMBS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Agriculture about the advisability of ensuring that adequate space and killing facilities will be available at the abattoirs to take the weekly flow of fat lambs during the next spring season? The Minister will know that in the height of this spring it became necessary, because of the overcrowding at the abattoirs, to zone certain areas of the State and to ask other areas to hold their lambs while the slack was taken up from the drier regions. The South-East was one of the areas on which a blanket applied and from which no lambs could be taken. Graziers south of Bordertown either had to keep the lambs on their properties or send them to Victoria, where the facilities also became crowded out. Earlier the Minister of Works told me that space was available at the abattoirs for storage, but apparently the killing facilities were the limiting factor.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague. I think that the honourable member would be aware that penalty rates were paid over some time for the killing of fat lambs at the abattoirs. The extent to which one takes account of the peak period of the season in providing extra capacity for killing or in having people work longer hours is difficult to judge. I am certain this matter is being fully investigated by the department.

## FISHERIES LEGISLATION

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say when a Bill to amend or repeal the Fisheries Act will be presented to the House? One of the leading fishermen in South Australia recently approached me saying that he was most concerned, as was much of the industry, that funds available from the Commonwealth Government on a $1 for $1 basis for research and allied matters were being denied South Australia because our legislation had not been brought up to date and we could not therefore avail ourselves of the money offering from the Commonwealth. As it seems rather urgent that the money be taken up by the State, I ask the Premier why this delay has

occurred and when the Act will be repealed or amended.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Draft fisheries legislation has been prepared, the aspect referred to by the Leader being provided for in the draft Bill. However, some matters contained in it are still being discussed by the Government, because it is essential that the fishing industry be properly protected in the new legislation and that every aspect of the contentious matters likely to arise regarding fisheries be covered adequately in it. Cabinet considered this Bill earlier this week. We are not satisfied that some of the matters it contains will meet some of the needs of the industry. Urgent discussions are taking place about reviewing the draft, and these matters will be discussed with various sections of the industry. I expect that the Bill will be introduced no later than the commencement of the second part of the session early next year. We will not miss out on Commonwealth grants. This aspect of the matter is fully covered, and we shall be able to obtain our share of the fund out of which the Commonwealth matches the grants of the States but then decides as to the application of the total funds, which do not always go equally between the States under the arrangement that has been arrived at, but go according to the priorities that are set in joint consultation between the States and the Commonwealth.

## GLENELG TRAM

Mr. BECKER: I apologize for the fact that my question to the Minister of Roads and Transport is in three parts, as follows: (1) When were the Glenelg trams last given a major overhaul? (2) How often are they overhauled? (3) How often were they overhauled prior to the abandonment of the remainder of the tramway system in 1958? Recently, in reply to a question about upgrading these trams, the Minister said that they were in good mechanical condition and that the Tramways Trust had no plans to modernize them. I understand that these trams are many years old, and I am concerned about their present condition and the comfort of patrons.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain for the honourable member precise information. However, I do not think he need worry about the comfort and safety of patrons. I believe these are the most comfortable cars in which to ride, and the safety rate regarding passengers would be the envy of the world. All in all, I hope we never see the day when the Glenelg trams are dispensed with.

## CRYSTAL BROOK SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say when it is expected that new classrooms will be available at the Crystal Brook Primary School? The Minister will be aware that some time ago it was planned that the Crystal Brook Primary School should have a new school building in about five years' time. About three months ago, when the Minister of Education visited the school, he gave me to understand that the solid construction building at the school would remain, that it would have a two-teacher open unit and new toilets, and that the present library would remain.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When I returned to Adelaide from that visit, I asked that the kind of scheme to which the honourable member has referred be considered. I did that, first, because the existing site of the Crystal Brook Primary School is attractive and the oval has been developed in an attractive area. My second reason for making this request was that the old solid construction building (which is in relatively sound condition) could be upgraded into something worth while. The third reason why the suggestion should be considered was that it would result in a considerable saving in cost. The honourable member will appreciate from what I have said in this House previously that the cost of a complete replacement programme in respect of all the unsatisfactory school accommodation in South Australia is well beyond our immediate financial ability. In fact, the submission made to the Commonwealth Government regarding the school-building programme for the period from 1971 to 1975 involves a programme totalling $198,000,000 over that period, or an expenditure of about $40,000,000 a year, whereas our current rate of expenditure in this financial year is $17,000,000. Crystal Brook Primary School replacement is one of the projects on the list submitted to the Commonwealth Government but, clearly, unless we get substantial help from that Government, that project, along with many others, will be substantially delayed and the amount of replacement that we shall be able to undertake will be much less than would otherwise be possible. We consider that in the present circumstances it is necessary to carry out as much replacement as possible and, therefore, to adopt a policy of retaining existing buildings where they can be retained and of upgrading buildings where they can be retained if they are upgraded. That is the policy we will be following and, unfortunately, at this stage it is not possible to put Crystal

Brook Primary School additions on to the programme. Indeed, we cannot do so until we know what help we will get from the Commonwealth Government.

## SOUTHERN DISTRICTS TRAINS

Mr. CRIMES: On behalf of the member for Mawson, who is temporarily absent, I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether he has a reply to the honourable member's recent question about train services in the southern districts?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Consequent on the honourable member's question, the Railways Commissioner has carried out a survey in the Marino Rocks and Hallett Cove area to ascertain by inquiry the potential increase in patronage if additional trains terminated at Hallett Cove. The result of the survey does not support any change in existing schedules at this juncture. Further, the provision of additional trains between 6.30 a.m. and 8.30 a.m. for people in the Hallett Cove and Marino Rocks area would result in major disruption of the existing morning peak service from Marino. It is proposed, when practicable, to initiate a passenger service terminating at Lonsdale. It is hoped that this service will meet the needs of the honourable member's constituents. In the meantime, I have asked the Commissioner to carry out further surveys from time to time to ascertain if any increase in movements would be warranted.

## LETTERS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Premier say whether his department is writing letters to all persons reaching the voting age in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know to what letter or to what voting age the honourable member is referring, and I am afraid that he has his facts decidedly awry. I know nothing of the matter to which he has referred.

## PLYMPTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Education accompany the committee of the Plympton Primary School and me on an inspection of that school? Some time ago I wrote to the Minister regarding the condition of the school, particularly its layout, and now I am most concerned about the condition of the floor in a temporary classroom. I consider that the only way to get action at the school is to take the Minister on an inspection tour, and I ask him to name a date when he can accompany the committee and me.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know that, if I inspect a school, anything more productive is likely to result than would result from the kind of investigation that the competent officers of my department and of the Public Buildings Department undertake. The honourable member will appreciate that, as Minister, I have an extremely busy programme and that it is not easy to fit in all the various requests I receive. However, I will try to visit Plympton Primary School on a date convenient to the honourable member, to the school committee and to me but, in the meantime, as the honourable member has raised the matter of the classroom flooring, I will have that investigated to find out what can be done.

---

## HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## STOCK EXCHANGE PLAZA (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BETTING)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 5, line 20 (clause 7)—After "Saturday" insert ": But where the meeting is to be held on the Victoria Park Racecourse and the totalizator is to be used in the 'Derby' as well as the 'Grandstand', the Commissioner of Police must be satisfied that the fee for admission to the 'Derby' will not be greater than the fee ordinarily charged for admission to the 'Flat' for a race meeting held on the Morphettville Racecourse on a Saturday".

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The Government, in framing this Bill and putting it before Parliament, has taken the view that, if a metropolitan club racing on the additional six mid-week days desires to confine its activities or the amenities available to the public to two enclosures, it should be required to maintain the cheapest of the enclosures, namely, the Flat enclosure, so that those people who do not wish to pay higher

entrance fees may still have the opportunity of attending the races by going on to the Flat. Of course, this means that at Morphettville and Cheltenham, if the club decided to open the Grandstand and Derby instead of the Grandstand and Flat, it could charge the admission price normally charged for the Flat and the admission would be 25c.

At Victoria Park, because admission to the Flat is free, the Flat being park land, the consequence of opening only the Grandstand and the Derby would have been that the Adelaide Racing Club would be required to admit patrons to the Derby free of charge. The Government has considered the amendment and, although adhering to the view that it is desirable that a racing club operating a midweek meeting should open the Flat on the terms that the Flat is opened to the public on a Saturday, we do not consider that we should press this issue to the extent of seeking a conference. In the circumstances, the Government asks members to agree to the amendment.

Dr. EASTICK: I congratulate the Government on reaching this decision, although it is rather strange that the decision could not be made yesterday when the information was known to the Government. The fact that the matter had to be deferred until today conjures up in one's mind a real reason for its being deferred. The statement made by the Attorney-General is basically correct and I have no argument with it. In fact, the amendment covers the situation that I sought to provide for when the Bill was considered in this Chamber earlier. This provision could not be considered at the time, because of the failure to present the necessary amendment to the Attorney-General in sufficient time.

The Adelaide Racing Club has already decided that Derby facilities shall be available on a week day at an admission fee of 25c, and this is the same fee that applies on Saturdays to the Flat at Morphettville or Cheltenham. The club has already indicated that its Wednesday prices in respect of the Grandstand will be $1 for a man and 50c for a woman, as opposed to the $1.40 and 70c respectively which apply there on Saturdays.

The club has also decided that pensioners shall be admitted to the Derby enclosure free of cost on Wednesday, and I believe it has gone out of its way to make every facility available to those who wish to attend race meetings but who would be embarrassed by having to pay under the existing provisions. The fact that the Adelaide Racing Club will have three areas open will make it unique, compared with the facilities at Morphettville and Cheltenham, but it is acknowledged that the Flat facilities at Victoria Park will be provided only for car parking, viewing races, and toilet amenities. From information that I have received from the Executive of the Adelaide Racing Club, I believe that the Government's decision will enable the club to provide at least $700 stake money on each race plus extra in respect of selected events and that, had the Government not been prepared to concede this provision to the club, the returns to the industry through stake money would have been at least $100 a race less than this.

Motion carried.

## NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Second reading.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It introduces a number of amendments designed to improve the operation of the principal Act and to meet the requirements of the nursing profession. A new curriculum of instruction and training for the general nurse and the nurse aide has recently been approved by Cabinet. The training programme for the nurse aide has been completely revised and its structure is similar in nature to the programme of instruction and training that a general nurse is required to undertake. A nurse aide is an essential member of a community nursing service but, unfortunately, she is too frequently regarded as a second-grade nurse. It is considered that this is possibly attributable to her title, which suggests an inferior status. Consequently with the introduction of the new course of training, it is considered that some improvement should also be made in the title applicable to this category of nurses. The Bill therefore provides that those nurses who have previously been described as nurse aides shall hereafter be entitled "enrolled nurses".

Last year a nursing adviser was appointed to the Hospitals Department. At that time it was agreed that her services would be available to the Nurses Board and that she would attend board meetings. Since her appointment, the nursing adviser has been of valuable

assistance to the board. However, at present she is only able to attend board meetings in an advisory capacity and, in consequence, her effectiveness is limited. Moreover, the nursing adviser is required to visit metropolitan and country hospitals in which training courses for nurses are undertaken and she is required to advise and give guidance on various aspects of such training. The Bill accordingly makes it possible for the nursing adviser to be appointed to the board. A further amendment proposed by the Bill makes it possible for appropriate fees to be paid to any member of the Nurses Board.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 are consequential on the change in title from "nurse aide" to "enrolled nurse". Clause 4 provides for the appointment of an additional member to the board. This will enable the Government to appoint the nursing adviser as a member of the board. Clause 5 enacts new section 10a of the principal Act. This new section enables the Governor to fix appropriate fees for any member of the board. Clause 6 amends section 17 of the principal Act. This section empowers the board to order a person to refrain from practising as a nurse where that person is a possible carrier of disease.

Clauses 7 and 8 are consequential on the change of title from "nurse aide" to "enrolled nurse". Clause 9 repeals and re-enacts section 33i of the principal Act. The new section provides that existing nurse aides will automatically be enrolled as nurses on the commencement of the amending Act. It provides for the enrolment of new nurses on the board's being satisfied that an applicant for enrolment has attained a proper standard in theoretical and practical courses. Where a nurse has permitted her enrolment to lapse over a period of more than five years she may be required by the board to undertake a refresher course prior to enrolment.

Clause 10 amends section 33j of the principal Act. The amendment permits enrolment of a nurse who has undertaken her training outside this State if in the State or country in which her training was undertaken reciprocal arrangements exist and if the applicant is of a satisfactory standard. Clause 11 amends section 33k of the principal Act. This section provides that no person shall be enrolled as a nurse unless she has attained the age of 18 years. In view of the improved educational qualifications of applicants, it is considered that this age limit can now be reduced to 17 years. Clause 12 repeals and re-enacts section 33l of the principal Act. This section provides for the application of various relevant provisions, relating to registered nurses, to enrolled nurses. Clauses 13 to 20 are consequential on the change in title from "nurse aide" to "enrolled nurse".

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): In principle, I support the Bill, which represents a further advance in the training and status of the nursing profession. I have no doubt that the relief it will give in respect of the present nursing shortage has not escaped the attention of those who have framed the Bill. However, that is not the main reason for its introduction. It is not desirable to increase status at any time without increasing the training necessary to acquire that status. I do not believe that a nurse aide has in the past necessarily been regarded as a second-grade nurse. However, if she has, this Bill will go a long way to correct the impression of inferiority that the nurse aide may have had, and it will also advance the status of the registered nurse. We must ensure that the highest of standards apply for registered or trained nurses as well as for this apparently new category of enrolled nurse. The present intent brings our nursing structure into line with the North American practice of nursing, where there are both practical and registered nurses. Indeed, the latter are graduates and have degrees.

It is necessary to maintain the highest standard of training, and the present proposals are a great tribute to those senior members of the nursing profession who have been working on the revision of the nurse-training programme for the last two or three years. They have worked most diligently and have tried to keep all possibilities in mind. However, I believe there is a great need to ensure that the upgraded registered nurse (the senior and more fully-trained of these two categories) will keep in touch with the patients. In far too many cases in North America the enrolled nurse, or the so-called practical nurse, does all the donkey work in the wards and spends her time talking to the patients (this is how nurses get to know and to help patients), whereas the graduate nurse tends to sit in a little glass-walled office and comes into very little contact with the patients. I believe and trust that this situation will not arise in South Australia. These people have occasionally been called theoretical nurses, because that is as far as their nursing goes.

I agree with the provisions of the Bill. I understand there was some query in another

place about the amendment to section 17, which, under a penalty of $200, prohibits the nurse who might be a carrier of a disease from practising. This is a most necessary provision, because no-one knows better than I how much cross-infection can occur in hospitals and how many carriers, both nasal carriers, particularly staphylococcal (golden staph), and carriers of other organisms, there can be and how much damage they can do throughout the hospital community However, it is probably not necessary to stipulate a penalty, as the dedication and sense of responsibility of most nurses is such that in those circumstances they would desist from practising, anyway. I suppose there are exceptions to every rule, as a result of which this provision should be included in the legislation. However, I venture to say that this is one penalty that will never be exacted.

The age of commencement of training is obviously now governed by the increased requirements for entry into nursing. In this respect I refer to the need to have four Leaving subjects including one science subject and English. I should like now to refer to one aspect of this matter which is not referred to in the Bill but which, depending on it, is a little disturbing. When introducing the Bill in another place, the Chief Secretary said that people throughout the State had given their blessing to it. I am sorry that I cannot agree with him, as not everyone has given his blessing to it. No-one will quarrel with the need for increased nursing training and increased status of nurse aides and enrolled nurses. However, I have still not received a reply to a question I asked the Attorney-General some weeks ago regarding the solution of the problem facing small country hospitals. This is a tremendous problem, particularly to the residents of those country areas involved. It is no good the Chief Secretary saying that everyone agrees with the legislation, when the residents of Riverton, Kapunda and Tailem Bend and the members of other small centres are most disturbed about what might happen to their hospitals.

It is easy to understand that the grading of certain country hospitals as nurse-training hospitals has left other country hospitals out on a limb. This immediately creates staffing problems for the committees of each of these hospitals. Nurse trainees will no longer train at the small hospitals but will move on to the nurse-training centre. Similarly, nurse aides will be of little value because, if they need supervision (which they usually do for six to 12 months), they are just beginning, by the time they are ready to move on, to give useful service to the hospital. As a result, the average country hospital will have to depend on trained nurses, and I do not have to tell members how difficult it has been for country hospitals to find trained nurses.

Time after time one comes up against cases where a matron has to be found for a country hospital. Great difficulty will be experienced in attracting extra trained staff to country hospitals, to say nothing of the cost involved. The long-term effects are more drastic. If a girl goes to a country centre for training, or if she comes to Adelaide, she is likely to stay at the hospital in which she is trained. When she has finished her training she will want to become a staff nurse in her training hospital. Then, as nurses commonly do, she will probably find someone who wants to marry her, and she will be lost to the country districts for good.

Many country hospitals are most unhappy about the threatened situation. They believe that their daily bed average and the average selection of cases treated in those hospitals provide at least equal (if not better) opportunities for nurse training as do the nurse-training centres. It seems that the selection of many of these country nurse-training centres has been made on a geographical basis only. This is reasonable if, indeed, there is a major hospital in the centre of a country area. However, it seems unreasonable if there are many smaller hospitals of about equal size in one area. Where this situation occurs nurses could possibly be trained in their own hospitals for their practical training and attend a co-ordinated programme at a centrally located hospital for their preliminary training, and for their lectures and specialized training. The cost of transporting them would probably not come up to the cost of providing trained staff at these country hospitals. It is a great pity that the available teaching material in these smaller country hospitals may be otherwise wasted.

This may seem a callous way to speak about people's sickness and illness but we must be realistic, and there is a wealth of material there for training nurses if it is used. If the Government intends to establish base hospitals in these areas and to upgrade the country training centre into a base hospital, I think that the Government should say so. I think the Government should make very clear to the smaller country community hospital just what is the future of that hospital. I am not talking

against base hospitals; indeed, I believe the principle in these days of increased transport facilities is a very good one because we provide better and wider facilities for more people. I believe, however, that these smaller country hospitals have a right to know where they stand because at present they are standing right behind the eight ball and they will be skittled unless a solution to this problem is found.

It may be that the Government has a solution, but I do not believe it has. If it has, it should set to work and find a solution before it goes ahead with this Bill. I think the closing of these small country hospitals will result inevitably, either on a voluntary basis because a base hospital is established, or involuntarily because they will not have the staff. This will result in a great disservice to smaller country communities. If the smaller country hospitals close, there will be the long-term difficulty of finding a doctor who will come to a country area where there are no hospital facilities. A doctor will not be interested in having a second-rate service imposed on him by the lack of hospital facilities. This is a very serious matter.

If we wish, we can pass this Bill without any thought of the resultant problems. I am not speaking against this Bill, but I think it is necessary that the position shall not be left in the air. This legislation will not solve this problem: we must try to find a solution. It might almost be better to defer the passing of the Bill until its full long-term implications and a solution can be worked out, but I think it would be a pity to defer it. I would have hoped that the Government would introduce the Bill only after it had found a solution to the problem. If the problem is not solved, the Government must take the responsibility of what happens to these country hospitals.

It is not the members of the Nurses Board who are responsible for this problem. I pay a tribute to the work those members have done in framing these ideas (particularly Doctor Nicholson and Mrs. Routledge, who is not yet a member of the board but who will be under the terms of this Bill). They have put in a great deal of work on this. It is not their job to consider its long-term implications to country hospitals: it is the Government's job and the Government's responsibility. I favour the provisions of this Bill, but I am most disturbed at the lack of information which we have been given about the long-term effects on country hospitals and medical services generally. I believe that the Government should clarify the situation for the benefit of country hospitals and come up with some answers if it is intended to proceed with this legislation now.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I did not intend to speak to this Bill, so I shall be brief. I must rise to support what the member for Bragg has just said about country hospitals. This problem concerns Eyre Peninsula generally more than most areas because of the sparseness of the population and the distance between hospitals on the Peninsula. I understand that, when determining where training schools should be, the Nurses Board and the advisory committee tried to work, for the new curriculum, on a basis of 300 beds. To get sufficient hospitals to provide 300 beds involves large distances on Eyre Peninsula and the problem the member for Bragg has described so fully is a real one. Hospitals that have been training nurses for the first two years of their training period will now be training enrolled nurses for one year, and this will result in a large turnover of staff which makes administration of the hospital very difficult for the matron and for the local doctor. If this curriculum comes into effect, will the nurses who have recently qualified be willing to go to the remote country areas? Quite understandably, girls who are usually young when they qualify wish to stay where there is a bright social life, but some towns do not have this. There will be a very real problem in attracting staff back to these country towns.

From a training point of view, the whole situation is understandable. The bed average is very low; in other words, there is not a sufficient variety of cases to train nurses perhaps as fully as they can be trained in the city, but more than this is involved. I reiterate what the member for Bragg said and hope that the Government has a real solution to this problem. Apparently the member for Bragg asked a question some time ago on this matter and I would like an assurance from the Attorney-General that he will obtain this reply because it relates to a matter of vital importance. I support this Bill because it is necessary to upgrade the standard of nursing in South Australia to conform to the position in other parts of the world, but I am concerned about the effects the legislation will have on the smaller country hospitals.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I rise to follow the line taken by my two colleagues. My comments may appear to be parochial but the problem is very real in my district. When I returned home from the House last evening,

there awaited me a four-page letter from the hospital at Kapunda which conveyed to me their serious concern about the fact that they may no longer train nurses, but that they have been classified for the purpose of training nurse aides or, to use the new term, enrolled nurses. This hospital has served the community for many years; in fact, when it was first built it was the only hospital between the metropolitan area and Renmark. It provided hospital facilities for Morgan, for the northern country areas, and across into the Barossa Valley. This hospital is maintained at a high level of efficiency, and there is considerable local interest in it. On a most inclement Sunday afternoon two weeks ago this interest resulted in no less than $1,630 being collected towards further hospital facilities and activities. The hospital has a capacity of 24 beds, the average occupancy in recent years being 14; the more recent daily average has exceeded 17. The hospital has provided many worthwhile nurses who have proceeded during the later stages of their training to the larger city hospitals but who have been pleased to return to this hospital to serve as sisters, one having served as matron. Now, the hospital may not even accept girls for general nurse training; it may train them only as enrolled nurses. The strong representations that the hospital has made to the Chief Secretary indicate, as the member for Bragg has pointed out, that people generally are not necessarily sympathetic towards the Cabinet's programme in this respect. In the debate in the other Chamber, the Chief Secretary said that a Cabinet decision had determined the training procedure to commence on January 1, 1971.

Much has been said about removing the stigma that applied to the term "nurse aide" and about the improvement made by using the term "enrolled nurse". I cannot accept that necessarily no stigma will attach to the latter term. Immediately there is a division in title, some people take this to mean that those with one title are more important than those with the other, or that one person is less trained than is the other person. Therefore, although I support the change of term, I cannot accept the Chief Secretary's opinion that the stigma attaching to the term "nurse aide" will not attach to the term "enrolled nurse". In speaking to this Bill, the Hon. V. G. Springett said, on November 26, as reported at page 3119 of *Hansard*:

It will give girls the opportunity of entering the nursing profession at one of two levels. Some girls are made for one level and other girls are made for the other level.

I think a similar proposition applies to any profession or trade; some do not have the capacity to complete scholastic training, whereas they can complete satisfactory technical or practical training. I note with approval that an opportunity is given to people who have not nursed for five years to undertake a short course of instruction whereby they may retain their registration. This will overcome one of the grave difficulties which presently exists and which has been highlighted by some members who have said that this profession loses too many nurses as a result of marriage.

It is important that married persons, after casting off their family responsibilities, will be able to undertake this short course and be reregistered. I know some people at nursing and sister level have already done this. I have referred to some hospitals that have lost status by not being able to train nurses. I referred to this briefly yesterday when speaking about specialist services in country areas. This matter was dealt with by the Chief Secretary yesterday afternoon, when he said:

We realize it will be costly and the hospitals, as the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan points out, may have staffing problems. We think that hospital staffs will need to be increased by one-sixth of their strength to maintain the required numbers.

If hospital staffs are to be increased by one-sixth, a further increase will be added to the already escalating costs of hospitals. As a member of a hospital board, I know that recent salary increases were offset to some extent by the increased subsidy made available by the Government. During the Budget debate, the Treasurer said that the increased subsidies were made to offset some of the increases in costs. Notwithstanding the increased subsidy, many hospitals have already had to increase the daily charge for their services. In two hospitals I know, this increase has been about $1.50 a day and has operated since November 1. If the cost of increasing staff by one-sixth is added, the charges for public, private or double rooms will be a problem for hospital boards, and this cost will be passed on to the general community. These matters must be seriously considered. Although I do not deny that the Bill has merit, and although I support it generally, I believe these facts must be pointed out to the Government, which must accept responsibility for the increases in costs that will follow.

I realize that it is necessary for the Government to entice qualified sisters back into

service in rural areas by paying them a sum of money on the satisfactory completion of 12 months' service. This definitely applies to sisters who have undertaken a midwifery course and who, on completing 12 months' service in a country centre, receive $250. Whether this is a recurring cost at the end of each 12 months of service, I do not know. I wonder whether we will get to the stage where, to entice satisfactory staff to country hospitals, it will be necessary for the Government or someone else to provide financial inducements at all levels. I support the Bill, hoping to hear from the Attorney-General comments about these escalating costs.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I will refer to the smaller country hospitals. A hospital of this type that comes readily to mind is the Tailem Bend Hospital. That is not a big hospital: it has an average of only about 18 or 20 patients a day, but it is extremely important in that part of the State, because it is a long distance from other hospitals. It is difficult to see how a small hospital can be conducted without trainee nurses, and it seems to me that, as under the new Act this hospital will not be permitted to train nurses, it will have enrolled nurses and then the next category on the staff will be nursing sisters. I do not consider that it will be possible to carry on the staffing of that hospital unless it is permitted to accept trainee nurses.

It is interesting that in the last two years 16 local girls have joined the staff of the Tailem Bend Hospital as trainee nurses and that 14 of these have succeeded in their examinations and will be transferred to other training institutions. It is also noteworthy that about 800 or 900 patients are treated at the hospital each year: that shows that the hospital serves a wide area and many people. I consider that this hospital is a type of local industry, in that persons can find employment locally, and I think many girls prefer to begin their training and their professional life in a hospital in their own district. It seems to me that they will now be able to work there only as enrolled nurses. I do not disparage that term or the term "nurse aides" by which they have been known, or the duties involved (it has been said that many persons are suitable for this position) but surely it is not the ambition of most girls who want to go nursing to serve as enrolled nurses. Surely many of them will want to carry on in the nursing profession. I agree with my colleagues about the staffing of country hospitals, and I regard seriously the fact that it will be extremely difficult for these hospitals to maintain their functions, because they will be unable to train girls as nurses.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): As members who have spoken have supported the Bill, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House by making a long reply. I think the matters that have been raised, particularly in relation to country hospitals but also in relation to city hospitals, will best be dealt with by referring them to the Chief Secretary, and I assure those members that the points they have raised will be brought to my colleague's attention and will be considered by him.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 and 6 to 20 passed.

Clause 5—"Fees."

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That clause 5 (in erased type) be inserted.

Clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I cannot blame the Attorney-General in any way for failing to give any replies to our questions about a problem that I consider is concerning many people. He has not got the replies, and that is not his fault. However, I repeat my grave concern at the possible future of small country hospitals as a result of the passing of this Bill. It is not good enough for the Attorney to say that he will refer the matters that have been raised by members on this side to the Chief Secretary. There was no way in which we could raise these matters in the Committee stage, because we have been concerned about an overall consideration, an effect that the Bill would have. I am most disappointed that the Chief Secretary has not been able to supply the Attorney with the replies in relation to this problem. It is not as though the Minister has not had notice: publicity has been given to the matter in the press, and I asked a question in this House some time ago but have not yet received a reply to it. I think that the Chief Secretary has adopted a rather irresponsible situation and attitude in introducing this Bill without having done all the necessary homework and given the answers

that vitally concern the country people of this State.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I repeat that I shall be making representations on behalf of at least one hospital in the district I represent on the matters to which the member for Bragg has just referred. The relevant information has not been made available and a satisfactory answer has not been given to the organizations concerned. But for the fact that the statement was made that these organizations had fully concurred in the principles of this Bill, I would not have risen at this stage; however, certain people have not agreed to various aspects of the matter. Although I will not vote against the third reading, I shall be making strong representations in the future.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later, the Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment.

## UNFAIR ADVERTISING BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to control unfair advertising and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It gives effect to a recommendation contained in the Report on the Law Relating to Consumer Credit and Money Lending which was prepared in the Law School of the University of Adelaide and which is commonly referred to as the "Rogerson Report". This measure is one of a series that the Government proposes to introduce to give effect to its policy on consumer protection. In this modern competitive society no-one, I think, would deny the right of the vendor to cry his wares in the market place and to take advantage of modern methods of mass communication in bringing the virtues of his goods before the public. However, it is not unreasonable to suggest that his advertising should not contain any materially inaccurate or untrue statements and that it should not be such as to mislead or deceive people to whom it is directed. The Bill is therefore intended to restrict unfair advertising, that is, advertising that contains a statement that is untrue or inaccurate in a material particular or that is likely to deceive or mislead the persons to whom the advertisement is directed.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Bill, and I draw honourable members' attention to the definition of "unfair statement", which represents the keystone of the measure. Clause 3 is the operative clause of the Bill: subclause (1) sets out the substance of the offence provided for. Subclause (2) provides a defence for the defendant to prove that at the time of publication he believed on reasonable grounds that the unfair statement was not an unfair statement. Subclause (3) affords a substantial measure of protection for what might be called "innocent publishers" and provides, in effect, that such persons will not come within the ambit of the offence provision unless it can be shown that they knew the alleged unfair statement was such an unfair statement. Clause 4 is the usual provision providing for summary proceedings.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

## WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 1. Page 3219.)

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill, which seeks to amend the original legislation introduced last year in connection with quotas to be applied to growers throughout the State. Members will recall that this legislation was introduced at the request of members of the wheat industry, who submitted that a restriction was necessary on the delivery of grain not only in this State: the request was made by the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation concerning the whole of Australia. The State's quota last year was 45,000,000 bushels. The original legislation was introduced last year rather hurriedly in order that it could be operating in time for the delivery of last year's harvest. As we know, and as happens on many occasions after a period of trial, certain aspects of legislation need to be amended, deleted, or added to, and that is what this Bill tries to do.

Much has been said about the reason for introducing restrictions on the delivery of grain. One must be sympathetic to the industry, because only two or three years ago there was a world shortage of grain. In 1966-67, there was a world shortage of wheat, and it would be rather unfair to say that the fact that growers were receiving $1.10 as a first advance on wheat was the cause of the present over-production of wheat. We know of the situation that exists in the wool industry and that circumstances have encouraged woolgrowers to grow wheat also. So often, we

hear people saying that it would have been better for wheatgrowers to have received much less than $1.10 as a first advance; in fact, some people have gone so far as to say that it would be better for growers to receive much less altogether, for their wheat, so that they would not have grown so much and there would not have been such a big carry-over.

In the 1930's when wheat was 15c a bushel, did this stop growers from producing wheat? No, it did not. It meant that growers produced as much wheat as they could in order to get the 15c a bushel. The argument that growers are receiving too much for their wheat is nothing but poppycock. I think the wheat industry is to be congratulated on the way in which it is trying to contain the industry by introducing restrictions on the delivery of grain. The Wheatgrowers Federation has been in existence for over 35 years, and you may be aware, Mr. Speaker, that your predecessor, Mr. Tom Stott, played an important part in forming the Wheatgrowers Federation and in getting the industry organized to the degree to which it has been organized for many years now.

Mr. Nankivell: What do you think—

Mr. VENNING: I hear a comment from the member for Mallee.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mallee is out of order.

Mr. VENNING: Be that as it may, Sir, I should like to answer his interjection later. The industry has asked that the amendments it proposed last year be effected now. The administration of this State's quota system has been fraught with many problems, and I commend the Chairman of the advisory committee, who had had an arduous task to perform. He has attended many growers' meetings all over the State dealing with the administration of quotas, an aspect about which I should like to say very little, as many mistakes were made last year. Regrettably, a few mistakes are still being made. I hope that the alterations to the building programme at Grain House will enable the quota committee to be housed in better conditions than it has had in the past. I hope it will have more room in which to operate and that its records will be kept together and not be lost again.

I hope, too, that the size of the large advisory committee will soon be reduced to, say, three or four members. At present it comprises eight grower representatives as well as representatives of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, the Wheat Board and the Government. It was necessary in the early stages to have the committee establish a basis of quotas for this State. Now this has been done, its size should be reduced, and the sooner this happens the better it will be for the industry as a whole.

Mr. Jennings: Do you believe in selling wheat to Red China?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. VENNING: I think the interjection should be answered, Sir, as many people are having much to say about this matter. Whether or not we recognize Red China will make no difference to her, as Red China will always buy her wheat from the country from which she can buy it most cheaply. Indeed, the Australian Wheat Board is waiting to be invited there to sell wheat. It is important that Australia continue its sales of wheat in this area, as our production has been expanded around the Chinese market. Indeed, we are selling about 38 per cent of our grain to China.

The Bill continues the operation of the legislation passed last year. Clause 6 inserts a new section 18a relating to the contingency reserve: this is the sum set aside from the State quota to satisfy appeals for increased quotas. Last year the review committee had only about 300,000 bushels to allocate for necessitous cases. The Chairman of the advisory committee and the review committee, as well as a Government nominee, will constitute the contingency committee, which will determine the amount of grain to be put into this reserve.

Clause 12 enacts many new sections intended to spell out the procedure to be followed when a production unit or part thereof is transferred. In the past, when a property has been sold the seller has not had to tell the buyer of the amount of over-quota grain delivered from the property. The amendment will make it necessary in future for the seller to give details to the purchaser of the amount of over-quota grain so delivered.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you dealing with wheat only?

Mr. VENNING: Yes. No restrictions in relation to other grains are being imposed. I am most concerned about one aspect of this problem that has affected growers this year. Earlier in the year growers throughout the State asked the Minister to inform them prior to seeding what their quotas would be. Seeding is normally carried out at the end of April or at the beginning of May, which should

have given ample time for growers to be informed of their quotas for the coming year. However, it is disturbing to note that many growers were informed of their quotas only three or four weeks ago; many farmers' quotas were reduced by up to 60 per cent on last year's quota. Having sown their crops thinking that their quota would be only 23 per cent less than last year's, many growers will have much over-quota wheat. The reason for this is clear; the State's quota was set at 45,000,000 bushels. It was regretted that the advisory committee had over-allocated grain to growers in necessitous circumstances, and this amounted to over 900,000 bushels. It was necessary for the quota committee to revise its formula to bring the base quota back to 45,000,000 bushels for South Australia. Notwithstanding this situation, the growers who have sown their crops have been placed in a difficult position. Some growers, thinking that their quota would be between 3,000 and 4,000 bushels, have been given a quota 60 per cent less than that.

I am pleased that, because of the present situation, South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited, in co-operation with United Farmers and Graziers, has decided to receive a grower's quota plus 100 per cent of that quota. This will assist those unfortunate growers who did not know of this year's quota until three or four weeks ago, when many were about to start reaping the present harvest. Clause 14 recasts the provisions of section 38, which was originally dealt with by an amendment moved by the former member for Ridley, Mr. Stott. He did this in all good faith, the industry having requested him to do so. No-one would have been better informed about the industry than would the quota committee, which would have known whether or not this aspect of the legislation was effective. However, the Minister has said that this provision must be included. If this is any indication of the Labor Party's idea of handling the problems of primary industry, I do not think much of it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What's wrong with it?

Mr. VENNING: It is not possible to bring it to fruition. New subsection (3) of section 38 states:

(3) Where the review committee is satisfied, on such evidence as it thinks fit, that the amount of a nominal quota determined by the advisory committee would result in the allocation of a wheat delivery quota for any quota season in respect of a production unit that represents less than the amount of wheat the proceeds from the sale of which, when aggregated with all other proceeds from the utilization of the lands comprised in the production unit directly or indirectly available to the holder of the nominal quota, would be sufficient to maintain the economic viability of the production unit, the review committee may direct the advisory committee to increase that nominal quota by an amount specified in the direction and the advisory committee shall give effect to that direction.

I believe this provision should have been removed, as the industry has requested.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why should it be taken out?

Mr. VENNING: It cannot be put into operation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why?

Mr. VENNING: Because the industry has recommended that way, and the people in the industry should know from past experience whether this provision can be of use. The idea of having this provision was that it could operate eventually, but 12 months' experience of the quota committee has shown that it should be taken out.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What about the recommendation of the review committee?

Mr. VENNING: I understand that all people concerned with the situation believe that it should be taken out.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You have to give a reason.

Mr. VENNING: I must admit that I did not hear the details of it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Surely you can advance a reason.

Mr. VENNING: How can one assess the viability of an industry? Part of a quota can be taken away from a genuine wheatgrower and given to a no-hoper who cannot run his own affairs, anyway. It can be taken away from an economic unit and given to an uneconomic unit. It is probably his own fault that the person with the uneconomic unit is in that position. It is not right to do this. It is evident to me that if members opposite had had more yeast they would be better bred and would know more about this.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not be provocative.

Mr. VENNING: I have referred to the context of the Bill, which I support.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I, too, support the Bill, and I wish to help get it through the House as soon as possible, as the matter is now urgent. Harvesting is well under way in most districts so that the legislation must be passed. The Bill has been introduced to give statutory

power to the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee and other committees set up under the Act. The legislation was first put into effect last year as a result of a crisis in the wheat industry owing to over-production and the necessity to provide storage for a large crop. This was emergency legislation and, as such, this created anomalies for the individual. It is hoped that, now we have had one year's experience of wheat quotas and their administration, the worst of these anomalies will be ironed out. It must be remembered that with any hard and fast rule wherever there is a demarcation line there must be an anomaly. Anomalies are inevitable: there will always be someone on one side or other of the line.

It is necessary to have a close look at this legislation, which validates the position of the committee formed last year to administer the then new wheat quotas and of the committee formed to allocate those quotas—a most unenviable task. There were anomalies, and injustices occurred to individual farmers. There were many outcries about the quotas that had been allocated. Most of the injustices and anomalies that occurred were as a result of administrative mistakes; I believe most people will admit that this was the reason. I am not saying that this should have occurred, because these anomalies should not have arisen. However, we must remember that the committee was set up quickly and had a big problem to deal with. It was hastily formed and had a formidable task to perform, so it was inevitable that mistakes would be made. It is to be hoped, however, that experience will prevent a recurrence of these mistakes. As it appears inevitable that quotas will be with us for some time, it has become necessary to lay down guidelines for the future, and the Bill does this.

As introduced in the Upper House, the Bill did not provide adequately for short-falls, about which there has always been doubt since the introduction of quotas last season. As a result of not knowing exactly what would happen to any short-fall they may have, most farmers have preferred to make sure that they do not have a short-fall and have therefore tended to grow more wheat than is necessary to fill their quota. As members know, it is impossible to estimate accurately in the case of something like this, which depends on nature. As I say, there has normally been over-quota wheat. An adequate assurance on the policy regarding short-falls has been necessary. The Bill as it is introduced in this House has in it a better provision to help solve this problem than was in the Bill originally introduced in another place, by virtue of an amendment moved by the Hon. Arthur Whyte. In particular, this amendment is of great assistance to fringe areas because, under the old scheme, a short-fall could be wiped out in the second year and the quota to other people gradually increased as a result of cancellation of short-falls. Perhaps this situation does not necessarily apply in the Flinders District, but it certainly applies to many farmers in the fringe areas elsewhere on Eyre Peninsula.

Mr. Nankivell: It applies particularly in the Mallee.

Mr. CARNIE: The honourable member can speak for his own area in a moment. Eyre Peninsula is an important part of the wheat-growing area of the State, as it traditionally grows over one-third of the total wheat produced in South Australia; on at least one occasion in recent years it has grown over 50 per cent. The Minister of Agriculture accepted the Hon. Mr. Whyte's amendment and congratulated him on it, so I hope the Government does not intend to tamper with the Bill here. As I said, wheat quotas are with us and look like being with us for some time. The sooner wheat quotas can be released and we can get back to a stable position the better it will be for the entire industry and for the economy of the State. Growers will then be able to grow wheat in marginal areas and to take the risks they have always taken. Traditional growers will be able once again to grow what they wish and produce wheat, and wheat has always been one of the important industries in this State. In the meantime, the Bill provides what is necessary to enable the advisory committee to exercise its powers.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill. Like most farmers, I do not like quotas, but I realize that, in the present circumstances, there is no alternative. My main concern about quotas is in regard to the position of a farmer who could not fill his quota in one year. He should be given the right to fill the quota later. I think the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Whyte in another place will take care of this matter but, if it does not, I hope that other action will be taken to guarantee farmers in the marginal areas (or, for that matter, anywhere else) the right to survive.

Particularly in the marginal areas, farmers are faced with bad seasons or frosts and in

some they have produced no wheat at all in one year. In the next year they should be given the opportunity to make up all, or a substantial portion, of the quota so that they will have a chance to survive. Farmers in the marginal areas need an opportunity over two years or three years to make up for a bad year, and I hope members appreciate that.

In my district and, doubtless, in the District of Mallee, many farmers would be regarded as being in marginal areas. I have nothing against their being there: I think it is a good thing. I want as many farmers as possible in South Australia and we should not do anything to remove farmers from the land. I strongly believe in the small farm and the right of the family farmer to exist. I hope that in future the quota committee will be far more efficient in its operations than it has been in the past.

Mistakes made by the committee that have been brought to my attention this year are inexcusable and I have heard of people telephoning members of the committee at all hours of the night or going to see them in a distressed state. For no reason at all these farmers' quotas have been halved and the economy of the farms has been ruined because of that. When I have inquired I have found that the persons concerned with those quotas have not added or subtracted correctly, or that apparently they cannot read. These things should not happen and I hope that in future the committee will not inconvenience farmers and cause them so much worry.

I also hope that in future quotas will make it impossible for speculators and Rundle Street farmers to move into our industry. We know what these people have done in other States, and I hope that they will be kept out of farming in South Australia. We have only a few of them in this State, and one advantage of this legislation is that it will prevent such persons from entering the industry. There is no place for them: they do nothing for the farming industry. I do not want to delay the passage of this legislation, but I think that the Government should have introduced it earlier so that members would have had more time to consider it.

I hope that in future the quota committee will notify farmers before they start seeding, as the member for Rocky River has said. In that way, farmers would know approximately how much wheat to sow and thus could decide whether to diversify by growing other crops, such as barley and oats.

Mr. Keneally: Or maize.

Mr. GUNN: I think that the less the member for Stuart says about farming the better it will be for all concerned.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I want to make several comments on this Bill, particularly because I represent a portion of the State comprising what are known as marginal areas. Like other members, I shall refer to those areas. It is a pity that this Bill should come into this House at this time in the legislative programme. I recall that, when the original Bill was introduced, it was introduced about the same time and, although the quota committe had time to decide how quotas would be determined, Parliament did not have long to consider the legislation in Committee. I support wheat quotas, and although many people in my district have been hit hard because of the quotas they have received, they support, in principle, the idea of wheat quotas because they understand the need to restrict wheat acreages and the quantity of wheat delivered.

Much of the Bill comprises machinery clauses that tidy up aspects that were not adequately covered by the original legislation. I might disagree with the basic principles and the quotas determined, because, although I consider that, if the five years chosen were average years, the system might be feasible and equitable, I do not think a worse five-year period than that chosen for the marginal areas, particularly the Murray Mallee, could be recorded. I do not think the records of production for those areas show any other period that compares with the five-year period chosen, therefore, I consider that the basis of fixing quotas generally was not entirely equitable or fair.

I realize that in several other States longer periods were chosen and a certain number of years in these longer periods was accepted as a basis for fixing quotas. I consider that, in my district, the selection of the best five years in a period of seven years would have been a much fairer basis and would have matched the figures obtained for the five-year period over the remainder of the State outside the marginal areas. One aspect of the Bill will help my district—the formation of a committee to deal with the contingency reserve. I realize that, if under this contingency reserve some farmers receive extra quotas to offset the five years chosen, someone will obviously have to go short in his quota. If this is necessary (and I consider that it is) the committee will have to determine a fair

way of arriving at what can be considered a basic quota.

The administration of this Act was made much more difficult because the committee did not have a good contingency reserve, and it would have had a good contingency reserve if it had had a bigger overall quantity from which to draw. I think the other States did establish far greater contingency reserves and thus could offset the problems of individual farmers by allocating wheat from these contingency reserves. I hope and believe that this House will accept the clause dealing with over-quota wheat to which several of my colleagues have referred, because its acceptance is the only way in which a farmer in the marginal areas will have the opportunity to offset his losses. Where it is obvious that a farmer consistently has drought years and frosts, in a good season he must be able to make up his losses caused by the adverse conditions in the bad years, and I consider that this is an important aspect of the legislation. It will help the farmer who sometimes has almost total losses to offset those losses in periods when he has a good crop. I support the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): Like the member for Murray, I deplore the fact that we are considering over-quota machinery amendments and other principal amendments at a time when people are already harvesting and delivering grain. I disagreed with many aspects of this legislation in the first place, and my disagreement has not changed. I hope the Loveday committee will recommend in its report some radical changes in the whole system of allocating wheat quotas in this State. I represent a marginal area, and the member for Rocky River represents a traditional area, but, as far as I am concerned, my constituents are traditional wheat farmers, many of them having been established for 30 or 40 years on the same property. However, because of the seasons taken as an average over which this quota system was established, they did not receive the same treatment as was received by certain other traditional farmers. I say this in defence of the people I represent, and I am unhappy about the deal they have received as a consequence of this system.

I accept the necessity to have quotas in a situation of over-supply. Except in extraordinary circumstances, we will not get out of this situation merely because of the situation in respect of world wheat supplies. Even though we had a world shortage of wheat in 1966-67, to which the member for Rocky River referred, the situation has changed today. There needs to be only one bad season, and America brings millions of bushels out of mothballs, so that there is a quick remedy there regarding a short-fall. I believe that we shall remain under a system of controls in regard to wheat production while we have an international agreement on the marketing of wheat. Included in the machinery clauses, which are necessary and which I support wholeheartedly, is a provision to transfer part or whole of a production unit, and this clears up the case of the transfer or sale of land subject to a quota. Provision is also made regarding short-falls, and this is terribly important.

I agree with the member for Eyre, who said that people in marginal areas depend on one good season in perhaps three or four to make up for bad years. Without the short-fall, those people are perpetually in trouble and unable to solve their problems of wheat production. In a good year, unless provision for a short-fall is made, these people have an over-quota and are in difficulty. I am looking forward to seeing the report of the committee that has been inquiring into the whole system of allocating quotas in this State. Because of the urgency of these provisions, which contain necessary machinery amendments, I support the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): The member for Eyre said that it was only just that the small traditional farmer should have a guarantee concerning his right to survival in so far as it was possible to give him that guarantee. The member for Mallee, in effect, in criticizing the way the existing quota system works, implied support for the sort of position adopted by the member for Eyre, and both members support the provisions in the Bill regarding short-falls, those provisions having been inserted in another place. However, the member for Rocky River, although he gave lip service to the remarks of the member for Eyre about the right of survival, objected to the provisions of clause 14, which re-enacts section 38 of the principal Act, namely, those provisions that he described as the Stott amendment.

I should like members to get the history of this matter correct, because this amendment originated as a Labor Party amendment and was put on file last year when this matter was first being discussed. At that time, following his wellknown practice of getting on the band waggon, Mr. Stott refused to go along with the Labor Party amendment, which would

have given the advisory committee the power to make this sort of decision, and he moved a similar amendment providing for the review committee to do the job. Mr. Stott got his idea from the Labor Party amendment. Certainly, it is true that concerning a contingency reserve the review committee was unable, even if it had wished, to do anything in the way of making adjustments under this section. However, I point out to members that the matter of what is an uneconomic unit cannot be determined at one time and remain set at that level for all time: an uneconomic unit depends on market conditions.

If, as a result of the determination of the basic quotas, people in marginal areas were unjustly treated, I point out that the committee, in its operations last year, might have determined a quota for marginal farmers that rendered a marginal farm uneconomic. If it is uneconomic, even though there is an adjustment for short-falls, it will stay uneconomic and, except for this provision, the review committee can do nothing about it. Clause 14 contains the only provision that enables the review committee to adjust a quota for a marginal farmer whose position has been rendered uneconomic by the method of determining quotas, and the member for Mallee rightly objects to that method. We know that it is difficult for a review committee to make a judgment on economic viability but, nevertheless, if marginal farmers are to be given any kind of protection apart from that given by short-falls, they can only be given protection of this kind. If we did not give the review committee the power to do this, it could give no additional protection at all. If the member for Rocky River wishes to go along with the proposition that the marginal farmer, who has been to some extent rendered submarginal by being given too low a quota, is to be guaranteed a right to survival while quotas are operating, it can only be done under this section, until such time as the Loveday committee recommends a system for determining quotas which takes care of this matter.

Mr. Venning: Why does the industry want to take it out?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The industry is not fully representative, I suggest, of all the various points of view on this matter within the industry. The member for Rocky River said that the industry wanted to take it out, and that should be sufficient for the Minister: he should have taken it out at the industry's request! No reasons have been established to my knowledge, however, to demonstrate that this clause is completely unworkable. The clause requires the review committee to make a judgment: it does not require the committee necessarily to adjust the quota, because the clause is permissive and uses the word "may". If the review committee is satisfied with various conditions it may direct the advisory committee. It allows the review committee to use its judgment in this matter. I agree that it is not possible to make a precise determination of economic viability but, nevertheless, when it comes to the matter of the livelihood of a marginal farmer who may have been rendered submarginal by a method of determining quotas which is unjust, someone should have the power to make an adjustment.

Mr. Venning: Do you think it will be possible to give a farmer in that category enough wheat to make him viable?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In some cases, yes. I hope that the honourable member and other members of the industry who are still getting by and who could even take a further reduction in their quota will be willing to take a small reduction in order to enable a few of these farmers to survive and to guarantee what the member for Eyre calls "their right to survive".

Mr. Gunn: Unfortunately, few farmers can afford to take a cut.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I accept that point, and I believe that it will only be possible, with this section as it stands, to make minor adjustments to help a few marginal farmers, but to suggest that we should not do that merely because the industry requests that we not do it and because the industry may agree with the view that anyone in this position is inefficient and not worth saving is, I believe, a harsh and immoral attitude. I agree with the member for Rocky River that one thing that cannot be done in relation to any primary industry is to assume that what is going on at present will continue for ever. The history of primary production has been a history of fluctuation and rapid changes in market conditions, and we could be confronted with changes in the market for wheat in the future that would render the quota system unnecessary.

That, however, is more reason for helping the submarginal farmer, who has been rendered submarginal unfairly, to survive in the intervening period. In a few years the quota system could be discarded, and how would we

feel then if we knew that the quota system we had implemented had forced off farms certain individualas who could well have survived in the long term if they had been given more generous treatment during the period in which quotas were implemented? That is the basic reason why clause 14, which reinstates section 38 of the principal Act, should remain in the Bill. It may be that the Loveday committee can make better suggestions in relation to this matter, and I hope that it will. I believe that the present committee investigating this problem is probably as good as any that we could get. It includes two ex-members of this House: Mr. Quirke, a man of considerable experience and wisdom: and Mr. Loveday, who is also a man of great intelligence with considerable experience of the wheat industry. The other member is Professor Jarrett, a specialist economist in agriculture at the University of Adelaide.

If anyone can work out a fairer system to determine quotas, these three gentlemen can. I am pleased that members have seen fit to give the Bill a speedy passage, and I apologize for the fact that, once again, it has been introduced late in the session. I hope that, when the review committee brings down its report, and if further legislation is required as a consequence of it, that legislation will be introduced in a way that will enable it to be considered fully not only by members but also by outside interests.

Mr. Gunn: How do you think the Wheatgrowers Federation will accept the Loveday report?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As Mr. Loveday is a former President of the Federation, and as Mr. Quirke is one—

Mr. Venning: That is not quite right. He was President not of the Wheatgrowers Federation, but of the Wheat and Woolgrowers Association.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Whatever it was, he was one of their first presidents, and those members who know Mr. Loveday and are not prepared to take a political point over the matter will agree that he has the ability and intelligence (as has Mr. Quirke) to do the job that is necessary.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Yes, but succession duties will kill the small farmer in the long run.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing about succession duties in the Bill. Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If a farmer is being forced off the land, the net value of his property would be so small or so close to zero that it would be impossible for any succession duty at all to be levied. Therefore, the honourable member's point is completely irrelevant as well as being out of order.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) moved:

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, knowing that it perpetuates an emergency measure that cannot, of its very nature, satisfy everyone in the industry. Indeed, it will bring dissatisfaction to many, as it will apportion, not solve, the problem: it distributes the problem as equitably as possible and as equitably as the industry, of its own volition, can do. The Bill deals with many interests that cannot be reconciled. In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to the necessity for the committee to have power to increase quotas to enable a property to become viable. This is one of the contradictions that have occurred in the search for a fair distribution of quotas, as in reducing the quota of those properties that are only just viable we are obtaining a situation in which two quotas, instead of one, are not viable.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to the traditional wheatgrowers: people who have properties on which wheat has been grown for many years. These people are facing an economic pressure of a different kind, which is being intensified by the quota system: the size of the property. Properties which a few years ago were sufficiently large are not now large enough and these traditional growers are vying, within this quota system, with newcomers on large properties who have all the benefits of the new agricultural technology.

The Bill does nothing in relation to marketing. As the years pass, we will see not a decreasing supply but an increasing supply of wheat on the world market, and the technologies that are helping not just South Australia but Australia as a whole are only now becoming evident in the under-developed countries of the world. I therefore have no doubt that the situation we are considering will become more permanent in the Australian wheat industry. It therefore behoves all concerned to work out the fairest possible system of quotas. I only hope that all of the investigations now conducted will bring together as

much as possible the various interests involved. These interests cannot be brought together entirely, because there are conflicts between what people want to achieve and what they will achieve. Many additional problems are involved. Capital taxation has been referred to. Although I will not develop this point, this is a real factor in the farming community today and in the ability of farmers to carry on, if that is one of the aims of the system. The matter of reconstruction is allied closely to the wheat quota system, and the two together will interact, having a tremendous effect one on the other, if the Government involves itself, as I believe it should already have involved itself, in the reconstruction field of agriculture.

We must continue to search for a better scheme and for more efficiency in the application of quotas. We must try to bring together the various forces in wheat producing, such as size, viability and, eventually, marketing, to a stage where in future this quota system, we hope, will be unnecessary. However, I believe we will have to live with it for some time. I support the Bill, hoping that we can evolve the fairest possible system. I support it not on the basis that it will bring everyone to a position where there is no viability but on the basis that it will save the industry, helping those in it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I want members to be clear on the question of viability. The Leader said that, in making one individual viable by increasing his quota, the quotas of others must be decreased, so that the net result may be that two people are rendered not viable. Clearly the provisions of section 38 requiring the review committee to use its judgment in this matter would ensure that such an adjustment did not take place. To mix a metaphor in relation to the primary industry, we cannot save one person from sinking by adopting measures that cause several others to drown. Another point I do not think members have appreciated sufficiently is in regard to the traditional grower the size of whose property is not now large enough to make him an economic producer, if his quota is too low, and who can be helped under the provisions of section 38.

He can be helped only to the extent that others who have to take a slight cut in quota in order to help him are not also put on the margin of being forced out of the industry. I believe there is some room, particularly in regard to those producers who are not traditional growers and in regard to those few producers who are large producers of wheat, to give additional assistance to the small traditional wheatgrower the size of whose property has now been rendered too small by the application of strict quotas to him. I believe it is necessary that we should ask the review committee to undertake measures that assist that person, and I believe the Bill can do this.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## FESTIVAL HALL (CITY OF ADELAIDE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 1. Page 3248.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): At the outset, I say that I intend to support the Bill. My reason for doing so is that it seems a situation of urgency has arisen with respect to the Citrus Organization Committee and other parties concerned with South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited involving the financial operations of the committee and, as a consequence, it seems that something must be done urgently to remedy the situation. When I consider the history of this organization, I remember expressing the concern of members on this side that it would be difficult for legislation of this sort to stand up, and I think this has been proved to be the case.

One of the problems has been that, when an orderly marketing organization is established in one State, its success depends entirely on the loyalty of the growers. For various reasons, this committee seems to have lost the confidence of the growers. I understand that, whereas in 1969 it was receiving about

90 per cent of the citrus fruit produced in South Australia, it is now receiving only about 60 per cent of the fruit. The Auditor-General's Report shows a comparison of the amount of fruit received in 1968-69 with that received in 1969-70. Also, when one looks at the trading situation, one sees that in 1968-69 there was a surplus of $31,108, whereas in 1969-70 there was a deficit of $26,555.

It is evident from this that something has gone wrong with this organization. It is said that there has been a clash of personalities, and that seems to be correct, because there have been 15 different members of this committee since it was established and only recently the Chairman and senior members of the committee have resigned. I think that the resignation of the Chairman of a committee of this kind shows that there is some unrest or unhappiness within the organization.

South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited does not seem to have been an effective sales promoting organization. Figures that I have show that there has been extremely little increase in the sales of fresh navel and valencia oranges anywhere in Australia in the past five years, so one may draw the conclusion that South Australia is not alone in this. The figures show that this is the position, and the Auditor-General's Report proves that South Australian Citrus Sales Proprietary Limited has not been effective in promoting sales. I have pointed out that the success of such an organization requires the confidence of the growers, and the organization had that confidence in this State when it commenced operations. In fact, the growers in South Australia, in all areas of production, seem to be more cohesive than are growers in some other States: persons from other States have told me that we in South Australia are able to hold our organizations together far better than is the case in other States.

However, we are marketing a commodity in circumstances in which we cannot even control the markets in our own State or insist that people in this State sell to the committee despite its having been established as the sole receiver under the Act and despite the fact that provision has been made for severe penalties for people who do not sell through the organization.

Further, about eight other agencies are exporting from South Australia, and all this proves that it is almost impossible to operate an organization satisfactorily if the organization has not the complete confidence and unqualified support of the growers. This is because, as I have said, fruit can be exported from South Australia to other States and it can come from places in other States (notably from Mildura) to the Adelaide market, yet we can do nothing by legislation of this kind to ensure that we preserve our own markets for our own producers. When one considers this matter further, one realizes that certain factors are disturbing. These factors include the manner in which some of the marketing has been carried out, and an honourable member in another place has said that the marketing of oranges on the Adelaide market is tied up by a group of merchants in the market, and it was suggested that they had acquired sole rights to wholesale oranges on behalf of the Citrus Organization Committee. This is a most unfortunate situation and, when one hears the names mentioned, one sees that it is rather reminiscent of the situation that developed in the potato industry.

One other important feature is the cost of operating the scheme in relation to the returns that are being received. As I have pointed out, there has been a deficit in operating expenses. These costs have increased from $130,000 to more than $300,000. This is a serious situation, particularly concerning an industry which has virtually pledged itself to orderly marketing and which wishes to continue, as far as possible, to market its fruit in an orderly way.

A marketing organization cannot be established in one State, because section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution makes it impossible completely to control the movement and sale of fruit within the State. Until uniform Commonwealth legislation exists, this problem will persist. In fact, unless the Citrus Organization Committee is managed extremely well it will have difficulty in surviving; indeed, it will have to regain the confidence of the growers in this State in order to receive their unqualified support, and that will not be an easy matter. That is why I think it is important that we should have some knowledge of those persons who are to be appointed to the committee by the Government and on whom, I think, rests the success or otherwise of this whole legislation. I realize that it is difficult at this stage to name the people concerned.

Nothing has been suggested to indicate that, once this legislation is passed, the organizations concerned will be quickly canvassed to ascertain whether the people to be appointed on behalf of the growers are, in fact, acceptable to the growers. The original Act permits any 100

growers to petition for a poll of growers if there is dissatisfaction, but it would be unfortunate if such a situation should develop. If growers become dissatisfied with their representatives on the committee, I think the committee will fail. Certain provisions in the Bill indicate that there has been difficulty in the past concerning conflicting interests among members of the committee; otherwise, why is it stipulated that no grower can be a member of the committee if he has any association with the marketing organization? This is a rather unfortunate situation, and I do not know whether the present wording of the Bill is actually what is intended. Most growers would be members of co-operative organizations which are, in turn, marketing organizations, and it could be construed that a grower who was a member of a growers' organization that marketed fruit would be excluded from being considered.

On the other hand, it is not provided that those to be appointed as merchant representatives must be divorced entirely from production. I think this is taking advantage of one section of the committee compared to another. This now becomes a Government matter completely; the Minister is to appoint a committee which, it is indicated, will be permitted to borrow moneys, the Treasury to guarantee the borrowing. This places on the Government the onus regarding the success or failure of this corrective measure, which is designed to save the operations of the Citrus Organization Committee.

I support the Bill, because I believe that something must be done urgently to deal with the situation that has arisen. Although I do not have all the facts, I think that many members of the public and growers would be concerned and alarmed at the amount of information that has been withheld. I would merely be repeating hearsay if I gave what I understood to be the facts of the case. There is a period of crisis concerning this committee, and the Government has had to act in the matter. I hope that its action will be successful and that the people appointed to the committee by the Government will measure up to the job given them, so that the committee will be able to try to remedy the situation that has arisen. I support the Bill.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill, and I commend the Government for introducing it and taking swift action to correct an unsavoury situation that has arisen in this important citrus industry and in the organization set up to control it. The Minister states in his second reading explanation that the Bill is founded on the report from the Director of Lands (Mr. Dunsford) that has been tabled recently in this House. This report, which was submitted to the Government a short time ago, had been initiated by the former Government and the Acting Minister of Agriculture in that Government (Hon. R. C. DeGaris), after considerable pressure from a group of growers in the "Riverland" district who were concerned and perturbed at the actions that had been taken to remove from the controlling body the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman, and two grower members.

The reason for circulating the petition for the inquiry (and I had something to do with that, as a citrus grower at that time) was the alarm felt by many growers at the lack of information being given to them about the situation which had developed and which resulted in the resignation of the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman, and two grower members from the controlling body. I must say that the request contained in the petition was agreed to reluctantly by the Acting Minister, but eventually the inquiry got under way and, after much diligent and speedy inquiry into the matters that had been causing concern, Mr. Dunsford presented an excellent report and made some good recommendations, as had been requested in the petition.

The Government and the present Minister of Agriculture studied the report fully, and last Tuesday it was tabled in the House and released for public perusal. To my mind, it is coincidental that one recommendation in the Dunsford report has been used as the basis of the present Bill. The situation that has arisen in the past few months has taken several years to develop, and I consider that it is of great importance to the whole citrus industry that the Government has acted to provide for a new committee to be appointed by the Government to replace the committee now in existence, which is partly elected and partly appointed. To throw some light on the reasons for the Bill being introduced, I shall quote from an article that appeared in last Saturday's *Advertiser*, for the information of honourable members. This states:

The financial difficulties of a company involved in citrus marketing are among the reasons which have led the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Casey) to prepare legislation for a fresh start to orderly citrus marketing in South Australia.

This situation that has arisen, as I have said previously, has taken several years to develop. It goes back to the passing of the original Act in 1965 which, contrary to what has been said in another place, was not introduced in the dying hours of a Parliamentary session: it was introduced in this House after a considerable period of discussion and with the full agreement of all sections of the industry at that time. Those discussions and other negotiations took place over a period of several months.

The spirit in which the legislation was passed in this House and agreed to by all sections of the citrus industry can be summed up in the terms of a circular sent out by the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association, dated November 25, 1965. In part that stated:

The view was expressed that the recommendations require only efficient and intelligent implementation to ensure that, with statutory backing, industry problems which have been beyond solution on a voluntary basis will be overcome. To that end, the full support of M.C.G.C.A. will be at the disposal of the Minister and others responsible. The immediate hope is that the Citrus Industry Organization Act, 1965, now before Parliament, will be passed without unnecessary delay so that as much time as possible may be devoted by the Minister to the all-important task of setting up the Citrus Organization Committee with appropriate personnel, and in reasonable time to prepare for the 1966 marketing season.

That organization, the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association, and the citrus section of the United Farmers and Graziers, as well as all other sections of the industry (the packing and marketing sections) fully supported the legislation that was passed in 1965. It was realized at the time that the legislation was not competent fully to control the industry and direct it along the lines on which it should be conducted: it was merely there as a guideline for the industry to work out its own salvation.

Unfortunately, the spirit that was in evidence at that time among the growers' organizations and other sections did not carry through into the years following the passing of the Act. I also quote from *Hansard* of 1965, page 3259, a letter referred to by the then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. G. A. Bywaters). This letter, addressed to the Minister, is in similar vein to the letter I have already quoted. It states:

The report of the committee of inquiry into the citrus industry in South Australia, and a draft copy of the Citrus Industry Organization Act, 1965, were considered at a meeting of the committee of management of Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association held at Waikerie on Friday, November 26. It was unanimously agreed that, through you, the inquiry committee be commended on its factual, comprehensive and constructive report. There was also unanimous support for the Citrus Industry Organization Act, 1965, as drafted. The hope was expressed that the relevant Bill would be passed without unnecessary delay so that steps for its implementation may be taken. The main purpose of a press statement, issued by direction of the association committee of management (copy attached), was to emphasize this urgency. There is no doubt that enactment of this legislation in South Australia will provide example and incentive for similar development on an Australia-wide basis. This, as you will know, is already under consideration by the Australian Citrus Growers Federation. (signed) J. J. Medley.

That once again emphasizes the spirit in which this legislation was enacted and in which it was agreed to by the industry at the time. However, as I have said, the spirit that existed at the time disappeared in subsequent years and, regrettably, the Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association set out to gain control of the organization that had been established. Pursuing this policy, it finally achieved its objective of obtaining majority control of the organization in February, 1970. I have referred to the resignations of the Chairman, the Deputy Chairman and two grower members which were accepted by the then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. C. R. Story): from what I have been told by three of the gentlemen who resigned at the time (Mr. Katekar, Mr. Davis and Mr. Vogt), the resignations were accepted under false pretences. It was specifically stated in those resignations that the members concerned would not serve with Mr. Andrews as Chairman of the Citrus Organization Committee and of South Australian Citrus Sales. On the Minister's statement at a meeting of the committee, he had every intention of appointing Mr. Andrews as Chairman. However, he accepted the resignations under false pretences, because he did not proceed with his intention to appoint Mr. Andrews as Chairman: within 48 hours he had changed his mind and appointed Mr. Jeanes to that position. I say again that the former Minister of Agriculture acted under false pretences in accepting those resignations.

As a citrus grower, I have been vitally concerned with what has taken place in the industry over the past five years. I have fully supported the principle of orderly marketing because, as a grower of a considerable quantity of citrus, I realize that it is to the

ultimate benefit of growers that they combine to ensure that their citrus is marketed in an orderly manner, that markets are not oversupplied but fully supplied, and that a reasonable price is returned to the grower. The grower is the vital person in this industry for, without him, there is no citrus to be sold and the whole operation collapses. The Bill provides for a caretaker committee to maintain the C.O.C. in operation while Mr. Dunsford's report is being considered by the industry. After it does that it may once again get together in the same spirit as it did in the early months of 1965.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The committee was set up by the previous Government.

Mr. CURREN: The actions I am referring to took place in February of this year, when the resignations of the committee members were accepted under false pretences by the then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Story), who accepted those resignations before he left for overseas. It was while he was overseas and while the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was Acting Minister of Agriculture that the petition was presented and Mr. Dunsford was appointed to inquire into the matter. In my view and in the view of many people who know what went on at that time, the then Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Story) accepted the resignations from members of the C.O.C. under false pretences.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The former Minister of Agriculture (Hon. C. R. Story), a member of another place, has been accused of acting under false pretences. I maintain that it is not in order to speak like that of a member of another place, and I ask that you ask the honourable member to withdraw that charge.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member prepared to withdraw the charge? Exception has been taken to the term "false pretences".

Mr. CURREN: I was not referring to the fact that the Hon. Mr. Story was a member of another place: I was referring to the fact that he was Minister of Agriculture at the time of the the resignations. However, if my remark is offensive to the honourable member I shall withdraw it. I want to finish my speech: I do not want to have to go outside as the honourable member had to yesterday. Before I disgressed to put the member for Alexandra on the right track I gave my views on what I thought would transpire following the passing of this Bill. The report, so well prepared and presented by the Director of Lands (Mr. Dunsford), will be considered by all connected with the industry and, during the next couple of months, they will get together in the same spirit as they did in 1965. After having had five years' experience of this Act, they will be able to work out a suitable organization so that all people connected with the industry can join it and support it. I will do my best to ensure that that is done. Having grown up in the citrus industry, I realize, as I have realized for many years, that the industry is of major importance to South Australia, and the most important aspect of the industry is the financial welfare and well-being of growers. They are the basis of the industry and their interests should be considered by all concerned. The views having been obtained of all who have a great interest in ensuring that a workable organization is formed, I am sure that the ideas will be consolidated into definitte proposals of what form the organization will take, what the composition of the committee will be, how it will be appointed, and what its duties and functions will be. I have no doubt that, when agreement is reached on these aspects, legislation will be introduced again to amend the Act to give affect to these proposals. Before the legislation is introduced I hope that a poll of growers will be held to accept or reject the proposals.

As pointed out by the member for Mallee, it is not possible for one State to control fully the marketing of a primary product that is produced in several States. It is only with the goodwill and co-operation of all concerned in the industry that it can be done on a State basis, but we must aim for the ultimate of orderly marketing on an Australia-wide basis. With this in view I support the action of the Australian Citrus Growers Federation in what it is doing to achieve this worthy object. The member for Mallee referred to the financial aspects of the operation of the committee and of the fluctuations that have taken place from one year to the next.

As a primary producer, he must realize that there are considerable variations in the annual crops, and this is the principal reason for the variation in the income of the committee, by whom levies are struck on a case basis on fruit marketed and on a tonnage basis for fruit sent to factories for processing. As this quantity varies considerably from year to year but as the commitments of the committee in managing its operations are reasonably constant, there must be a fluctuation

between profit or loss in the operations of a particular year. Section 9 of the Act is amended by deleting the present provisions dealing with the election of the committee. The other amendments in the Bill are consequential, being designed to deal with references to the election of zonal representatives. As I want the Bill to pass the House this evening, I will not delay proceedings further. I support the Bill and commend the Director of Lands (Mr. Dunsford) for the fine report he has prepared. I trust the industry as a whole will note the report, consider it in depth, and act on its recommendations.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): A good summary of the citrus situation is given in Mr. Dunford's report. Another comprehensive review was given in another place on November 26, as reported at page 3107 of *Hansard*. I will make three statements about the spirit of the Bill and three comments about the Bill itself. First, I support the Bill because it is terribly important that the industry should not fall apart any more than it has done. If this legislation was not changed, the industry would fall apart in the sense that, when the Australian Citrus Growers Federation was able to organize the whole country on the basis of orderly marketing, citrus growers in this State would have had a bitter experience of orderly marketing and it would be difficult to get the citrus industry here back into an organized way of operating. I think this Bill will tend to hold the present situation in South Australia.

Secondly, I believe the original legislation was incorrectly conceived as the answer to all citrus industry problems in South Australia. The matter was considered too much in isolation. If a marketing scheme applies only to an industry in one State of the Commonwealth, it is impossible to have complete orderly marketing, and the scheme here was implemented in isolation from the rest of the citrus industry in Australia. It is amazing that not more has been done with regard to an Australian organization. On page 41 of his report to the Minister, Mr. Dunsford states:

> It is surprising that in the past five years so little appears to have been actually achieved in any form of federal organization for export marketing. Much work has been done in this direction but nothing concrete appears to have resulted.

That is an extremely important statement and I hope that it causes someone in the Commonwealth organization to try more, on behalf of the citrus industry, to have orderly marketing in Australia. The history of this Act has been checkered. It seems to have been bugged from the outset by individuals and small pressure groups and, until we find a solution, the situation will be impossible. The purpose of this legislation is to rescue what remains of orderly marketing in citrus and to try to put the industry back on its feet. I am pleased that the provision regarding zones has been taken out of the legislation. I consider that, in the appointment of grower representatives to this committee, it is essential that the best men be chosen, whether they are from the centre of the citrus-growing area, the bottom of it, or the top of it.

My next observation is on the appointment of the five-man committee, with the Chairman to be appointed by the Governor, and two grower representatives and two marketing representatives to be appointed. It would have been satisfying to the members of this House to know the names of the persons that the Minister had in mind to appoint to the Committee: I think there would have been greater satisfaction with and support for the Bill if the names had been known. I consider that the success of this amending legislation depends entirely on the persons appointed. If this committee is to regain prestige and influence, and gather up again all the persons involved in the industry, the members of the committee should be selected for their ability, and selecting them will be extremely difficult. It will be most interesting to see who the Minister has in mind for these positions.

It is worth noting again that the Minister of Agriculture assured members of another place, in the debate in the Committee stage in that place last evening, that the two representatives from the marketing organizations would not be involved financially in the industry. That undertaking was reassuring. The Minister also said that the grower representatives appointed by the Governor to this committee would serve for two years. We must bear in mind that the principal Act provides, in the case of grower appointees, that at any time, by securing 100 signatures to a petition, growers may petition the Minister for a poll of growers. So, action may be taken in, for example, two months, three months or four months, or on the other hand a grower representative may serve the whole allotted term of two years. If the growers are dissatisfied, they will be able to call for a poll and make their own appointments.

I support this legislation but I consider it to be purely an interim measure, depending

entirely on the persons appointed by the Governor to carry out the work of this committee. I believe all the dedication and support that the growers in this industry can give will be necessary to make this orderly marketing venture work.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): When this legislation was first introduced in 1965, I issued some warnings about the experiences of the Potato Board, and the very things that happened in the Potato Board have now happened in the Citrus Organization Committee. We should be told who the members of the new committee will be. If we do not know who they are, we shall be buying a pig in a poke. We are voting for something that we know is doomed to failure if the people previously on the committee are to continue to run it. We know from experience that those people do not have the best interests of the growers at heart: rather have they their own interests at heart. At this stage I support the Bill.

I merely reiterate the warning I gave previously, that it is essential that we have the right people on the new committee. We do not want members of the Agriculture Department on it. They may be trained in other avenues of primary production, like horticulture, but they need to appreciate the problems of the growers. When such people have been members of committees of this kind, they have proved to be failures, whereas, when the growers have been allowed to run their own boards and committees and appoint their own members to control the industry, that industry has been as successful as any industry facing the problem of over-production can be. It will need a wise group of people to secure an economic price for oranges, which are being grossly over-produced at present. The marketing structure needs to be completely reorganized and there must be a new approach to the industry as a whole. I would strongly object to departmental officers being appointed to the new committee. I support the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I thank members for their contribution to this debate. It is comforting to realize the wide appreciation there is amongst members of the problems of the citrus industry and of the need to ensure that a new start be made in the general marketing of citrus. It is now recognized that the initial actions of the Citrus Organization Committee were too ambitious, that an attempt to get a complete coverage of the industry in South Australia by the kinds of methods that were adopted was bound to lead to troubles and difficulty, as a consequence of the clash of conflicting interests within the industry.

This has certainly happened, as the report of the Director of Lands makes crystal clear. It is evident that, while there is no nation-wide marketing authority, the extent to which the orderly marketing of citrus can occur in South Australia is limited only because of the operation of the Commonwealth Constitution, section 92 of which requires that trade, commerce and intercourse between the States shall be absolutely free. That means that we can empower the C.O.C. to control the marketing of citrus within South Australia only if that citrus has been produced in South Australia. As Mr. Dunsford's report sets out, only 10 per cent of local production is marketed in South Australia. The Citrus Organization Committee can have no powers over markets in other States or export of citrus or over bringing citrus into South Australia from other States; it can achieve orderly marketing only through co-operation and through building up goodwill in all sections of the industry.

Some of the methods that have been adopted and some of the disputes that occurred have certainly not been conducive to that. As members are aware, the consequence has been that the committee, from having an initial coverage of 94 per cent of production in South Australia, is now covering only a little more than 60 per cent. I do not know (and other members have expressed a similar doubt) whether the committee will be able to re-establish itself. Certainly there needs to be a clean break with the past and the establishment of a committee that is divorced from the pressure groups that exist within the industry. I have always had doubts about the wisdom of producer-dominated boards, and I think the experience concerning the Citrus Organization Committee is an example where the dangers of a producer-dominated board are only too apparent. I think it is vital in relation to any orderly marketing scheme that the majority on the board or committee concerned with the scheme should be people who are not directly involved in the industry and who do not have direct commercial interests in the industry.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the successful boards?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not saying that grower representatives should not be members of the committee: I am merely saying that, where either producers or special

interests within an industry have a majority on the board, there is a propensity to monopolize and to produce a situation that creates much ill feeling and much further dispute.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Your Party introduced the committee.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am aware of that. I am saying that there is a danger with that sort of board, and the danger has been adequately illustrated by the experience of the Citrus Organization Committee.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Is this general Party policy?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, I am expressing my own opinion on this.

Mr. Millhouse: As a Minister?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am entitled to express my opinion.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you binding your Cabinet colleagues?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No.

Mr. Millhouse: Then you're wasting our time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham not only makes interjections—

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: —that are out or order but he is also getting more and more ill tempered these days, and I think it is a great pity, because he does not do himself justice.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What is your Government's policy in relation to this committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The policy in relation to this committee is that it should no longer be dominated by the interests that are directly associated with the industry. That is the recommendation of Mr. Dunsford, even to the extent of requiring that the grower-representatives on the committee should not have direct commercial interests in the marketing process.

Mr. Hall: That means that no grower would be eligible.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It does not mean that. I will not be subjected to the kind of misinterpretation of which the Leader is so fond. If he is incapable of understanding a simple point, I would appreciate it if he did not take part in the debate. The point is set out clearly in Mr. Dunsford's report, it is a point that I support, and it is incorporated in this legislation. It is important to avoid further conflict such as that which we had over the five years of the existence of the C.O.C. Such conflict will lead only to the breakdown of orderly marketing in the industry. The effectiveness of the C.O.C. can be established only through co-operation and through avoiding further conflict. That means that the committee must not be dominated by any special interest groups within the industry. This is a valid point made by Mr. Dunsford in his report and it is involved in the Bill; it is a point that contains a principle that I support.

If members check previous remarks I have made on related matters they will find that I have expressed a personal opinion that producer-dominated or special interest groups carry certain dangers. I think I said, in relation to the Builders Licensing Board, that if direct interests in the industry controlled the board it could produce restrictive practices that would be inimical to the interests of consumers. The Government's policy is at this stage confined to the C.O.C. It is stated in this Bill, and that is as far as it goes at this time. I have stated my views, and they are on record for any honourable member to check them. I am pleased that members who have spoken in this debate have supported the principle involved in the re-organization of the C.O.C. and the formation of the committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Constitution of committee."

Mr. McANANEY: The Government should be willing at this stage to say who the members of the committee will be, because of the accusations that have been made about the previous committee. The people on the committee who were failures were not the grower members, but other members who had proved failures in their representation on other boards. We should be given this information before we are asked to vote on this clause.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I was expecting the Minister to comment on this matter and say what the Government had in mind in relation to the appointment of this committee. Can the Minister forecast the type of representation the committee will have and, without giving names, at least make a general statement on the form of the new committee?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): It would be improper at this stage for names to be given. Not until the Act has been passed should such information be available. In circumstances where appointments have to be made by the Governor it

would be discourteous and improper for us to do that.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Can you say whether the people representing the interest of growers will be growers?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The requirements are set out in this clause. We are not confined to the appointment of growers. Certainly, the aim would be to appoint growers who, in the opinion of the Government, would adequately represent the general interest of growers and not any specific interests. The purpose is to obtain a committee to run orderly marketing in this industry that is independent of the conflicts and disputes that have caused so much trouble in the last few years.

Mr. McANANEY: Will they be members of the present committee or will they be entirely new members?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not able to reply to that question, as the honourable member would appreciate.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Power to borrow."

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON moved:

That clause 11 (in erased type) be inserted.

Clause inserted.

Title passed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) moved:

*That this Bill be now read a third time.*

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): If some aspects of primary production are difficult to organize, this industry is particularly difficult to organize on the basis of some security in marketing. Not only does it have the difficult situation of a form of production that takes much expenditure, time and organization to set in operation but it also has a production capacity subject to severe fluctuation depending on climatic and other circumstances. The operation of the committee is subject to a lack of interstate discipline. This product can be easily transported. These factors, along with many others, make the committee's task extremely difficult to perform. In addition, the cost squeeze on this type of industry and the effect it has on the expenditure needed to take the product from the producer and put it into the consumer's hands in this inflationary era is always moving against the producer.

It is not with great confidence that I support the legislation, as I know the enormous difficulties confronting the committee. However, I believe that the Parliament and the Government must do the best they can to ensure this industry every chance of success, and succeed it must do on behalf of the producers. I support the Bill knowing full well the enormous difficulties confronting the committee and the industry. These difficulties mount yearly as the cost squeeze works against an industry such as this. As with many other primary industries, in this industry producers compete against each other, causing over-supply in some areas; also, producers in one State compete with those in another. Until some effective means of organizing on more than just a State basis is produced in Australia, I believe the influence of this committee will be greatly nullified. However, with hope rather than optimism, I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): After hearing the Minister, I think this legislation is without much hope. Although we sincerely wish it to bear fruit, I think the situation will be hopeless.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): For the second time this evening, the Leader has spoken on the third reading of a Bill when he did not speak in the second reading debate. I suppose this means that he has elevated himself to the level of a senior statesman, commenting on events after they have passed. However, I think the remark by the member for Heysen deserves some comment, at least the comment that the problems of the citrus industry are of such an order that we should not set out at this stage to knock the re-organization before it has been given a chance to work. Orderly marketing can have great benefits for the individual producers involved in the industry, for it can secure the avoidance of catastrophic price cuts arising from the dumping of fruit at inappropriate times and can secure the improvement of standards and a general higher reurn to growers. I hope that the member for Heysen and other members opposite will do all in their power to see that this reorganization of the citrus industry is given every possible chance to work and succeed, in the interests of the individual growers whose livelihood is at stake.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.57 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

## COMMONWEALTH POWERS (TRADE PRACTICES) BILL

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council Conference Room at 7.45 p.m.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Hon. D. A. Dunstan be a manager at the conference in place of the Hon. L. J. King.

This motion is necessary because conferences on this Bill and another Bill have been arranged for the same time, and I have been nominated as a manager for this House at both conferences.

Motion carried.

At 7.45 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 9.40 p.m.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I have to report that the managers have conferred, but that no agreement was reached.

## DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council Committee Room at 7.45 p.m.

At 7.45 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 9.40 p.m. The recommendation was as follows:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

Later, the Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendation of the conference.

## MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendment No. 1, and that it did not insist on its amendments Nos. 2 and 3 but had made the following alternative amendments in lieu thereof:

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 16 insert new paragraph as follows:

"and

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

(4) An order or direction shall not be made or given under paragraph IVa of subsection (1) of this section in respect of mining for opal or operations incidental or ancillary thereto carried on outside a municipality or district within the meaning of the Local Government Act 1934, as amended or the Flinders Range Planning Area declared under the provisions of the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1967, as amended."

No. 3. Page 3 (clause 4)—After line 32 insert new sections as follows:

"Compensation.

10d. (1) In this section—

"established extractive industry" means an industry of quarrying for stone or other material or extracting or removing sand or clay, carried on at the commencement of the Mines and Works Inspection Act Amendment Act, 1970:

"the Court" means the Land and Valuation Court established under the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1970.

(2) If a person by whom an established extractive industry is carried on is required to comply with an order or direction under paragraph IVa of subsection (1) of section 10 of this Act or with any regulation under paragraph 25 of the second schedule to this Act, and if in consequence the industry cannot be carried on, or cannot be profitably carried on, in the area to which the order, direction or regulation relates, that person may apply to the Court for an order directing the Minister to pay him such compensation as may be fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

(3) Any compensation awarded under this section shall be proportioned to loss sustained or reasonably likely to be sustained in consequence of the order, direction or regulation.

Acquisition of land.

10e. (1) The Minister may subject to and in accordance with the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, acquire any land to which an order or direction under paragraph IVa of subsection (1) of section 10 of this Act or a regulation under paragraph 25 of the second schedule to this Act applies.

(2) If the Minister proceeds to acquire any such land, no order for compensation shall be made under section 10b of this Act."

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be insisted on, and that the Legislative Council's alternative amendments be disagreed to.

The Legislative Council's further amendments make no substantial difference to the objections raised in this Chamber previously. The provision for opal mining, whilst it is not restricted to a particular area of the State, is still in areas that give rise to objections. That there is no mining for opal or likely mining for opal within any of the areas specified in the further amendments makes no difference to the principle of the Bill. What is carefully not covered in the amendments is the likely areas for opal mining in South Australia. No improvement has been made in the other position that was before this Chamber last evenng and was rejected.

Mr. GUNN: I am disappointed at the Premier's attitude, because grave concern has been expressed to me today by representatives of the opal industry. I have received two telegrams from members of the association: one from Mr. Harold Buck, of Andamooka, representing the opal miners there, and one from Mr. Konopka, representing Andamooka miners, and they are concerned at the conflicting statements the Premier has made on this subject. On November 3 the Premier said that this Act would not have any effect on the opal industry.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I did not.

Mr. GUNN: The Premier is reported in *Hansard* of November 3, at page 2299, as saying:

On that matter, the specific provision for the back filling of bulldozer cuts will be introduced as a piece of legislation in the comprehensive revision of the Mining Act. It is not intended that action be taken under the Mines and Works Inspection Act in relation to that matter.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is with bulldozer cuts.

Mr. GUNN: Yes. The Premier said yesterday that the opal miners should not be given treatment that other industries will not receive. Today, I received pleadings from organizations at Andamooka and Coober Pedy, and they have expressed grave concern at what the Government intends to do. If this Bill becomes law it seems that an inspector can make it impossible for mining operations to continue, and an inspector should not have this power under the Bill. I hope the Committee will consider these amendments again, because they have the support of the opal industry. If they are not accepted, the industry will be gravely affected. No Government should take action that may ruin an industry that is of great benefit to South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member started off by saying that the opal industry was concerned at my inconsistent statements, and said that he had telegrams from two people who claimed to be representatives of the opal industry—

Mr. Gunn: And they do represent it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and who are not.

Mr. Gunn: They are.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They are not representatives of the opal industry.

Mr. Gunn: I challenge you to go and tell them that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have told them to their face and I will tell them again.

Mr. Gunn: You go to Andamooka and Coober Pedy and do so!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Government members have visited Andamooka and Coober Pedy recently.

Mr. Gunn: And so have I.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case I can only wish that the honourable member would show some consistency. I remember him coming to me with pastoralists of the area and not saying what he is saying now about the effects on the opal-mining industry in that area.

Mr. Gunn: I took a pastoralist to you because he wanted to see you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member and the Hon. Mr. Whyte, a Legislative Council member for the Northern District, introduced this man to me and presented cogent evidence.

Mr. Gunn: I did not present it.

Mr. Langley: You would be incapable of doing that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All I can say is that the honourable member sat there and nodded.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Earlier today you had a different point of view.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the member for Eyre had intended to disagree with his constituent, one would think that one would have heard about it.

Mr. Millhouse: Why? He said he introduced a deputation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Hon. Mr. Whyte most certainly vociferously agreed with the constituent.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You are not talking to the Hon. Mr. Whyte now.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the member for Eyre had disagreed with the evidence and the proposition put to me, he was extraordinarily reticent. It was extraordinary that after I had discussed it with him, with Mr. Whyte, and the pastoralists of the area and pointed out what we were trying to do, the honourable member thanked me for my consideration. There is not the slightest inconsistency with what is being done here and the remarks that appear on page 2299 of *Hansard*, which are clear that, on the matter of bulldozer backfilling, this Act is not involved. The draft Mining Bill, which has been circulated to the opal mining industry, is involved. For the honourable member or any other person who has anything to do with the opal-mining industry to say that the industry has

not had the utmost consideration from this Government is nonsense. A great many of the proposals of the opal-mining industry have been incorporated in the draft Mining Bill, and the honourable member knows that very well, as do opal miners. What is proposed here is that every other quarry owner and every person involved in the extractive industry—every person involved in mining anywhere, whether it be Burra, Kapunda, Coffin Bay, the West Coast or Kanmantoo—

Mr. Jennings: Bull Creek.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not heard of mining in Bull Creek, but perhaps the member for the district will tell me what extractive industry is there. All those things are to be dealt with under the Mines and Works Inspection Act to ensure that the amenity of the area is not destroyed and that reasonable mining practices proceed. This is not something that apparently is to apply to opal miners. What justice is there in suggesting that opal miners should not comply in any way with what the rest of the mining industry agrees is necessary, for the extractive industry is not objecting now to the necessity for provisions of this kind? It is not putting forward amendments to say that these powers should not exist and that the plans for the development of its extractions from the soil should be changed. Only today the member for Alexandra was most concerned about rutile mining at Kangaroo Island.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's entirely different from opal mining.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not suggesting that opal is found in the beach sands of Nepean Bay, but I suggest that these same principles apply and that the area has to be preserved. The evidence given to this Government by the member for Eyre's constituent, who is a pastoralist in the area, shows there has been great depredation worked on the area by careless opal mining that has nothing to do with bulldozer cuts, and that much of the pastoral area has been destroyed because of careless mining operations that need not have occurred if entirely reasonable economic and sensible provisions had been undertaken. That is all that is being asked for. Why is it that opal miners can wreck the countryside while the people in the Flinders Ranges, at Exoil or Transoil and all those people prospecting in that most valuable and vital area of the State are to be required to carry out mining operations sensibily and effectively to preserve the natural environment and ecology of the area?

I cannot understand why the honourable member is suggesting that some extraordinary privilege should be given to opal miners that will be given to no-one else, particularly as the draft Mining Bill circulated to opal miners has preserved and intends to preserve to opal miners the form of mining necessary to small mining operations, which are the basis of present opal-mining operations and which are completely different from the kinds of licence that will be given under the new Mining Bill to wider mining, which relates now to the geophysical and geochemical surveys necessary to the discovery of minerals in South Australia that are so valuable to us. Every consideration has been given to the industry. What I said as reported in *Hansard* and as quoted by the honourable member relating to bulldozer backfilling is true. There is nothing in this Act covering that matter which is spelt out in the draft Mining Bill, which has been circulated to the opal-mining industry and which is not yet before the House, but it will be before us later this session.

Mr. HALL: The Premier shows his ignorance of the opal-mining industry by asking, "Why can't it comply as other extractive industries are complying?" He obviously does not think the opal-mining industry is an extraordinary industry. If anyone takes the trouble to study it, he will find it is an extraordinary industry, and unlike any other mining or extractive industry in South Australia. The Premier knows very well that quarries in the Hills, limestone deposits at Coffin Bay and copper at Kanmantoo are known deposits and are extracted on an economic basis: those who work them know the economics of them before they begin and can calculate from the start whether or not not they can fulfil the conditions the Mines Department may put on reinstatement of the area. The opal industry is entirely different, being based on thousands of individual operators who operate on two systems. One system is underground mining and the other is open cut. Can any member say how many people who put down an underground mine strike payable opal? Everyone knows that only a small fraction of mines is payable. Less than half produce anything like a worthwhile return to the owner.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: So they can wreck the countryside!

Mr. HALL: We are not talking about letting anyone deliberately wreck the countryside. We are talking about the Government's intentions

of destroying a $16,000,000 industry. Not just the people who operate on the field will be affected, but hundreds of people in the city of Adelaide who are employed in the machinery industry and in the bulldozer industry will be affected by the provisions of the Bill. The Premier does not know this or he has failed to see it. Let him talk to the people who make Caterpillar and International tractors about how they value their business at Coober Pedy. In an earlier debate the Premier has said that the matter of bulldozing would be dealt with separately, and he has repeated this this evening, but I take this to be a general provision for the opal-mining industry. Earlier I asked the Premier a question. The Premier should talk to opal miners rather than try to insult Opposition members and talk of nodding heads. I give the Premier credit for having more common sense than that. I said:

There has been much publicity specifically in the opal-mining industry and questions have been asked about the Government's intention regarding the back-filling of bulldozer cuts in particular.

Then I asked the Premier whether he would say what was the Government's intention in this regard. The Premier then gave the reply that has been quoted tonight. At the end of that reply, he stated:

Although the Mines and Works Inspection Act applies to the whole State and not only to the planning areas, it is intended that the opal-mining situation be specifically legislated for rather than that there be an administrative provision.

*Members interjecting*:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! There will be one speech at a time. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: The Leader was about to read on.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That would damage his case.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. HALL: We have an extremely intelligent group opposite this evening. They can interject and deride any argument put in favour of an industry worth about $16,000,000. The Premier has said that the matter of back-filling bulldozer cuts will be dealt with in other legislation. Therefore, the present argument centres on what the Government intends to do with the underground mining provisions in relation to the opal-mining industry and what will be asked of that industry. It is important to know what the Government has in mind for it, because it is obvious to anyone who has studied the opal-mining fields and the persons living there and making an industry of the operations that it will be impossible for most opal miners to take part in any expensive back-filling under the existing system of mining.

It will be the death warrant of the industry if expensive requirements are demanded of them. I have been down an opal mine and have shovelled the dirt out, and I have spoken to the miners on the field. It is fatuous nonsense to say that they are making a fortune. Only a few of them are doing well. If a provision in this Bill states that significant back-filling will be required, the industry will become a skeleton of its present position. We have not been told what the Government has in mind for the industry in relation to direct expense. I am speaking not of the big companies, such as Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited or Broken Hill South, but of the individuals who are deeply in debt, hoping to make a strike soon.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What the Government proposes is what the Leader's Government also proposed. The provisions in this Bill are exactly the same as the provisions proposed by the Minister of Mines in the Leader's Government and agreed to by his Cabinet. I have the Cabinet approval of this measure, and our Bill is in exactly the same terms, except for the appeal provisions that we wrote in. The Bill provides that, in the proceeding of any mining operation, reasonable provisions are to be made for the preservation of the area in which the mining is taking place, given the need to look after the area and the economics of the mining operation. That is what was proposed by the previous Government, adopted by it, and accepted by Cabinet. The Bill was printed. Later, it was accepted by our Government, because the representations that have been made to the previous Government and the decision that that Government had made were entirely proper.

Mr. EVANS: I take it that the Bill covers the whole State?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

Mr. EVANS: I take it that, under the terms of the Bill as now printed, if an inspector of mines wished to ask a particular operator to back-fill a particular operation, he could do so. I consider that the matter regarding bulldozers is already covered if the inspector wishes to make an order. I refer particularly to the provision that the inspector may require

the restoration of the land in a prescribed manner. Surely this gives the inspector the right to say that he wants a particular cut back-filled. I wonder what other sort of regulation or control we can bring about in this area. I have had experience in quarrying and, in the main, I believe in this type of Bill, giving some control over quarries and mining.

However, I consider opal mining different from other types of mining or quarrying, because of the uncertainty about the presence of a particular product. Further, many bulldozers operate at Coober Pedy. I do not consider that further control is necessary. The Premier has told us that there will be greater control than already exists in the Bill. Bulldozer operators moved into Coober Pedy from 1965 on, when they could not get earthworks anywhere else. That was during the term of office of the Labor Government and the operators went there because there was no alternative.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): Members opposite seem to be arguing that, because we are dealing with prospecting, that gives the right to destroy and despoliate, to do what one likes with the country, in such a way that does not apply to persons involved in a payable mining proposition, and that only on this basis is the Legislative Council amendment exempting the opal-mining industry from the provisions of clause 3 to be justified. That position is not tenable. Does the Leader, the member for Fisher or the member for Eyre suggest that any prospector, whether for opals, oil, natural gas, copper, or anything else, because he has not necessarily got a payable proposition, should have the right to tear up the country and destroy the use of the country in any other way? Surely, that is not a proposition that any member interested in conservation, rather than in playing politics, can sustain. Surely the issue is one of conservation, basically, and if a rule is good enough to prevail in relation to quarrying or any other form of mining—

Mr. Becker: How can you conserve a desert?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This really constitutes the Opposition's attitude. I suppose the whole North-West can be forgotten! If the Opposition cares about conservation, it will reject the Legislative Council's amendment and agree that we simply cannot make fish of one group and fowl of another. It is about time certain people in this State forgot about making a fast buck or about looking after others who were making a fast buck and took an interest in preserving the land in which we live, even if it is desert.

Mr. HALL: There seems to be a contradiction between the Minister of Education and the Premier, the Premier having said that this legislation was ours. Regarding the Premier's statement that our Bill was printed, and so on, the previous Minister told me that he had given an undertaking that prior to introducing the Bill he would discuss it with members of the industry in relation to their needs, and that is where is was left with him. No-one is talking about allowing unrestricted ravaging of the South Australian environment. When I was last on the Coober Pedy opal fields I discussed the matter with operators who were working bulldozer cuts to a depth of 60ft. I believe that, with proper communication with the opal industry itself and with co-operation from the mining inspectors, much can be done to have a proper working of the claims instituted, without a great economic imposition on those who work the fields. I believe that a sensible approach can be adopted through making use of the great area of organization that exists and that it will not be possible to use the sort of sledge-hammer attack on the industry that the Minister of Education is advocating, because that will ruin an industry on which thousands of people rely at present.

Only a few months ago the Opposition Whip and I were on the opal fields and taking part in the operations there, and I know something of the working in the area and of the economics involved. One of the bulldozer operators had been working for 4½ months and, although he was an efficient operator, he had obtained no opal at all. Then there were two other people who were using a grid-drilling system in an effort to find an intersecting opal vein. Although they had been doing this for two years, they had achieved no result. This is the story across the opal fields. I want to know what the Government intends to do in this most delicate of areas which, I remind the Premier, involves an exploratory industry.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you apply the exemptions to oil prospectors, copper prospectors, or any other prospectors?

Mr. HALL: The Minister knows that that is entirely different and that in most cases it involves wealthy companies.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson. Come on!

Mr. HALL: What does the Minister mean by that?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Get your facts right for once in your life.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. HALL: There are wealthy mineral exploratory organizations in this State that are not faced with the problem that confronts the opal-mining industry. Many operators use the sort of drilling system, whether it be for oil or any other minerals, that involves exploration and does not greatly alter the environment. I ask the Premier specifically what has the department and he in mind as a regulation for underground mining, which will apparently come under this Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest to the Leader that he read the Bill that his Government agreed to: that is, that in certain circumstances the mines inspector may make orders in relation to the mining operation to ensure the maintenance of the amenities of the area. It has been explained time and again during the debates in this Chamber that all that is proposed here is that in mining operations reasonable plans be agreed with the mining operators, so that it can be ensured that the area is not despoiled needlessly and uneconomically. The Leader has suggested that it is possible to obtain from mining operators in this area reasonable co-operation to ensure that the area is not despoiled, and I agree that that is possible. The Leader knows that there are a few people, and particularly a few people involved in the opal industry, whose attitude is that nothing shall stand in their way no matter what they do. They have expressed that point of view to me specifically, unlike other mining operators. We need some means to say to those who are unco-operative, "We expect you to co-operate the same way as reasonable people." That is all the Bill is about.

I point out to the Leader that the undertaking given by his Government to consult the opal miners was the same undertaking given by my Government to consult opal miners, and that was on the draft Mining Bill. The Opal Miners Association and the progress associations in the area, anyone who asked for the draft, the people who saw me previously and those who attended meetings addressed by members of my Party, and the member for the area who preceded the member for Eyre: all these people received drafts of the Mining Bill and were invited to comment. It is absurd to say that they have not been consulted and that they have no details. What is asked for here in relation to the Mines and Works Inspection Act is the reasonable and sensible co-operation between the industry and the Mines Department that the Leader said was entirely possible.

Mr. EVANS: I refer one or two points to the Minister of Education. I have not said that I agree to the amendments: I have said that it is a different type of industry. I did not speak to these amendments last evening: those amendments were not the same as these, although they were similar. My speech in relation to the Bill was identical with what I would have said whether I was in or out of Government, but there were some points on which I disagreed to the Bill. The Premier's assumption that the Bill was accepted by all on this side is not correct, because we have the right as individuals to differ in our views, if we wish, from those of our colleagues. We are not bound by a Party pledge. I make the point that there is a big difference between a person's mining for opal with a bulldozer and operating down a shaft underground. I agree that one is a much more rapid process of despoiling the surface area, but a person cannot place back in the hole all the soil that he has removed from it. It will not go back.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What has this got to do with these amendments?

Mr. EVANS: If we persevere with the intention of the Bill and try to have all the soil replaced in the hole, we shall find that that is impossible. The Minister of Education said that the industry was out to make a fast buck, and I agree. I did not suggest at any time that we should forget opal miners and let them drift on. I said that this was a different type of industry and needed to be considered differently.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You will not accept the Legislative Council's amendments?

Mr. EVANS: I have not said that I would support or reject them. I was trying to ascertain from the Premier how far he would like controls to go in relation to open-cut opal mining, whether the mines should back-fill, and whether there should be bigger claims so that the miners could operate one cut at a time and fill as they go. The Minister said this would come later, but some statement of intention now would be a guide to those discussing this Bill. I have never said that we should not have control over quarries or mines or that we should not try to restore and beautify areas.

I said that an open cut such as Kanmantoo, where there will be a 600ft. cut in the ground with all material taken away, cannot be economically filled, although the edge can be beautified and plants grown inside the cut. In the case of opal mines it may be possible to fill all the open cuts and spread surplus waste to perhaps a satisfactory level according to the mines inspector. If that were done I believe the bulldozer operators would be put out of the opal fields. Underground miners would find it much more difficult, but they would not be put out of the industry.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have made clear many times that the question of back-filling or bulldozer cuts is not covered in the Mines and Works Inspection Act. What is intended here is that the mining operation proceed in a reasonable manner without unreasonable and uneconomic despoliation of the general countryside. The Act provides for disposing of overburden and seeing to it where overburden occurs it is disposed of in a reasonable manner. An inspector can make immediate orders, but there is an appeal provision in the Act. I have told members what our policy is in this matter: that is, that there will be special provisions for the opal-mining industry in the new Mining Bill to be introduced later this session and the question of back-filling of cuts will be dealt with in that Bill. At present, we are concerned with matters set out in this Bill to ensure that there is reasonable disposal of waste materials from the mines, and that there is a plan for mining development that will not wreck the countryside.

Mr. EVANS: Do you agree that an inspector could force operators to back-fill under this legislation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He could demand that, but I have told members what the policy of the Government is, and there is an appeal provision and an administrative direction in relation to it. That is not what will arise under this measure.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Broomhill, Dunstan, Mathwin, Rodda, and Slater.

## WEST LAKES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

H9

## SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PENSIONS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (PENSIONS)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## COMMONWEALTH PLACES (ADMINISTRATION OF LAWS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

## DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MARIHUANA)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2139.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): In view of the proceedings that have taken place this evening, I move:

That this Bill be read and discharged.

Bill read and discharged.

## FOOD AND DRUGS ACT REGULATIONS: CYCLAMATE

Order of the Day, Other Business, No. 9: The Hon. D. H. McKee to move:

That regulations 2, 4 and 6 of the regulations made on February 12, 1970, under the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1962, in respect of the labelling of any food containing cyclamate, and laid on the table of this House on April 28, 1970, be disallowed.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation having taken further evidence from the Public Health Department and the soft drink manufacturers, and the Minister of Health in Victoria having informed that committee that similar regulations will come into operation in Victoria on April 1, 1971, I move:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

## ADJOURNMENT

At 11.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, December 3, at 2 p.m.