HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SOCIAL WELFARE ACT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Wednesday, when speaking on the motion to go into Committee of Supply to consider the Supplementary Estimates, I canvassed, amongst other things, the matter of the Government's failure to introduce, this session, amendments to the Social Welfare Act. I referred to a Question on Notice that I had asked last Tuesday and to the reply by the Minister of Social Welfare. The question and the reply appear at page 4459 of *Hansard*. During the course of my speech I was accused by interjection by members opposite (notably the Minister of Roads and Transport and the member for Elizabeth) of having deliberately misquoted the question to get some debating advantage. Those interjections and accusations appear at page 4575 of *Hansard*. When the Minister of Social Welfare spoke in the debate, he also made this accusation against me at three separate points in his speech (at pages 4583 and 4584 of *Hansard*), although I had denied any wish deliberately to misquote and said that I did not believe I had misquoted. Of course, during this debate the *Hansard* transcript was not available. On its becoming available some time after Question Time on Thursday, I immediately checked what I had said. I find that I am reported as quoting the question (which, as I have said, appears at page 4575 of *Hansard*) accurately and in full. I make this personal explanation in case any member should still feel (if any member really ever did) that I had attempted to mislead the House)—

Mr. Clark: I can assure you that I did, and still do.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and I look for an apology from the Ministers and the honourable member involved.

QUESTIONS

KANGAROO ISLAND LAND

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to review the departmental decision ordering the sale of Mr. C. J. Berryman's property and stock on Kangaroo Island? If the Minister cannot stay proceedings indefinitely, will he arrange to have the sale of the stock carried out at a more seasonally and financially advantageous time? The case of Mr. Berryman, which has received much publicity, is a case that I have been reluctant to enter upon, on the basis that it involves an administrative decision taken after longstanding surveys of his business situation. However, it is common knowledge that other settlers on Kangaroo Island are in similar trouble, and it is also known that Mr. Berryman has developed a rather large cattle herd on his property and therefore is probably in a better position to meet a debt situation than are some others whose properties may be based entirely on sheep, wool and lamb production. I consider that that supports a request to have the whole question of this forced sale reviewed in relation to this gentleman. Also, responsible neighbours of Mr. Berryman vouch for the quality of the cattle grazed on his property. They say that this is the normal time for such stock in that situation to be in poor condition, that the quality of the cattle is at least as good as that of other cattle on adjoining properties, and that by spring and early summer Mr. Berryman's cattle normally will be in excellent condition and, of course, worth much more than they are worth now. As about 300 cattle are involved, many thousands of dollars is involved, and not only the return to the department but also any residue that may be available for Mr. Berryman is involved. Therefore, there seems to be every good reason, on a management basis, for delaying the sale while the major question of review is also considered.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to confer with my colleague on the points the Leader has raised and to bring down a reply as soon as possible.

MURRAY STORAGES

Mr. CURREN: Can the Premier report to the House any substantial progress in discussions with the Commonwealth Government and the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria on the amended River Murray Waters Agreement? Press reports this morning indicate that this matter was discussed in Canberra yesterday, and there is an indication that a softer attitude is being adopted, particularly by the Premier of Victoria.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Commonwealth Minister for National Development was not available in Canberra when we were there yesterday. However, we had discussions with

the Premiers of New South Wales and Victoria. The Premier of New South Wales has said that he is having the whole matter reconsidered immediately, and he has invited our Minister of Works to confer with the New South Wales Minister, as well as the Victorian Minister, at an early date. The Premier of Victoria indicated that Victoria's commitment on the matter would be decided as soon as the amount of Loan money to be available to that State next year was known. However, Sir Henry Bolte did not raise any difficulties about proceeding, provided that his Government considered that it was in a financial position to proceed. He said that there need otherwise be no delay as Victoria, which is the construction authority, has been proceeding to plan in relation to the construction of the Dartmouth dam. Subsequent to our talks in Canberra, an arrangement has been made for the Minister of Works to meet the relevant Ministers from New South Wales and Victoria on April 16.

WATER RATING

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works say what will be the impact on this State's revenue of the measures in relation to water rating assessments that were set out in the Treasurer's speech on February 23? The Treasurer then said that the standard charge of 35c a thousand gallons for rebate water would be increased to 40c, while the charge for excess water would not be altered. He also said that valuations, which were 7 per cent to 10 per cent below the then current rates, would be restored to parity. However, the Treasurer did not say how much revenue was expected to be raised as a result of the measures mentioned in his Ministerial statement. I therefore ask him what these increases will be. From my experience, I realize that on July 1 the Minister of Works must declare the rates for the coming year. When I was the Minister responsible for this matter, bitter accusations were made against me by members of the Minister's own Party when I increased the charges. I should like also to know when the House is to be informed of the recommendations of the committee which inquired into water rating and which was set up by the previous Government.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I believe Treasury officials estimate that about $2,000,000 a year will accrue to the Government as a result of the alterations to which the honourable member has referred. However, I will check that for the honourable member and give him an accurate figure if (as I think would have happened) an assessment has been made. Regarding the Sangster committee's report, Cabinet approved two weeks ago the setting up of a working committee to evaluate the report. The report was given without any evaluations having been made, and it is expected that it will take about nine months for this evaluation to take place, as many complications flow from the report. When that evaluation has been completed, Treasury officers will examine it, and it will then be some time before I can give the House any further information on the report. However, I assure the honourable member that the Government is considering the report.

PRISONERS' HAIRCUTS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to investigate the cutting and shaving that occurs whenever a person, whose hair is somewhat longer than that of the Minister of Education or whose beard is either more or less luxuriant than that of the member for Bragg, is placed in prison? Discussion on this topic has become current in the community as a result of two well publicized cases when men were recently imprisoned and had their hair cut and beards shaved. I understand that in previous days this practice was carried out because of the dangers of lice infestation, but I consider that this could easily be covered by some sort of inspection of men when they are placed in gaol. Apart from that, it seems to me that the practice is merely a relic of nineteenth century penology.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to the Chief Secretary and obtain a reply.

STURT HIGHWAY

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider having changed the name of that section of Sturt Highway between Gawler and Nuriootpa via Lyndoch and Tanunda? This matter has been discussed by the Angaston and Tanunda councils and the corporation of Gawler, agreement having been reached in principle. The suggested name for this part of the highway is the Barossa Valley Highway or the Barossa Valley Scenic Highway. The road that bypasses Gawler, extending to Greenock and Nuriootpa is known (albeit not officially) as the Sturt Highway. In these circumstances, the matter having been considered by the appropriate bodies, will the Minister consider this change of name?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I take it from the comment or explanation of the honourable

member that this matter has been considered by the three corporations concerned. If those bodies, in the normal course, convey their views to me, those views will certainly be considered and, if it is desirable to change it to the Barossa Highway, the Goldsworthy Valley Highway, or the Kavel Valley Highway, I will consider that matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: They don't want it called the Virgo Highway!

DENTAL CHARGES

Mr. WELLS: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked on March 9 about dental charges and other associated matters?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary and the Premier are looking closely at the cost of private dental services. Fees recommended by the Australian Dental Association have been examined, as are possible ways of keeping these costs within the ability of people to pay for necessary services.

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to grant an interview to officers of the Dental Technicians Association to hear their reason for trying to obtain "contractual chair-side status" and their views on other relevant matters? On March 9, I asked the Attorney the question to which he has been courteous enough to reply today. However, in my opinion that is only a partial reply and does not mention the interview and other matters that I raised, as reported in *Hansard*. Will the Attorney ask his colleague to give urgent attention to my request?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall refer the question to the Minister and obtain a reply.

BORDERTOWN RACING

Mr. RODDA: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the Bordertown Racing Club?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary has considered this matter but is satisfied that the allocation of racing dates is a domestic matter of racing administration.

COORONG

Mr. NANKIVELL: I have been heartened to see support being given to my 12-year campaign to have something done about improving the condition of the Coorong, and I notice that this matter is now being taken up in the press. I should therefore like to give the Minister for Conservation an opportunity to say what is intended to be done in this regard and what investigations, if any, and proposals the Government may have in mind to remedy the present situation in which this area, which is a natural attraction, is deteriorating, largely because of the effect, as is well known, of drainage and other interferences resulting from Government works.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member showed his interest in this matter by asking a similar question recently, in reply to which I pointed out that I was concerned about the future of the Coorong and the stagnation that has occurred during the last six years as a result of the drainage scheme in the South-East. I told him that investigations had been made into the proposals canvassed by him in relation to diverting waters into the Coorong from areas adjacent to it. Three years ago I believe the cost involved in such a scheme would have been about $8,000,000 and it was pointed out then that there was no guarantee that the expenditure of this sum would have the desired effect. As a result of that report, I asked for further investigations to be made and I have asked for consideration to be given to the proposals canvassed in the press recently that a channel could be cut out to sea. It is doubted whether this is a practicable solution, but I shall be pleased to let the honourable member know what are the results of that investigation.

LAND TAX

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Treasurer say whether the expected land tax returns from rural land within the newly created metropolitan area have been included in the total of rural land tax for 1971-72? Earlier this session the metropolitan area was defined to include a large area of hitherto rural land in the hundreds of Port Adelaide and Munno Para. Whether the returns from this land are now shown in the figures he has given the House as being of rural land origin or whether they have been taken from the total to be received from rural lands is of considerable importance. The proximity of these properties to the Adelaide metropolitan area of necessity makes them fairly valuable and the land tax returns from these properties have played a considerable part in the total received in respect of rural areas in previous years. I ask this question so that we can fully appreciate the figure of $1,000,000 compared to $1,100,000 that has been mentioned by the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

PORT LINCOLN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say whether it is planned to leave the wooden buildings at the proposed new Port Lincoln High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know that the new plans will be ready shortly but I cannot answer the honourable member's question in detail. The Port Lincoln High School site is a difficult one for the design and upgrading of the high school; this is certainly the opinion of the architects who have been working on the project. Whether or not the wooden craft block will be left, I do not know.

NON-EXEMPT SHOPS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked last week about shops not exempted under the Early Closing Act?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: An exempt shop can stock and sell non-exempt goods as well as exempt goods, provided that the non-exempt goods are locked away either in cabinets or on screened shelves after 5.30 p.m., Monday to Friday, and 12.30 p.m. on Saturday, and remain locked away all day on Sundays and public holidays. A non-exempt shop (other than hairdressers' shops and service stations which hold a licence to sell at certain times on public holidays) cannot open on Easter Saturday. An exempt shop can open on that day but all non-exempt goods must be locked away as detailed above. For this Easter, the above applies only within the metropolitan area which existed before last year's amendment to the legislation, and country shopping districts. The shop trading hours do not apply in the fringe area of the new metropolitan area until April 13, 1971, which is the day after Easter, so for this Easter there is no restriction on the trading hours of any shop which is situated within the new metropolitan area but outside the old metropolitan area.

The old metropolitan area comprised the municipalities of Adelaide, Brighton, Burnside, Campbelltown, Enfield, Glenelg, Henley and Grange, Hindmarsh, Kensington and Norwood, Marion, Mitcham, Payneham, Port Adelaide, Prospect, St. Peters, Thebarton, Unley, Walkerville, West Torrens, Woodville, and the Garden Suburb. The area which may still open on Easter Saturday this year, that is, the area to which the new legislation will apply after April 13, 1971, consists of the municipalities of Elizabeth, Gawler, Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully, the district council districts of Munno Para, East Torrens, and Noarlunga, and those parts of the district councils of Meadows and Willunga affected by the new legislation.

SCHOOL CLASSROOMS

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education say when additional classrooms will be added to the Hallett and Burra Primary Schools? For some time, the Hallett Primary School has been promised an additional classroom. At present, the third teacher's class is conducted in an enclosed galvanized iron verandah; conditions have been hot this summer, and they will be cold in winter. With the influx of children as a result of the current mining operations, the accommodation of the Burra Primary School is over-taxed at present.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I understand that the problem at Burra has been made more difficult by the closing of the local parish school. As the honourable member was good enough to telephone my office yesterday morning on this matter, I asked for an immediate report on it so that I might give him a detailed reply this afternoon. Although I cannot do that at this stage, I will do my best to have the information available for him by tomorrow.

ADELAIDE ABATTOIRS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the cleaning of the yards at the Adelaide abattoir?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague has informed me that the cleaning of the Adelaide abattoir yards is carried out in ordinary working hours whenever possible, having regard to normal market requirements and the availability of labour. Although there are only two sale days a week, it is necessary to pen stock prior to sale. In the case of sheep and lambs, this starts on Tuesday morning for the Wednesday sale. The carrying out of actual sale day operations, and the clearing of the market following sales, leaves only limited normal working time for cleaning the yards, a position which can be aggravated by adverse weather conditions. Overtime is not authorized unnecessarily but, in view of adverse criticism which usually follows a report of unclean yards, it is a direction by the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board to resort to overtime cleaning when the state of the yards warrants this action.

HOSPITAL DENTISTS

Mr. BECKER: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about dentists in hospitals?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that in the past month two dentists have been appointed to the Dental Department at Royal Adelaide Hospital on a permanent basis and a further three on a temporary basis. There are still, however, four vacancies to be filled and every effort is being made to recruit dentists to fill these vacancies. A major reorganization of the Dental Department has been planned and it is at present under consideration by the Public Service Board. Two very senior positions, namely, those of Director of Restorative Dentistry and Director of Orthodontics, have been created and are currently being advertised both locally and overseas and these, with a further position of Senior Dentist with a special interest in radiology which is being investigated, comprise the first stage of the reorganization. The second stage, which will proceed upon appointments being made to the above positions, will incorporate changes in the classifications and numbers of the supporting staff of the Dental Department. It is stressed however that there is a serious shortage of dentists, and vacancies continue to exist despite widespread advertising. The means test for outpatient treatment at Royal Adelaide Hospital, including dental treatment, was recently reviewed and Cabinet approval given to a new eligibility means test scale effective from February 1, 1971, the same date as new dental fees were introduced. The allowable income levels under the new eligibility scales, compared with the previous scale, are slightly higher for single persons and appreciably higher for families, particularly those with more than three children.

GRASSHOPPERS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Agriculture Department is making available to farmers and landholders in the North of the State spray for the spraying of grasshoppers, large numbers of which are now appearing there? For some time the department has been aware of what could be a problem in the North. The departmental officer (Mr. Peter Birks) has kept in close touch with what is happening in these northern areas. At present large hatchings of grasshoppers of the locust type are worrying landholders.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will get a report for the honourable member.

BUILDERS LICENSING BOARD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the Builders Licensing Board?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Builders Licensing Board has met on 32 occasions since May, 1970, and Mr. Baulderstone has missed 14 meetings owing to illness. Some of these meetings have been held until late at night and, on medical advice, Mr. Baulderstone has sought leave from these meetings although his health has improved. However, he has been able to attend the last five daytime meetings and, as it appears that the necessity for night and weekend meetings has now passed, I hope Mr. Baulderstone's ill health will not hinder his regular attendance. He is a most valuable member of the board, his advice having been sought on many occasions.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Works tell the House what is the present position regarding storages in metropolitan reservoirs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's interest in this matter and I am sure the information is also of much interest to all other members. I always have the figures with me on Tuesday, in case such a question is asked. The information is as follows:

Supply	Capacity (gall.)	Storage (last year) (gall.)	Storage (present) (gall.)
Mount Bold	10,440,000,000	3,847,000,000	3,384,100,000
Happy Valley	2,804,000,000	1,702,500,000	2,440,900,000
Clarendon Weir	72,000,000	72,000,000	70,400,000
Myponga	5,905,000,000	3,087,000,000	3,357,700,000
Millbrook	3,647,000,000	956,100,000	475,900,000
Kangaroo Creek	5,370,000,000	242,200,000	1,174,000,000
Hope Valley	765,000,000	632,000,000	453,000,000
Thorndon Park	142,000,000	113,200,000	105,500,000
Barossa	993,000,000	830,600,000	902,800,000
South Para	11,300,000,000	6,667,900,000	6,407,400,000
Totals	41,438,000,000	18,150,500,000	18,771,700,000

If the present weather continues, I expect these storages to be depleted severely.

HOLIDAY MAGIC

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Attorney-General investigate the business firm of Holiday Magic? A constituent who spoke to me the other day, and who has lost many thousands of dollars in this project, has suggested to me that, apparently, when a person begins operations, he buys in as a master and, for this privilege, pays $3,300 by bank cheque and then signs an agreement form as a distributor. The person concerned then has to join the Consumers Retail Service, which is really Holiday Magic, at a cost of another $45 a month. Next, the person must belong to the Holiday Magic Centre, which costs another $65 a month, and each master must do an A.G. course, which costs another $150. The person's wife must do a trainer general course, at a cost of another $75. My constituent claims that many people who have taken out second mortgages on their houses and businesses to buy into this firm have lost their life savings on this venture.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment.

Mr. MATHWIN: The cases I have been told of suggest that there is cause for investigation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This matter has been considered and I think I have replied to at least one question about it previously. In view of the facts stated by the honourable member. I shall have the matter examined again.

KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about progress on work on the Polda-Kimba main?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Progress on the Polda-Kimba main has been very satisfactory and mainlaying is now about 3.8 miles ahead of schedule. Excavation as planned is about .3 miles ahead of pipe laying. The department's pipe requirements for this and many other schemes are known and scheduled for production at the factory of James Hardie & Company Proprietary Limited and no problem is expected in maintaining supply. Because of the need to maintain close control over spending it has been necessary to restrict pipe purchases very closely to requirements and also to direct activities more towards work with a high labour component. Fund allocation on the scheme of $575,000 will be fully spent this financial year.

DRIVERS' LICENCES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Government intends to introduce a system of provisional or probationary licences for newly-licensed motor car drivers in South Australia? The leading article in a recent issue of the *Medical Journal of Australia* states:

> The role of experience—or lack of it—is not very clear at the present time, but there is some evidence that people are at higher risk of involvement in a traffic accident during the first few years of their driving experience, whatever their age.

The report goes on to state that there are pros and cons about whether the introduction of the provisional licence scheme reduces the number of accidents or acts as a deterrent. I should be interested to know whether the Government has further considered introducing this system.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the former Government considered the introduction of provisional licences and also the introduction of a points demerit system, and it decided at that time to introduce the latter rather than the provisional licence plan, considering that it was undesirable to introduce both. As the honourable member knows, we are introducing the points demerit plan, the legislation being before the House at present. Nevertheless, the Government is examining the provisional licence scheme, but I cannot say more than that. The matter is certainly not a dead issue, but I cannot say that the scheme will be introduced: it is being examined.

INSURANCE

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Attorney-General say why claims by insurance companies for recovery of vehicle damage from Motor Marine and General Insurance Company are now being served on persons who have insured with that company? As I understand that the company is not in receivership or liquidation, should not these claims be brought against the company now?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I imagine that the claims to which the honourable member refers are claims by persons who have suffered damage to property as a result of the negligent driving of a motorist who insured with Motor Marine and General and, in those circumstances, the proceedings would be instituted against the individual motorist, who would then be obliged to report it to his insurer (in this case M.M. & G.), and the insurer would have the right to take over the matter at the stage to which the honourable member has

referred, to make a claim, and to bring proceedings. The claims referred to by the honourable member would be claims by motorists who have suffered damage against motorists whose driving has caused the damage involved. What follows after that is a matter between the defendant motorist and his insurer, in this case M.M. & G. What is happening at present regarding the relations of the defendant (or insured) motorist and M.M. & G., I do not know. However, I do not think there is any doubt that the procedure up to the point that the honourable member has described is correct.

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Attorney-General say whether he is aware of any moves in South Australian insurance circles to set up a fund to cater for the liability of persons who are insured in respect of property damaged in vehicle accidents and whose insurance company fails? I understand that at present a fund exists for a similar purpose in relation to compulsory third party bodily injury liabilities.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Although no such plan exists, I will look into the matter.

DEFECTIVE VEHICLES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether he took any action, following the allegations made several weeks ago by a Labor member of the House of Representatives (Dr. Gun) that Chrysler vehicles from the Lonsdale plant were unsafe, I think because of a lack of effective inspection procedures, and, if he did take action, what action did he take? About three weeks ago Dr. Gun made these very serious allegations regarding the safety of vehicles from the Chrysler plant—so serious that they would not, I am certain, have been ignored by the Minister. I have been waiting ever since, because of the allegations that were made, for an announcement of action taken by the Government. Members on both sides of this House are conscious of vehicle safety, and, as no announcement has been made of any action taken, I ask this question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As I understand the position, this company, during a period of industrial disturbance, ran into difficulties regarding the safety of some components of its cars. I understand that the Commonwealth member for Kingston (Dr. Gun) accompanied plant officers on a tour of inspection, and, from reports I have received subsequently, some defective parts, which were rejected and not put into the vehicles, were found. The production of vehicles in a satisfactory roadworthy condition is entirely in the hands of the manufacturer, and it is certainly not my role to police safety factors associated with vehicles. The vehicles must be of a certain standard laid down not only by the general requirements of the public but also by the design rules adopted by the Australian Transport Advisory Council. Provided that these criteria are met, it is certainly not my function to pursue the matter any further.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works obtain for me a report on any plans that the Engineering and Water Supply Department may have for sewering a small area at Highbury, which includes Paradise Grove, and, if it is intended to sewer the area, will he give me details of the scheme, especially regarding whether the houses facing Paradise Grove will be connected from sewerage points at the front of the properties or from the sewerage easement that already exists at the rear of those properties?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to obtain a report from the honourable member and to bring it down as soon as possible.

SELF-SERVICE PETROL

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether any permits have been issued by him or by his predecessor for the installation of additional automatic self-service petrol pumps, and does he intend to issue any new permits soon for the installation of more of these pumps?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: No additional permits have been issued recently. However, a meeting of interested parties was held last week and, next week, another meeting will be held, at which the matter raised at the recent meeting of representatives of the Royal Automobile Association and the self-service petrol interests will be discussed, with a view to ascertaining whether there is a need for further self-service outlets.

BERRI NURSERY

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Works take up with the Minister of Agriculture the matter of changing the name of the Woods and Forests Department nursery at Berri from "Upper Murray" to "Riverland"? A sign recently erected at this nursery, which is on the main Berri by-pass road, does not conform to the generally accepted principle that all State Government departments in the Riverland district shall be called "Riverland", not

"Upper Murray" as previously. This practice was instituted a few months ago at the request of the Tourist Promotion Council, which has been pleased with the action taken to change the name of several departmental undertakings in the Riverland district.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will see whether we can oblige the honourable member.

AIRCRAFT

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Premier take up with the Department of Civil Aviation and with Ansett Airlines the question of the re-introduction of DC3 aircraft in South Australia by Ansett's subsidiary, Airlines of South Australia? A few weeks ago Airlines of South Australia, which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Ansett Airlines, improved the services in this State by replacing two outmoded DC3 aircraft by a second Fokker Friendship. However, after only two weeks in service this Fokker aircraft has been returned by Ansett to Victoria, and two DC3 aircraft have been substituted. The latter are over 30 years old, and the deterioration in service has given rise to numerous complaints from passengers. As the parent company (Ansett Airlines) has taken this action, which is, in effect, a downgrading of the service in South Australia, I ask the Premier to consider my application favourably.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly take up the matter with Ansett Airlines and the Department of Civil Aviation. I am concerned to ensure that South Australia has effective air services, and I appreciate the honourable member's raising the matter.

KARMEL REPORT

Mr. MATHWIN: As the Minister of Education has implemented parts of the Karmel report, will he say whether he intends to introduce free transportation of handicapped children to schools? At present one-third of the cost of transporting children by taxi to the nearest school must be borne by the parents, and this causes hardship to many families. The Karmel report suggests that the whole of the cost should be borne by the Education Department. Can the Minister say when he expects that this may take place?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Certainly, I support the principle set out in the Karmel report on this matter, although the introduction of this principle depends on the availability of finance. The honourable member will appreciate from his reading of the report that arguments concerning Commonwealth aid for education are set out clearly in the report. Our ability to provide in all areas the standard of educational service that should be provided (I include here the matter raised by the honourable member) is limited by the finance that we have available and by the horse-and-buggy Constitution under which we operate.

Mr. Mathwin: It'll cost only about $20,000.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It will cost more than that.

Mr. Mathwin: No, it won't.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get the detailed information on what it will cost, but I assure the honourable member that, when we can implement this proposal, we will do so immediately.

WILD DOG BOUNTY

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Lands to my recent question about the wild dog bounty?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands has informed me that since July 1, 1970, the Lands Department has received 177 claims, involving 5,040 dogs and 268 pup scalps. Reports the department has received from lessees, managers of properties and doggers generally indicate that there has been a sharp decrease in the dingo population of the State, especially in the Far North-East. However, there have been isolated reports that an increase of dingo activity has occurred along parts of the dog fence. At present, the Wild Dog Fund still requires to be subsidized by the Government, under the provisions of the Wild Dogs Act, to enable bounty claims to be met. It is not expected, therefore, that there will be any rise soon in the bonus rate in respect of dingo pup scalps.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier say whether he favours the Adelaide Airport being upgraded and becoming an international airport? As I understand that the Premier has expressed support for this proposal, will he say whether his opinion is still the same?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An investigation into the disadvantages that South Australia suffers regarding trade and tourism (but especially trade) from not having an international terminal is still under way. If Adelaide were to get an international terminal, the South Australian Government, in negotiating in relation to such a terminal, would require that any international rights that were established concerning Adelaide would not be at the expense of additional

noise nuisance to people living near the airport facilities. I know of no specific decision whether an international terminal would be at Adelaide or elsewhere.

STOCK EXCHANGE

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Attorney-General say whether he is confident that there are sufficient rules to control short-selling on the Stock Exchange either at Government level or at Stock Exchange level in South Australia? If there are not, will he say whether this matter has been investigated?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Short-selling is not practised on the Adelaide Stock Exchange, unlike the Sydney Stock Exchange. I expect that this matter will be listed for discussion at the next meeting of Attorneys-General, but until that time I do not intend to make any decisions or recommendations on the matter.

SALES ADVERTISING

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney-General say whether his department has considered the activities of "Auctioneer Ron" in regard to "action and advertising" sales? This person advertises in various areas that he will have a "one-day only" sale in one or two sessions, and he offers such enticements as "brand name cigars: pack of five, 10c", and "family gifts, 15c", etc. In particular this person announces, "Before attending our fabulous action sale" (although auction is often referred to, action sale is the name given to the actual event) "print your name and address on the entry form below and drop it into the box at the show. At the end of the show we will draw a few names out of the box, and if you're a lucky winner you win a valuable prize. Even if you don't win a prize at the show, you could be a lucky winner at the end of the year, when we will draw our super prize of considerable value." The Attorney-General will appreciate that this enticement is not necessarily policed or carried out.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall have the matter investigated.

SOUTH AFRICAN SPORTING TEAM

Mr. HALL: Despite the Premier's statement that no facilities will be offered to the visiting South African sporting team, will he assure the House that at least the full protection of the Police Force will be offered to the team if it comes to South Australia? Although I deplore the entry of politics into sport in any way, I am concerned that in making a blanket statement on this matter the Premier has indicated the withdrawal of all facilities. Will he say whether or not this includes the protection of the Police Force?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It certainly does not include the withdrawal of members of the Police Force from keeping law and order in South Australia. The Government does not intend that there should be any departure from law and order in South Australia in this or in any other matter.

BROWN'S WELL SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question relates to proposed improvements at the Brown's Well Area School, where the new open-teaching technique is being used. This is an interesting school to visit, and most of the development that has taken place has been achieved by using and modifying existing buildings. At this stage, a three-room, timber classroom has been modified by removing partitions and carpeting the floor, but to complete this unit an extension must be provided to connect it with the adjoining old stone school building. It is this connection between the timber-frame building and the stone building, and the upgrading of that stone building in conformity with the other improvements being made, with which I am concerned. Can the Minister of Education say when it is likely that these improvements will be effected so that the whole unit is complete?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am aware of the work that has been done at this school. Last year, at a meeting I attended at Berri, I met the teachers primarily involved in this experimental work. I am happy to take up the honourable member's question and to obtain the information he requires. If it takes too long, I will try to hurry it along a little.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS

Mr. VENNING: When the Prime Minister announced that additional finance would be made available to this State, he said that such finance was to help pay off existing State debts. Can the Treasurer say whether this means that additional finance will be available to the Loans to Producers Fund. This fund has been of great benefit to certain co-operatives in this State, which are now seeking further help.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The funds being made available by the Commonwealth Government do not allow us to extend loans to producers, which are already greater this year than they have been for a long time. The specific undertaking that I was asked by the Prime Minister to give was that this money would not be used for an extension of moneys

to the general community. There was not to be any expansion in services; it was given only to improve the present cash situation in the State Treasuries, as they are all in a difficult position.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether the Government intends any change in respect of the running of the Modbury Hospital as outlined in the report of the Public Works Committee of February 8, 1968? On page 12, under the heading "Finance", that report states:

It is considered that local general practitioners should be able to treat their own patients similar to the system operating in the country Government hospitals, Queen Elizabeth Hospital and New South Wales and all patients, both public and non-public, should be available for teaching purposes.

My question relates to that aspect of the report.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

TOMATO WEED

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to provide some direct financial assistance to the District Council of Riverton and perhaps other councils in the area towards the eradication of the weed commonly known as tomato weed before that weed gets out of control? I have received a letter from the District Clerk of that council expressing grave concern at the spread of that weed in his area. He states:

Over 3,000 acres of first-class agricultural land is infested with an area estimated at 530 acres of tomato weed. This involves five properties at Halbury, Tarlee, and Riverton.

The council considers that action should be taken before landowners become discouraged and begin to live with the weed, as one is already doing. The letter also states:

Our environment must be protected at all costs and, if it is beyond the individual, then surely the State must shoulder some of the burden.

The letter concludes with the following request:

Because not enough is known about tomato weed and its control, it is also requested that more money be allocated to the Agriculture Department for research work. Some valuable work has already been undertaken but it is feared that it is hampered through lack of finance.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take this matter up with my colleague and bring down a reply.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier take up with the appropriate authority the question of aircraft noise over the southern suburbs? I have received from "a number of residents of Malvern" a letter dated March 25 and, from the handwriting, I think these people are probably older people living in the district. The letter states:

If in order to placate the residents of North Adelaide it is necessary to annoy other suburbs, how is this a solution to the steadily increasing noise from the Adelaide Airport? At Malvern (in the vicinity of Winchester Street and surrounding areas) the noise is becoming a real menace, and it will increase, not decline. Are the southern suburbs to be the regular air route for all planes coming and going?

As a resident living close to the area mentioned in the letter, I can endorse the fact that this does seem to be a regular path for aircraft.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will inquire of the Department of Civil Aviation whether anything can be done, but there must be somewhere over which aeroplanes can fly in order to get here.

Mr. Millhouse: They could go over the sea.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Even so, the approach from the sea to the runways is not always the safest one, depending upon weather conditions. I will raise the matter with the department and see whether I can get a reply.

CARBONIZING PROCESS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister for Conservation take up with the Industrial Development Branch the economics of using a carbonizing process in order to dispose of waste, as well as providing a boost for the economy? A letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* of March 5 states:

It has recently been proposed in certain engineering journals that the process used for carbonizing coal could, with little adaptation not only dispose of certain of our wastes, but even generate a cash flow. The types of materials which can be thus treated include rag, wood waste, paper waste, plastics, etc. . . . a small carbonizing plant could be set up at one of the rubbish dumps and the materials treated there. It might even be possible to dispose of used tyres by a similar process.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated. As I understand that this is the type of proposal that the recently established Garbage and Waste Disposal Committee will be investigating, I shall be pleased to refer this matter to that committee and ask it to consider it.

FOODSTUFF FRESHNESS

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Lands to my recent question about the marking, with the safe date for selling, of packaged foodstuffs sold in supermarkets?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Food and Drugs Act provides that all foods when sold shall be free from disease, and shall be sound, wholesome, and fit for human consumption. The Act also provides that foods shall be of the substance, nature and quality demanded by the purchaser or of the substance, nature and quality which they are represented or purported to be. There is provision to make regulations under the Food and Drugs Act requiring the date of packing or expiry to appear in the label and at present pre-packaged meat and infants' foods are required to have the date of packing stated on the label. The acceptability of food at the time of sale is not only affected by the date of packing but also by the quality and freshness of the food from which the product is prepared, the methods of preservation, and distribution. In certain cases the date stamp might give a sense of false security to the purchaser which is not justified by the conditions under which the food has been kept since packaging. The public is protected by existing legislation as there is adequate power in the legislation to deal with complaints. Any person not satisfied with his purchases should complain to the local food authority for the area where the food is sold.

EASTICK REPORT

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Eastick report, which concerns a matter that is presently of great interest to people in my district and in the Minister's district?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands has informed me that he does not intend to table the report of the Zone 5 (South-East) Rentals Inquiry Committee of which Sir Thomas Eastick was Chairman.

ACCIDENT COMPENSATION

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Attorney-General investigate a case concerning a motor accident at Medindie between the car of a constituent of mine and a Government departmental vehicle? My constituent contends that, as he is the innocent party in this accident, he should receive full settlement. However, the Crown Law Department has offered a settlement on a 75 per cent to 25 per cent basis, as I know is commonly done. If I give the Attorney privately the name of the person and details of the case, will he investigate it to see whether full settlement can be made, as my constituent maintains that he is completely innocent? If this cannot be done, my constituent will have to have recourse to the courts to secure his rights.

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the honourable member furnishes me with details, I will certainly look at the file. It is only fair to say that I should be extremely reluctant to interfere with the professional advice of Crown Law Department officers charged with the responsibility of advising the department in the matter. Generally speaking, I take the view that, if there is a difference of opinion between the legal adviser of the person concerned (the honourable member's constituent in this case) and the legal advisers of the Crown, the appropriate way for the matter to be dealt with is either by compromise or, if necessary, by adjudication by a court. However, I will look at the file to see whether there is any reason why the matter should be reconsidered at Crown Law Department level.

STIRLING EAST SCHOOL

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Stirling East Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have now been informed that an Education Department officer has met with a subcommittee of the Stirling East School Committee. The meeting agreed (1) that the construction of a swimming pool not be undertaken at this time; and (2) that the second basketball court be proceeded with in the total contract of works prepared by the Public Buildings Department. This court will involve the school committee in a cost of about $680. These matters will now be discussed by the full school committee at its next meeting, and the department will be informed later whether the school committee endorses the decisions of its representatives.

INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Labour and Industry Department intends to hold in country districts a series of seminars on industrial safety? Some weeks ago a preliminary meeting was held in the Riverland district, civic and industrial leaders being invited to discuss the possibility of conducting an industrial safety seminar in the district. Can the Minister say what was the outcome of that meeting and what further action is intended by the department?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The department intends to hold such conferences in country areas. The conference to be held in the Riverland district will be the second country conference to be held, the first having been held at Mount Gambier and having been, I understand, a great success. At a preliminary meeting in the Riverland area, the response was so great that it was decided to set up a committee, the personnel of which is as follows: Mr. D. M. Rosenthal, Chairman, District Council of Berri (Chairman); Mr. R. C. Harvey, President, Lions Club, Berri, and Resident Engineer, Engineering and Water Supply Department (Secretary); and Mr. L. G. Sims, Mayor, Corporation of the Town of Renmark, Mr. R. V. Glatz, Chairman, District Council of Loxton, Mr. A. D. Thomas, Chairman, District Council of Barmera, Mr. D. R. Elliott, Chairman, District Council of Waikerie, Mr. D. D. Wutke, Councillor, District Council of Barmera, and Mr. R. H. Maddocks, Engineer-Manager, Renmark Irrigation Trust (members). At the request of the committee, I have agreed to open the conference, and Sir Donald Anderson (Director-General of Civil Aviation) will present the main address.

COOMANDOOK SIGN

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the need for a sign at a corner near Coomandook?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The signs to be erected by the Highways Department at the Sherlock Road junction will warn of the curve in the main road as well as warn of the road junction.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say what is the cause for the delay in the payment of accounts by the Public Buildings Department, particularly accounts relating to emergency services or repairs carried out by local tradesmen? In discussions I have had with people around the countryside, particularly with those associated with work on schools and other Government buildings and with local tradesmen, I have frequently been told that tradesmen have refused to undertake emergency works because their experience has been that payment takes from six months to eight months. From time to time, the Minister of Education and the Minister of Works have spoken about the authority of officers-in-charge in this respect. From further comments made to me over the weekend, I suspect that this is not a problem with regard to the officer-in-charge: the fact that tradesmen have difficulty in receiving payment is the reason why emergency repairs and other works are not carried out.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received complaints of this type before. If the honourable member is specific, I shall be happy to examine the example he gives. I cannot attack the department for inefficiency if I cannot put my finger on a specific case. I should appreciate the honourable member's supplying any information he has.

ADELAIDE PROMOTIONS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney-General say when I may expect to receive a reply to my question of October 29 last in which I sought an investigation of the activities of Adelaide Promotions?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Investigations have been made into Adelaide Promotions. I shall re-examine the file to find out whether at this stage I can make public the information that the honourable member has sought and, if I can do that, I shall give it to him tomorrow. However, without checking the file and the present state of the matter, I cannot say whether I can give the information publicly at this stage.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what action he is taking in the face of the deteriorating industrial position in South Australia in relation to strikes and, in particular, say what he has in mind to assist the employees of Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited who may be threatened with retrenchment because of the strike at the Broken Hill mines? I understand that there is a complicated situation involving a strike at Whyalla, where several boilermakers, shipwrights and ironworkers have been stood down because of strikes. I also understand that shipwrights have gone on strike and that boilermakers have decided to go on strike until Thursday. I have also been told that an overtime ban may be imposed by the Ships Painters and Dockers Union. In addition to this unfortunate situation, I have been told that no more than two weeks' stockpile of ore may be available at Port Pirie to enable operations to continue.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have had no request from the trade union movement or any of the industries to which the Leader has referred. Until I am invited to intervene or discuss the problems with the industries and the

trade union movement, I consider that the obligation is on them. As the Premier has pointed out only last week and as I have said many times, I do not know how long the Opposition will go on asking such questions as this and how long it will take to sink in to Opposition members' heads that in this State we have a conciliation and arbitration system to deal with these matters.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry use his good offices with both sides to ensure that fines imposed in the Arbitration Court upon trade unions are paid?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't you hate the trade unions! You hate them nearly as much as you hate your Leader.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One of the most important issues in Australia at present (certainly on the industrial front) is the refusal so far of several trade unions to pay fines properly imposed on them by the court. The Minister has just said that he believes in arbitration, and he has reminded the House that he merely echoes the Premier, who has made a similar statement in reply to several questions I have asked. I point out that the fines have been imposed as a result of the working of the arbitration system and, if the system is to continue to work, it must be observed in every detail. I am sure the Minister agrees with that and, therefore, I ask whether he will use his good offices with the employers (if that should be necessary) and, in this particular case, with the trade unions to see that the fines are paid.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: That is exactly the sort of question I would expect from an anti-unionist. The honourable member knows well that the matter he has raised is at present being discussed by the Prime Minister and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. His question is similar to something that the Government could well ask the Opposition, namely, who is likely to be the new Parliamentary Leader of the L.C.L.

MOUNT GAMBIER SCHOOLS

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Works find out when it is expected that asphalt resurfacing of the schoolyards at the Glenburnie and East Gambier schools will be carried out? I understand that work proposed at both schools has been included in a group contract. However, persons connected with these schools have been waiting for a long time for this work to be carried out and they would be pleased if it could be expedited.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member has pointed out, this type of work is included in group contracts, which involve work at several schools in the area. I will find out the position in these cases.

WOMBATS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Lands to the question I asked recently about wombats?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that for many years wombats have caused considerable damage to the dog fence on the Far West Coast, particularly in the vermin fenced districts of Fowlers Bay, White Well and Nullarbor. It has now reached the stage where some of these animals have to be destroyed. To this end landholders adjoining the dog fence have obtained, from the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, permits to destroy specified numbers of wombats. In the case of Crown Lands on the outside of the dog fence, the permit has been issued to the Lands Department. However, the actual destruction is delegated to the local Vermin District Board and is carried out by the usual conventional methods, which do not include poisoning.

NATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On October 20 last I asked a question of the Premier regarding the making up by the Government of the pay of national servicemen. Not having received a reply, I followed this up on March 10 but still did not get a reply. However, as I understand that the Premier now has a reply, will he be good enough to give it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Chairman of the Public Service Board states:

The Public Service Board has again considered this matter of making up pay of State public servants whilst undergoing their National Service under Commonwealth legislation. The issue raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is whether an employer should make any payment to one of his employees who is by the processes of law prevented from continuing for the time being to carry out his normal duties as an employee. It is significant that the Commonwealth legislation does not place any responsibility for such a payment on the employer. Two matters seem to be indisputable: first, that the obligation for the defence of the country rests under the Constitution with the Commonwealth Government; and secondly, that the cost of defence and, therefore, of the National Service training scheme is clearly the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government.

It is obviously true that the financial burden (if any) of National Service to national servicemen varies according to the civil income

that would have been enjoyed during such training. Because this burden varies widely, that does not of itself justify any remedial action either by the Commonwealth Government in its scale of payment to national servicemen, or by employers. If the basis of payment to national servicemen requires adjustment, then it is the Commonwealth Government's responsibility to make that adjustment. (It should not be overlooked that in many cases the financial discrepancy between the national serviceman's civil income and his National Service pay is greater than it would otherwise have been, simply because in many cases students take advantage of the opportunity to defer National Service training to complete a course of study.) For example, a student teacher who reached the age of 20 years is in receipt of an allowance of the teachers college of approximately $1,100 a year. If he obtains postponement of his National Service obligation until he has completed his training and has been nominally appointed a teacher at a salary of about $4,200, should he be able to claim that he should therefore be paid (irrespective of by whom) during National Service training at a higher rate than the person who commenced his training at the age of 20 years?

The fact that some private employers who have very limited numbers of their staff subject to National Service have chosen to make up the pay, does not, in the board's opinion, provide any reason why the State Government, by far the biggest employer, should follow suit. This issue is over-simplified by concentration on the individual case, which appears at first glance to involve hardship, and overlooking the basic principles and the wider issues. As so often happens if this is done, it is the less needy who gain the most. Attempts to iron out alleged inequalities often fail to achieve the desired result, but at the same time involve the taxpayer in more money. The board reiterates that in its opinion the amount payable to National Service trainees is solely the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government and through them of the taxpayers of Australia as a whole. It is not the responsibility of the South Australian taxpayer to subsidize the Commonwealth Government in the discharge of its constitutional liability for defence.

CARTAGE RATES

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier have the Prices Branch further investigate cartage rates being paid to tip-truck operators by quarry proprietors, and will he consider an increase in the maximum price allowed by the Prices Branch to these operators? During the term of office of the previous Government, I led a deputation comprising the present Minister of Education and other interested persons to members of Cabinet regarding this matter, when a direction was given to the quarry proprietors that, if the cost of material in any contract was reduced, the reduction must be made not on the cartage rate but on the bin price of the material. I believe that at present some quarries are contracting under the agreed maximum price and are taking the amount from the truck operators and not from the material at bin price. On December 7 last year the quarry proprietors were awarded a 10c a ton increase for all material carried by them except sand, on which a 20c a ton increase was granted. The operators asked the Prices Commissioner for a 4 per cent increase in January this year, when general carriers received an 8 per cent increase. However, this application was refused, it being stated that in many cases tip-truck operators were receiving rates below the maximum allowable for each ton-mile. This industry is in a serious position at present; big contractors, who have the finance to do so, are trying to push out the small operators. As some of his colleagues are also aware of this problem (and, indeed, have made representations on behalf of the Tip Truck Operators Association and the South Australian Road Transport Association), will the Premier take up this matter and seriously consider my suggestion?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand that a submission made by the tip-truck operators recently was for the establishment of a minimum price.

Mr. Evans: They have asked for an increase.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will examine that request. As it came to my desk this morning, the request was for a minimum price, against which the Prices Commissioner has recommended. Except in the most exceptional circumstances, such as the necessity in the case of the grape price legislation, the Government does not intend to provide minimum prices, as it believes that the matter should, as far as possible, be left to the market. However, I will examine the matter and let the honourable member have a reply.

WEED CONTROL

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether it is intended to bring weed control and associated matters under the control of one central authority? There is some fear, particularly at the local government level (at which level action has been taken over a long period on the responsibility for weed control), that this authority may be taken from individual councils and, more particularly, if councils are required to pay for any part of the central activity, that the money to be spent within the districts may

well lead to areas, which are now under control because of constant action being taken in them, subsidizing areas where there is currently no control.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter for the honourable member.

PANORAMA "STOP" SIGN

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport take up the matter of the installation of "stop" signs at the intersection of Eliza Place and Boothby Street, Panorama? I have received a letter from one of my constituents, part of which is as follows:

On the corner of Eliza Place and Boothby Street, three doors from my children's nursery—the nursery which this person runs—an accident occurs at least once weekly. These are quite serious accidents, the vehicles concerned usually being immobilized, although as yet no-one has been seriously injured. There are 70 children brought here daily, all travelling by car, and I am extremely concerned that one of the parents may have an accident there. I would appreciate your using your influence to have "stop" signs placed in Boothby Street, instead of the present "cross road" signs, which are apparently useless. I know that you are greatly concerned with the welfare of children.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If my memory serves me correctly, one of the honourable member's constituents wrote to me about six months ago asking me to have this matter investigated. The honourable member would know that this person wrote to me because he had also written to the honourable member, who said there was nothing he could do to assist his constituent.

Mr. Millhouse: That is inaccurate.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As a result of the representations made to me, I took up the matter and, to the best of my knowledge, the Mitcham council (which is responsible for this area) has taken some action on the matter raised by the honourable member. However, I will certainly take up the matter again and let the honourable member know the situation as, indeed, I let his constituent know what had happened.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have another question to ask.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, Sir, you did not give me a chance to ask the other question.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Questions having expired, I have called on the business of the day, and we will be proceeding with business of the day.

Mr. Millhouse: That's unfair, Sir.

WASTE FOOD DISPOSAL

Dr. Tonkin, for Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. How many Government hospitals use waste disposal units to dispose of waste foods through the sewer system?

2. What was their total cost, including installation?

3. What is the approximate quantity of water used annually by the units?

4. What was the total amount received annually for waste foods from primary producers by these institutions which now have waste disposal units?

5. Why is the cold store method as used by the Royal Adelaide Hospital for waste food storage not used at all similar institutions?

6. What is the annual amount of money received by the Royal Adelaide Hospital for waste food?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Five, *vide* No. 2 below.

2. (*a*) Queen Elizabeth Hospital: Two units installed in one ward area and the nurses' dining area about five years ago on a trial basis—cost approximately $2,000.

(*b*) Strathmont Centre: Units installed throughout as part of construction contract; separate costs not known.

(*c*) Glenside Hospital: Two large commercial units installed February, 1967; approximate cost $4,200.

(*d*) Hillcrest Hospital: One large commercial unit installed 1970; estimated cost $2,265. Two small kitchen sink-type units installed by Repatriation Department in repatriation wards; cost not known.

(*e*) Port Lincoln Hospital: One small commercial unit installed in 1969 at a cost of $1,300.

3. Not known, as units not separately metered.

4. (*a*) Queen Elizabeth Hospital: $900 a year at present: minimal reduction resulting from installation of units.

(*b*) Strathmont Centre: Nil; new installation; little kitchen waste at this institution, as it is supplied with frozen food according to needs.

(*c*) Glenside Hospital: $1,464 a year prior to installation; now nil.

(*d*) Hillcrest Hospital: $1,680 a year prior to installation; now reduced to $780 a year.

(*e*) Port Lincoln Hospital: $27.50 a year prior to installation; now nil.

5. The collection and storage of food waste is gradually being phased out in Government hospitals because of:

(*a*) the danger and cost of prevention of cross infection through increased fly population around stored waste awaiting pick-up in ward and kitchen areas; even with cold stores the smell of the waste attracts flies to the proximity of the storage;

(*b*) the additional labour required to transport the waste to the storages and to keep the storages and bins clean;

(*c*) the difficulty of preventing staff from depositing things like drugs and broken glass in the food storage bins, thereby making the waste dangerous for feeding to animals; complaints have been received from some contractors of pig losses through these causes;

(*d*) the use of disposal units is now commonly accepted practice in many hospitals, including Queen Victoria, Adelaide Children's and Lyell McEwin Hospitals, and the Home for Incurables;

(*e*) the increasing difficulty in obtaining competitive tenders for the purchase of the waste and the reduction in the offers received from contractors.

6. Royal Adelaide Hospital:

North Terrace	$900
Northfield	$600
	$1,500

The quantity of waste has been reduced by about 50 per cent over the past few years because of the policy of disposal of waste from ward areas which is now deposited in "garbags" which are sealed and incinerated instead of the waste being transported in bins to pick-up areas for sale to contractors.

ABORTIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many abortions were performed in this State from January 1, 1971, to March 31, 1971, inclusive?

2. How does this figure compare with the corresponding period last year?

3. On what grounds and in which categories were those abortions performed as compared with the same period last year?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Figures for this period are not available: statistics are regularly categorized usually at two-monthly intervals ending on the seventh day of each month, with one week allowable in which to forward the notification.

2. Not available. Statistical information was first categorized for the period January 8, 1970, to June 7, 1970. Delays in notification occurred during the initial weeks in January, 1970.

3. *Vide* 1 and 2.

PORT STANVAC ACCIDENTS

Mr. HOPGOOD (on notice):

1. How many industrial accidents have occurred at Port Stanvac oil refinery in the last 12 months?

2. How many persons are now out of employment as a result of these accidents?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The replies are as follows:

1. Five which involved lost time from work, of which three resulted in absence of only one day.

2. Two.

BEACH ACCIDENTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. On which metropolitan beaches have accidents involving motor vehicles occurred in the years, 1968, 1969 and 1970?

2. How many accidents have occurred on each of these beaches in each of these years?

3. On which country beaches have accidents involving motor vehicles occurred in the years 1968, 1969 and 1970?

4. How many accidents have occurred on each of these beaches in each of these years?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have details of accidents involving motor vehicles on metropolitan and country beaches but, as the information consists of a long table, I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Metropolitan Beaches

Locality	1968 Personal Injury	1968 Property Damage	1968 Fatality	1968 Total	1969 Personal Injury	1969 Property Damage	1969 Fatality	1969 Total	1970 Personal Injury	1970 Property Damage	1970 Fatality	1970 Total
Taperoo	2	2	—	4	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—
Snowden Beach	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	2	4	—	6	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—

Rural Beaches

Locality	1968 Personal Injury	1968 Property Damage	1968 Fatality	1968 Total	1969 Personal Injury	1969 Property Damage	1969 Fatality	1969 Total	1970 Personal Injury	1970 Property Damage	1970 Fatality	1970 Total
Telowie	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
Port Broughton	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—
Whyalla	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Louth Bay Beach	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
Brownlow, Kangaroo Island	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	2	—	—	—	—
Aldinga	—	—	1	1	1	4	—	5	1	6	—	7
Port Noarlunga South	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
Moana	4	3	—	7	—	1	—	1	1	1	—	2
Thompson Beach	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
Goolwa	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—
Kingston	2	—	—	2	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	1
Robe	—	2	—	2	—	1	—	1	—	2	—	2
Carpenter Rocks	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
Wallaroo	—	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	6
Sellick Beach	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	2
Port Lincoln	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Port MacDonnell	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Myponga Beach	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Middle Beach	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
Cape Douglas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Grey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
Port Elliot	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
St. Kilda	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Port Hughes	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pondalowie	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
Total	6	15	1	22	3	15	—	18	4	20	1	25
Grand Total	8	19	1	28	3	17	—	20	4	20	1	25

MARGINAL DAIRY FARMS (AGREEMENT) BILL

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to approve an agreement between the Government of the State and the Government of the Commonwealth to provide for financial assistance to the State for the purposes of a marginal dairy farms reconstruction scheme and for purposes incidental thereto. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

After lengthy negotiations the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of South Australia have entered into an agreement in relation to a marginal dairy farms reconstruction scheme. This agreement was executed on Friday last, April 2, 1971, by the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth and the Government of this State. The agreement is set out as a schedule to this Bill and by this measure Parliament is asked to approve the agreement and to pass the necessary enabling legislation so that the scheme of reconstruction can be established. The purpose of the scheme is to provide arrangements for the reconstruction of dairy farms which are marginally economic. The agreement is based upon the general proposition that the Commonwealth and the States mutually recognize that there is a low income problem within sectors of the dairy industry, particularly in the case of those producers relying on the sale of milk or cream for manufacturing purposes.

The low income problem within the dairy industry varies within different regions of the Commonwealth and arises from various causes which may include the marginal nature of the farm in relation to its level of production or its general efficiency. The Commonwealth Government has agreed to provide $25,000,000 over the four years from July, 1970, for the purposes of carrying out the scheme throughout Australia. There is no definite allocation of money to any particular State, the actual amounts available to each State being determined by the rate at which the scheme progresses. The scheme is one which is Commonwealth-wide and the terms laid down by the agreement are, of necessity, general in their application to the dairy industry throughout Australia. However, to meet the particular needs of South Australia, special provisions have been agreed between the Minister for Primary Industry and the State Minister to provide for the situation created by the system of equalizing returns to farmers from sales of whole milk and manufacturing milk in the metropolitan milk-producing districts. Although these provisions are not included in the agreement, as this document is one of Australia-wide application, they are covered by an exchange of letters between the respective Ministers of the Commonwealth and the State.

I would particularly direct members' attention to the definitions of marginal dairy farms and economic units, which are shown in clause 1 of the agreement. If members refer to clause 5 they will see that the level in respect of a marginal dairy farm agreed for the purposes of these definitions is an average of 12,000 lb. per annum of butter fat or such other level of production as may from time to time be agreed by the Commonwealth Minister and the State Minister. For the general purposes of the scheme the average level of 12,000 lb. of butter fat will be used, but where farms in the metropolitan milk producing district are concerned this will be modified. Provision is made to include a rural property used wholly or partly for dairying within those areas of land constituting the metropolitan milk producing district, as are prescribed from time to time, provided that:

(*a*) not less than one half of the gross income of the rural property is obtained from the production of milk or cream that is derived from not less than 20 lactating cows,

(*b*) the authorities certify that the level of production of the rural property if used only for dairying and purposes incidental to dairying is not reasonably capable of producing to a level of, or the equivalent of, an average per annum of 10,000 lb. of butter fat, and

(*c*) a system acceptable to the Commonwealth Minister and the State Minister operates for the purpose of equalizing the returns from the sale of milk produced.

This provision will operate in a manner which will enable an uneconomic dairy farm within the metropolitan milk producing district to be dealt with under the scheme should any dairy farmers in this situation so desire. This latter provision is one of great importance

to the dairy industry in South Australia and the Government is pleased that the Commonwealth has seen fit to agree to this provision. The Government regrets having to ask the House to consider a measure of this nature at this stage of the session but, as the agreement has only just been executed, honourable members will realize that submission of a Bill earlier has not been possible. Nevertheless, the Government wishes to bring this scheme into operation at an early date and hopes that the House will see fit to give this Bill a speedy passage.

I now turn to consider the Bill in some detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Bill. Clause 3 provides for the approval of the agreement and formally designates the Minister to whom the administration of the measure will be committed as the authority for the purposes of the reconstruction scheme. The Minister of Lands has constituted this authority and it is intended that the administration of the scheme will be handled by the Lands Department. Clause 4 is a formal provision providing for amendment of the agreement with a provision that any amending agreements will be tabled in this House. Clause 5 is a most important provision from the point of view of this State, as I have previously mentioned. Because of the operation of the system of equalizing returns to farmers in the metropolitan milk producing district from the sales of milk wholesale and as manufacturing milk, it is likely that many dairy farms in this State would not have fallen within the definition of a marginal dairy farm as set out in clause 1 of the agreement. This equalization scheme is unique to this State. As I have already stated, an exchange of letters has taken place between the Commonwealth Minister and the State Minister, which forms the basis of an extension of the scheme as earlier outlined. This exchange of letters will constitute the framework within which the agreement for the extension of the scheme will operate.

Clause 6 formally constitutes the marginal dairy farms reconstruction scheme fund the operation of which will be apparent from an examination of the financial provisions of the agreement contained in clauses 17 to 28 thereof. Clause 7 enables advances to be made by the Treasurer to the fund. Clause 8 is intended to ensure that farms built up under the scheme do not again become fragmented in uneconomic units. The agreement itself is, as I have mentioned, set out in the schedule and generally is self-explanatory. The scheme has been undertaken so that dairy farmers, whose farms have insufficient potential to become viable economic units while based on the sale of milk or cream for manufacturing purposes, may voluntarily dispose of their land and improvements. Such farms, after allowing for the disposal of redundant improvements, may be made available to build up other dairy farms into economic units. In the disposal of reconstruction land it is required that the authority shall have due regard to the objective of securing the most practicable and economic use of land, with a view to achieving, so far as consistent with such land use, the diversification of production. It should be pointed out that there is no obligation on the authority to purchase farms solely because an application has been received for it to do so. The scheme is entirely a voluntary one and it is expected that it will operate by farmers wishing to build up their holdings arranging with others who wish to sell out joining in a joint application to the authority.

The authority will not be in a position to provide livestock, plant or crops or the like and funds must be devoted entirely to the purchase of land and improvements for reconstruction purposes. In dealing with the agreement in some detail, clauses 1 to 3 are self-explanatory and require no comment. Clause 4 of the agreement sets out in detail the basis of the scheme and I direct members' attention to this particular clause. Clauses 5 to 16 of the agreement again set out in detail the manner in which the scheme is intended to operate. Clauses 17 to 26 set out the financial basis of the scheme. In summary, the State will be required to pay back to the Commonwealth half of the amount paid by the Commonwealth to the State together with interest over a period of 23 years. I commend the Bill to members.

Later:

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): We on this side have no objection to the Bill, because it ratifies an agreement that has been signed by all States and the Commonwealth Government. However, I should like to draw the attention of the House to two points. One is that it is a first-come-best-dressed Bill in regard to money being made available by the Commonwealth Government, and I think it is important that this point be emphasized. Unlike the Bill that will follow, there is no percentage allocation of the $25,000,000 to any individual State. The sum of $25,000,000 is to be allocated over four years, repayable over 23 years. However, the State that borrows most money will receive the most benefit. There may be areas in this State, such as

the dairying districts which are now involved in a readjustment process as a result of the policy on catchment areas, wherein I believe something might well be done to take advantage of this legislation.

The only other point to which I refer is that the second reading explanation refers to a special provision relating to South Australia which is not incorporated in the Bill. The Bill refers specifically to milk and cream used for manufacturing. No reference is made in the Bill, including the schedule, to milk or cream used for human consumption, and I believe that that is why this State has been continuing to negotiate with the Commonwealth Government. This State has agreed to accept the proposals only at this stage because, as we are told, letters have passed between the State and the Commonwealth relating to our objection. The State's objection was that many of the dairy farmers in this State are involved in city or whole milk production for human consumption.

As I have said, this is not referred to in the schedule or the Bill itself, and I should like the Minister to assure the House that he is confident that the letters passing between the State and the Commonwealth regarding city milk licensing areas, the special provisions made here with respect to the quantity of butterfat that qualifies a city milk licensing property to be considered as a marginal farm, and all other aspects relating to this matter that are specific to South Australia are, in fact, covered in such a way that there can be no doubt in law that they are binding on the parties. I raise this matter because it is independent of the Bill. In the second reading explanation we have been told that the provision has been agreed to by the Minister for Primary Industry and the State Minister, and it goes on to say that, although the provision is not included in the agreement, as this document is one of Australia-wide application it is covered by the letters that have been exchanged between the respective Commonwealth and State Ministers. It is only on this matter that I have any reservations concerning which I should like an assurance from the Minister when he replies. I support the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I wholeheartedly agree with the remarks made by the member for Mallee regarding the special arrangement that applies to South Australia. We find that as at June 30, 1970 (the date to which the figures provided in relation to the Metropolitan Milk Board licences apply), there was a total of 1,870 licences. One major provision to which the Minister referred in his second reading explanation was that 20 lactating cows represented one of the basic features of the arrangement. The distribution of herd size in relation to these 1,870 licences is interesting, and is as follows: between one and five cows, there is a total 34 licences; six to 10, 65; 11 to 15, 102; 16 to 20, 122; 21 to 30, 294. That gives a total of 617 licences, or 33.04 per cent. Although I have further figures, I point out that to have 20 lactating cows in production requires that considerably more cattle be held on a farm. From personal experience, I believe that 30 or 35 head of cattle would be required. On this basis, we see that potentially one-third of the total Milk Board licensed properties would qualify in respect of the arrangement effected in the Bill. Although I know that other issues are involved relating to quantity of butterfat and percentage of total income that shall apply, etc., I raise this point. I repeat that one-third of the total Metropolitan Milk Board licences in South Australia could be involved under this scheme.

My colleague has said that it seems to be a first-in-best-dressed arrangement, and the fact that the agreement was signed only as recently as last Friday will, I hope, enable properties in this State to obtain assistance if required. This could be important in those areas that are becoming affected by the recent amendment to the Waterworks Act involving zoning and problems in relation to the size of subdivided blocks. In explaining the Bill, the Minister said:

> Clause 5 is a most important provision from the point of view of this State, as I have previously mentioned. Because of the operation of the system of equalizing returns to farmers in the metropolitan milk producing district from the sales of milk wholesale and as manufacturing milk, it is likely that many dairy farms in this State would not have fallen within the definition of a marginal dairy farm as set out in clause 1 of the agreement.

The executive of the Metropolitan Milk Board, which has had the opportunity to consider the matter in the brief time since the Minister introduced the Bill, points out that there is doubt about use of the term "wholesale" as it is referred to in the second reading explanation. The board, from its experience, believes that there could be some confusion here and that it would be better to insert "for human consumption" instead. The board believes that the use of "wholesale" could be unduly restrictive as regards interpretation. However, I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I, too, support the Bill. Naturally, I am interested in the provisions set out in clause 5 and the exchange of letters referred to in the Minister's second reading explanation, because it is crucial to the South Australian dairying industry that dairies that produce whole milk are not excluded from the scheme. Some of these dairy farms are in considerable difficulty, and certainly merit attention. In his explanation the Minister states:

An exchange of letters has taken place between the Commonwealth Minister and the State Minister which forms the basis of an extension of the scheme as earlier outlined. This exchange of letters will constitute the framework within which the agreement for the extension of the scheme will operate.

Will the Minister provide information about the exchange of letters, or will he further explain it? We have his assurance in his second reading explanation (I take it as his assurance) that the whole milk dairies will not be excluded from the scheme but, unless this is secret information, there is no point in his withholding the letters that show this to be the case. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The member for Alexandra always seems to be suspicious that we may not have tightened things up quite enough. The Government realized that this aspect was crucial and that is why it pursued the matter as it did. The honourable member can be assured that the Government has done all that it could in the circumstances to ensure that people who would be affected by this measure have been catered for. As we have said, it is a unique situation concerning the equalization scheme. Clause 5 provides for the extension of application of the scheme. I do not know whether the letters exchanged between the Commonwealth and State Ministers contained any information that should not be revealed, but I should imagine that they did not. If my colleague the Minister of Lands does not object to providing the letters (and this would satisfy the honourable member), I am sure he would provide them, although I cannot say now whether he can do so.

I assure the honourable member that this aspect would not have been pursued in the way it has been if we had not been concerned about it. I am satisfied that officers of the Lands Department and the Minister would have been certain that this covered the matter adequately, or they would not have agreed to it. As pointed out by the member for Light, the agreement was signed only on Friday, and we have the distinct advantage of being the first State to enact the legislation, and this should enable us to take advantage (if it is an advantage, and if one can talk of an advantage in this situation) of capitalizing on it, to have the scheme working, and to obtain our fair share of the $25,000,000 in the next four years. I draw the attention of the member for Mallee to clause 5 concerning the exchange of letters. I understand that he realizes that the extension of application of the scheme is written into the Bill, as this clause provides:

Notwithstanding anything in this Act or in the agreement, the scheme may, with the consent of the Minister and the Commonwealth Minister—

and no doubt this is provided for in the letters exchanged that both must sign—

extend to the acquisition under the scheme of land comprised in a rural property used wholly or partly for dairying but not being a marginal dairy farm as defined for the purposes of the scheme as if that rural property has been such a marginal dairy farm.

Concerning the point made by the member for Light about wholesale milk, I draw his attention to the fact that it is referred to in my second reading explanation: there is nothing in the clause of the Bill, and I cannot say whether it was a loose interpretation placed on it in the second reading explanation. I will check that point and if there is a need to alter it that can be done.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Extension of application scheme."

Mr. NANKIVELL: I point out to the Minister that if the matter had been clearly defined in clause 5, as the Minister suggests, it would not be necessary for the exchange of letters to take place between the Commonwealth and State Ministers.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is there only as a result of the letters.

Mr. NANKIVELL: It is not made clear. It is an ordinary clause in the agreement, and I presume that this clause would apply to the Bill in every other State. I question whether it is as clear-cut as the Minister suggests, because the clause provides that there should be an extension of application of the scheme. If it appears here and if it is common to other Bills (as has been suggested), there should not be any need to have the letters to confirm whether the position in South Australia is as set out in the second reading explanation.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I support the member for Mallee: the Minister reacted strongly to my suggestion.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are always so suspicious.

Mr. Millhouse: Your reaction would make him suspicious.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Generally, this Committee considers itself entitled to be given full information. The Minister's statement, for its passion and emotion, convinced us that the Minister is satisfied that South Australia's interests have been properly cared for. I do not think he has read the letters.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I have not seen them.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister does not know whether there is something secret in them or much else about them, except that he is satisfied. Many hundreds of dairy farmers in my district will not be considered if these letters contain a flaw. I do not intend to ask the Minister to find the letters or speak to his colleague, but by the time this legislation finally goes through Parliament it should be made clear, if not in this Chamber, in the other place, what is in the letters, as this greatly affects future safeguards for the farmers concerned.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 8), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RURAL INDUSTRY ASSISTANCE (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make special provision for carrying out and giving effect to an agreement for a scheme of assistance for rural industry and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will be aware that for some time this State, conjointly with other States, has been negotiating with the Commonwealth Government with a view to setting up a scheme of assistance to rural industry, particularly the sheep and wheat-sheep sectors which have been affected by depressed wool prices and more recently by the imposition of quotas on wheat production. Both the Commonwealth and the States have agreed that it is essential that action be taken in these circumstances, and discussions and negotiations have proceeded between the parties for the past four months. A draft proposal was prepared but only recently the States, realizing the increasing difficulties facing farmers, had further discussions with the Commonwealth and this has had the effect of delaying the conclusion of a final agreement. It is clear that economic circumstances have deteriorated since this arrangement was first contemplated and it may well be that the provisions which were earlier considered may need to be further varied.

This State has made submissions to the Commonwealth for consideration so as to ensure that whatever scheme is finally decided upon will serve the purpose for which it is intended. This action has been taken as, from information available to us, it appears that the present proposals are likely to be found quite inadequate to meet existing circumstances and many farmers are likely to find that they would not qualify for assistance. Recent movements in wool prices have been contrary to the earlier forecasts upon which the arrangements were originally developed and this circumstance, in itself, has thrown serious doubts upon the likely effectiveness of the original proposals. It is now clear that agreement is unlikely to be reached until after the end of this session of Parliament, and the Government wishes to be able to proceed with the scheme as soon as agreement is reached and the Commonwealth legislates to bring it into operation.

The Government has therefore decided, in order to avoid any delay in making assistance available to farmers of this State, to bring down the present measure. This measure is essentially of a temporary nature and is designed only to cover the period between the execution of the agreement and the bringing down of such supporting legislation as may be found necessary. If this measure is enacted there needs to be no delay in bringing the scheme into operation, and the House may be assured that the Government will bring down a Bill to give full effect to this scheme and the arrangements together with all necessary machinery matters during the next session of Parliament. As no formal agreement can be made available to honourable members, I can do no better than describe in general terms the matters which have been discussed in the formulation of the provisional arrangements.

The financial arrangements proposed by the Commonwealth provide that a sum of

$100,000,000 will be made available to the States over a period of four years. A sum of $75,000,000,000 will be—

Mr. Nankivell: That should be $75,000,000.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, $75,000,000, but I wish it were $75,000,000,000 because we would then have a chance to tackle the problem adequately. A sum of $75,000,000 will be loaned to the States over a period of 20 years at an interest rate of 6 per cent and $25,000,000 will be provided as a grant. The State would receive $12,000,000 as its share. The States will be required to repay to the Commonwealth a sum of $130,800,000, which represents principal and interest on the $75,000,000 loan. It is estimated that, if the scheme can be operated in the manner prescribed, the States would recover sufficient to meet these repayments with a small surplus.

It is intended that the scheme will operate in three parts. The first part will deal with the reconstruction of farmers' affairs, the second part will deal with the build-up of rural properties into economic units, and the third part will deal with some form of rehabilitation for farmers. It appears that, in so far as reconstruction is concerned, this will basically be designed to assist farmers who, although having been denied credit from normal sources, can be adjudged as having sound prospects of future economic viability provided that some assistance can be provided to them. It appears that an economic assessment of each farmer's application will be necessary to establish the likelihood of a successful outcome and, if an applicant qualifies, funds will be made available to assist with debt reconstruction and to provide carry-on finance. It is intended that funds under this heading will be made available at an interest rate of 4 per cent a year.

In so far as farm build-up is concerned, this will be available to farmers who are unable to obtain finance for this purpose from other sources and is generally designed to build-up properties which, whilst reasonably successful, are not considered economically viable units. It is intended by these means to build farms up into economic units in a manner which should enable them to be able to carry on in the present environment. Interest rates for the purposes of farm build-up have been determined at 6¼ per cent a year. The third part of the agreement will be devoted to measures for the rehabilitation of farmers who may for various reasons have to leave their properties. Arrangements for this purpose have not as yet been reached an advanced stage and it is not possible to make comment on the likely provisions which will emerge. I regret that I am unable to give honourable members a great deal of information about this scheme, and I hope that it will be understood that the only reason for this is the fact that we have not yet an agreement upon which to operate.

As I said earlier, this Bill is one which will enable the State to enter into and operate an agreement, and subsequently the Government will bring down further legislation. The present Bill incorporates a scheme of protection certificates to give certain farmers some immediate but temporary relief in cases where creditors are pressing. The intention of this section is to provide protection while an application is being considered and a scheme arranged. It is included only and will be used only for this purpose as it is clear that the wholesale granting of such certificates could seriously and adversely affect the availability of credit to rural industry. The Government seeks the full co-operation of the various private credit sources in the difficult situation in which sectors of primary industry find themselves. It is unfortunately necessary, for good legal reasons, that the provisions relating to protection certificates, clauses 11 to 24, constitute a large portion of this Bill, but I would once again stress that they must be regarded as being available only in the most limited circumstances.

I now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Act. I would draw honourable members' attention to the definition of "farmer" which excludes persons eligible for assistance under the Marginal Dairy Farms Reconstruction Scheme. Since an agreement in relation to dairy farm reconstruction was executed on April 2, 1971, it is now possible to bring down an appropriate Bill in this session. Clause 5 formally binds the Crown. Clause 6 authorizes the Government of the State to enter an agreement to provide for a scheme of assistance for rural industry and to do all things necessary to carry out the agreement.

Clause 7 constitutes a Minister to be the authority for the purposes of carrying out the agreement and the scheme. It is intended that this measure will be administered by the Minister of Lands. Clause 8 is a formal financial provision. Clause 9 deals with the

function of a committee which will be constituted by regulations under the Act. Subclause (2) provides that the Minister in his capacity as an authority will act on the advice of the committee. Clause 10 formally constitutes the fund in the Treasury and transfers to it the balance of a fund maintained under the Primary Producers Assistance Act, 1943. Clause 11 provides for the grant of protection certificates. Clause 12 is of great importance as it attempts to spell out and make clear that the grant of a protection certificate will be limited to circumstances of the greatest financial hardship when immediate relief is the only solution if the farmer is to have a chance of economic survival.

Clause 13 provides for the cancellation of the certificate if the farmer abandons his farm. Clause 14 provides for the keeping of lists of protection orders by the Master of the Supreme Court and the Clerk of the Local Court. Clause 15 sets out in some detail the types of protection afforded by the certificate, and subclause (4) provides for the Minister to lift the protection certificate in relation to particular land or chattels. Clause 16 provides in effect for a magistrate to allow claims to proceed notwithstanding the fact that a protection certificate has been issued. Clauses 17 and 18 provide for the cancellation of a protection certificate by the Minister. It might be mentioned in this connection that it is the firm policy of the Government that protection certificates will run for no longer period than is absolutely necessary.

Clause 19 provides that in computing the time for taking any proceedings no regard shall be paid to the time during which a protection certificate is in force. Clause 20 provides for the delivering up of a cancelled protection certificate. Clause 21, in effect, protects the rights of the creditors in relation to property that may be unlawfully dealt with. Clause 22 gives the Minister the right to supervise the operations of a protected farmer, particularly the right to limit the incurring of further debts. Clause 23 continues the application of the protection certificate in the circumstances mentioned in the clause.

Clause 24 exempts certain actions from the prohibition contained in the protection certificate. Such actions may proceed to judgment only. Clause 25 permits the Minister to delegate his powers and functions under the Bill, other than the power of granting or cancelling a protection certificate. Clause 26 is a formal financial provision. Clause 27 provides for summary hearing of offences. Clause 28 provides a comparatively wide regulation-making power, wider perhaps than is usually granted by the Parliament, but I suggest no wider than is necessary adequately to provide for contingencies that may arise until appropriate further legislation is introduced. Any regulations which may be made are, of course, subject to the scrutiny of this House. The schedule to the Bill sets out the form of the protection certificate and the form of notice of cancellation of such certificate.

I trust that this Bill will be accepted by the House in this session and thereby enable a scheme of rural reconstruction, as envisaged, to be given effect to without delay. The Government regrets that it has not been possible to submit this measure to the House earlier but it should be understood that, in the absence of an agreement, this has not been possible. Nevertheless, the Government wishes to be in a position to give effect to any agreement which may be reached with the Commonwealth so that any benefits which may emanate from it can be made available to farmers. I seek the assistance of honourable members in a speedy passage of this measure.

Later:

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I strongly support the action the Government has taken in this matter. From my understanding of what is transpiring at present with regard to the intended agreement between the State and the Commonwealth, I believe the Director of Lands is playing an important part in formulating what must be a new agreement. As I understand it, the agreement that has been drawn up is the result of a survey undertaken by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in September and October last year and presented to the then Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony). On the basis of that report, we have an interim agreement on which the Bill has been drawn up and which I believe has now been shown to be based on a most shaky foundation. In September, I moved a motion asking for an inquiry to be conducted in this State into the precise position of rural industries. I was told that it was the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government to do this. However, it is apparent that, as this information was not available and as the survey was sketchy at best, we are now supporting a Bill which, as the Minister has said, is only an interim measure.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that this measure was essentially

of a temporary nature and designed only to cover a period between the execution of the agreement and the bringing down of such supporting legislation as might become necessary. I can understand the dilemma of the people responsible for drawing up an agreement and finding themselves in this position. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics made a feature of the fact that, in its estimation, the long-term projection of wool prices would be a mean price of 40c a pound, whereas the current mean price is 29c a pound. Therefore, marketing forecasts were not accurate. Although the situation may have appeared to be reasonably buoyant in October last year, it has now deteriorated to the point where it is critical for many people engaged entirely in rural production in the pastoral areas and the high rainfall areas of the State.

I suggest that, in the present circumstances, it is almost impossible to assess profitability to enable a decision to be made, as suggested in the Bill, whether a property is or is not viable. I know that 12 months ago many assessments were made by instrumentalities and institutions that lend money to the farming community. These assessments, which were made in good faith, were based on certain assumptions that have not been borne out. As a consequence, many people who entered into agreements to purchase land and stock to engage, particularly, in woolgrowing have found themselves in serious difficulties. I do not believe that any agreement we draw up in respect of reconstruction or debt adjustment can possibly succeed until we have some stability in the industries referred to, notably the wheat and woolgrowing industries, although the Bill will naturally apply to any rural industry that finds itself in difficulties. I should like the Minister to deal with that point. I suggest that more is needed than merely an adjustment of existing debts.

In present circumstances of return on costs many people whose debts can be completely written off, within a short time, would find themselves in a similar position to the position in which they are now. There is no prospect for these industries unless there is some stability in the price that will be returned to the producers from the product they are producing. Those of us who know the problems of rural industries know that, until some definite policy is laid down with regard to marketing, there can be no stability in these industries. There is no way of predicting how far the situation will deteriorate, how many people will be affected, to what extent they will be affected, what the problems of rehabilitation will be, and what will be the impact on country towns and rural communities generally. These matters must be looked at in considering any programme. It is not just a question of trying to make Joe Smith's property temporarily profitable: it is a question of ensuring that he can remain continuously in the industry as a citizen and earn a fair and reasonable income in the same way as anyone else in industry does. At present we have no problems with secondary industry, because that type of industry is assured of a market, as it produces largely for home consumption. People who manufacture for the home market can transfer their costs into the price of the article, so the increasing costs of labour and input costs make little difference to them.

I must repeat the statement that has been made many times, namely, that in the rural industry at present there is no prospect of passing on these costs. There is only a limited capacity to absorb and, consequently, the persons involved in the industry must be able to earn more if they are to continue in the industry. I ask members whether the big wool industry, on which Australia has rested for so long (and for years we have heard the cry that Australia rides on the sheep's back), is expendable in present circumstances. It seems to me that some people may think it is, even though it brings in $700,000,000 to $800,000,000 a year from other countries.

Mr. Venning: It is fresh money.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As the honourable member says, it is fresh money. This is important to Australia as a nation, and the impact of these things on the rural community of Australia and this State is surely important to us, as members of Parliament. As negotiations still remain open, I hope that these matters are driven home and that, when an agreement is introduced in this House, it will be comprehensive, it will take full account of the problems that confront us, and it will be an agreement that works. From what the Minister has told us in reply to questions, I consider that what is proposed at present will be quite inadequate to meet the situation.

I must support the Bill, because it sets into operation a scheme that is acceptable in principle to all members. This State must establish a committee, and the necessary documents must be produced. The organization must be set up so that it can put into effect immediately whatever programme is resolved

as a result of further discussions about what I hope will be an effective agreement. I commend the Government and I thank the Minister for his co-operation. I asked for an advance copy of the Bill, because I considered that this matter was urgent and that we could deal with it expeditiously only if this was done. This is common to both Parties and, as a matter of courtesy, I say that what has been done is appreciated, at least by me.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): One may commend the Government for introducing this measure before the end of the session but one cannot condone the Government's failure to come to grips sooner with the problems of the rural sector. The member for Mallee has mentioned a matter he raised some months ago and which would have helped to bring forward several issues and subsidiary issues that will be dealt with soon. However, the Government failed miserably to do that and even voted against any consideration being given to the country people in their plight. In his explanation, the Minister stated:

A draft proposal was prepared but only recently the States, realizing the increasing difficulties facing farmers, had further discussions . . .

Members on this side have been telling the Government since Parliament met that there are difficulties in the rural area, but the Government does not seem to realize that the problems exist.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you serious, or are you saying this for your local rag?

Dr. EASTICK: I wonder whether the Minister is serious. Does he think that a member of this House talks for the sake of talking? Many times during this session questions pertinent to the problems of the rural industry have been discussed but have been poohpoohed by the front bench opposite. In his prepared explanation, the Minister stated:

Recent movements in wool prices have been contrary to the earlier forecasts upon which the arrangements were originally developed and this circumstance, in itself, has thrown serious doubts upon the likely effectiveness of the original proposals.

I agree with that. It is a statement of fact: the type of fact that has been mentioned in this House over the last couple of months. Some action could have been considered long before now. The Minister also referred to the fact that it is intended that the scheme will operate in three parts, and I fully agree with this. That is the only logical way to approach the matter. The third part to which the Minister referred is rehabilitation of farmers and, whilst I agree fully with this, I wonder what arrangement has been made or what the Government is doing to rehabilitate the people who provide the ancillary services to the farming community.

I hope that the Minister knows that, in the farming community, many other services, organizations and tradesmen are in grave difficulty because of the problems of the rural community, and I ask what will be the real answer for these people if many certificates are handed down in the areas in which they live. I fully appreciate, from the information given to us, that the Minister and his advisers will seriously consider the situation, but provision is made that the recovery of debts can be stopped at whatever point it may have reached, whether by direct contact or at law, and these persons who have provided the goods over a long time will have no immediate redress or opportunity to gain income.

Probably, this is inevitable in the situation that we are discussing, but I ask the Government whether it has considered, or intends to consider, helping financially these people who will have difficulty in maintaining their viability. Part IV contains no provision for appeal by a person whose application is declined by the Minister. This is quite final. Probably, having regard to the number of applications that will be considered, a line must be drawn somewhere, but I point out that this is a final situation for the individual if he cannot have his application reconsidered. Clause 9 provides that the Minister may act only on the recommendation of the committee. This will prevent any possibility of political pull or pressure, and I think it is a wise provision.

This is a useful measure that will help farmers in the situation in which they find themselves today. Clause 12 provides that one of the qualifications needed to obtain a protection certificate is that the farmer has actually applied for assistance under the scheme. I find it difficult to imagine that the Minister or the committee would consider the matter had the person concerned not applied for assistance. Whether this provision is aimed at preventing outside persons or other individuals from applying on behalf of another person in an endeavour to get help themselves, I do not know.

The Bill also provides that a magistrate has the right to alter the protection afforded by the certificate. For the sake of all concerned, I hope that this provision will not be used often. If in the normal course of events

creditors are prevented from taking action against a person under the protection of a certificate, individuals could be taking unilateral action to the detriment of others. I have no doubt that some method will be spelt out loud and clear in the legislation so that the rights of individuals will not be interfered with, rights which are unfavourable to all parties that will have a stake in the distribution of the revitalized farm production. Although other aspects of the legislation will have to be considered in Committee, I support the Bill.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I realize the importance of the Bill and the Minister's anxiety to get it passed as soon as possible. Knowing something of the difficult plight facing so many people, particularly those on the eastern fringes of my own district, I, too, support the Bill. Many of these people have been expecting this legislation ever since the Commonwealth Government announced that it intended to introduce an assistance scheme. Although my district is probably one of the most heavily populated dairy cattle areas in the State, I did not speak in the debate on the marginal dairying reconstruction scheme, as most of the dairies in my district are large enterprises that will probably require less reconstruction than dairies in most other areas of the State. It is, however, a different matter in relation to this legislation. There have been many forced sales and, indeed, many instances in which farmers have, through ill health, had to leave their properties; and it would have helped some of them had this legislation been passed earlier. I am not sure that I go as far as the member for Mallee regarding the stability of the industry. He spoke about some form of nationalization whereby the farmer is assured at all times of a stable income. I believe that in primary production there will always be an element of risk, and it is perhaps the nature of things that it should be so. It perhaps fulfils the spirit of private enterprise that there is this risk rather than that there should be stable prices. I suppose it was obvious to the Government throughout the 1967 drought that a percentage of claims would never be met and that it would not be able to recoup from those persons to whom grants were made. I suppose this is a human risk as well as a risk of the elements and of the viability of the unit. Probably 10 per cent, 12 per cent or 15 per cent of the people who at present appear to have a viable unit and good prospects of being able to weather the financial storm about them will not be able finally to make the grade.

Mr. Nankivell: It may be more than that.

Mr. WARDLE: Yes, it may be, although we hope not.

Mr. Nankivell: I think you will find it is, and that is the reason for the delay in the agreement.

Mr. WARDLE: That may be so. I have no facts or statistics to give the House regarding the 1967 position. I have heard the figure of 15 per cent stated, but I cannot give any authority for it. It is probably obvious now to those who were involved in the scheme that, at least from the farmer's point of view, he might have been better off had he not been part of the drought assistance scheme. However, who was to know that the prices would fall, that the seasons would be poor, and that large losses would be incurred?

Mr. Nankivell: Aren't the seasons a big enough handicap without falling prices?

Mr. WARDLE: They are always a risk to the man on the land, who, to a large extent, gambles with the weather and prices; therefore, it can perhaps be said that his occupation is risky. The legislation will assist persons in districts such as my own. I have never believed that the $12,000,000 first mentioned would be sufficient in this situation, and I am pleased to see that this is only an interim measure. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill. I understand from the Minister's second reading explanation that this legislation will enable the agreement to proceed. The Minister expects that after the agreement has been reached further legislation, which can be considered in detail next session, will be introduced. In the meantime, this legislation will enable something to be undertaken as agreement is reached and, for that reason, there is no point in trying to hold it up. Indeed, there is every reason for pushing it along. I do not know whether the community realizes the extent of the problems facing primary-producing areas. They are serious, especially where people have no chance to diversify from the main lines of production. One of the first things that happened was the introduction of the wheat quotas legislation, which effectively prevented people from going into the wheat-growing industry and prevented the wheat-growers from expanding their activities. This, to some extent, cast the wheatgrowers into competitive fields with other cerealgrowers and with people engaged in animal husbandry.

There are other forms of primary production for which control of production will undoubtedly be asked in the future. One obvious industry that comes to mind is the poultry industry, which is, of course, small in relation to this matter. In those industries where production is controlled, the farmers concerned have fewer outlets and are driven out of the line of production in which they have been mainly engaged. Of course, people who have been depending on wool production and largely on fat lamb production are now looking to other forms of meat production, notably beef production, although some people have done well in the pig industry. However, I suppose that the main thought of a person who was formerly a woolgrower is that, as his property is suitable for carrying cattle, he should turn to such production.

The problems facing these producers at present are mainly those of finance for the additional outlay required. I hope the present optimism is justified, but we cannot foresee much of what will happen regarding the beef industry, although there is no sign of weakness in it at present. With these developments taking place, the industry is undergoing a tremendous change. Many people will not be able to finance activities associated with beef production, and many others will not be able satisfactorily to produce any other kind of crop or to engage in any other form of animal production for which there is a buoyant market. They will largely be the people who will be affected by this scheme. I wish the Government success in getting the scheme satisfactorily launched; I hope it will eventually lead to an adequate solution of the primary producer's problems, but it does not seem that the whole solution has been found. As the agreement has not been finalized, I have yet to see who will actually qualify for assistance. Despite the provisions that the Government is trying to implement through the agreement, it may still be a limited group of people.

There are one or two matters in the Bill which I query but which I think the Minister will answer quite easily. I refer, for example, to clause 10, dealing with the Primary Producers Debt Adjustment Fund, which, according to the Auditor-General's Report, amounts to $804,636. I should like the Minister to make quite clear that this will not be confused with the fund on which the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act draws.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill. I was disappointed that, when the Minister gave his second reading explanation this afternoon, only four members of his Party were in the House. This indicates that the Government has not much sympathy for this legislation or for the people whom it is supposed to help. Had they listened to what the Minister said today, those who may not have much knowledge of the rural industry's problems may have learnt something, but unfortunately most of the Government benches were vacant. It is not necessary for me to go into great detail about the rural problems existing at present. However, the industry has been waiting patiently for this legislation, knowing that complementary legislation was being prepared by the Commonwealth Government. Indeed, we were expecting this measure to be introduced some time ago.

The Bill enables the Government to get the plan under way in South Australia and to spend the $800,000-odd of Commonwealth money at present held. I am sorry that the Government did not take this step earlier, because this money was in hand and would have helped much sooner than will now be the case. However, the sum to be made available to rural industry over the next four years is only relatively small and, as a result, relatively few of the farming community will receive help. It is the responsibility of this Government to help rural industry in this State in other ways, and there are many ways in which it can help, especially when we realize what rural industry has done for the State. In 1955, South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited was given a charter, and since then growers have paid to the company $24,000,000 in tolls to get bulk handling under way in South Australia, whereas in the other States, except Western Australia, Government instrumentalities have been involved.

When interest is calculated on this $24,000,000, it amounts to another $2,000,000 a year that is contributed by growers in this State to their bulk handling system. However, a charge is levied by the railways where sidings are built, and over $1,000,000 in rail freights is paid each year to the department. In addition, if grain is moved by other than rail transport, a charge of 83c a ton is levied against the industry. Bearing in mind the $5,000 in charges relating to our terminals, we can see that primary industry in this State has done much to help itself, and we can appreciate that through circumstances beyond its control the industry finds itself in the

present position. Rising costs, increased wages and taxation, including succession duties, etc., represent some of the problems facing the primary producer. It is up to the Government to give some relief in other ways to primary producers in this State, but unfortunately this will not come within the ambit of this legislation. This legislation should be passed immediately, but I remind the Minister of the contribution that primary producers are making to South Australia, and in their hour of need I hope this Labor Government will not be found wanting.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I, too, support the Bill, and I am pleased that the Minister has introduced it. It will fill a need and be a start in the right direction in considering the needs of primary producers. I know the Bill should pass as soon as possible, but it is appropriate that I and others who represent primary-producing areas should say something about it. Today, rural producers are producing and selling their goods (beef is the exception) at world parity and a long way below the cost of production, and many sacrifices have been made by them. The Minister and I come from the same part of the State. I am a farmer and at weekends I work overtime on the farm.

If the primary product was taking its rightful place at a parity level in the community it would stand on its own feet, and the farmer would be able to give jobs to fellows who set up in rural areas. Such persons are the life blood of decentralization, but, as the farmer is being forced to do much of his own work, many shearing and other contractors are not being employed. This legislation has been criticized for not going far enough. I do not criticize it, because I am pleased that a start is being made. This nation and the world must be fed. Every person that I know wants three square meals a day, and there are many mouths in this world to feed.

Many primary producers are extremely worried whether they will be able to continue on the job next year. As the member for Mallee has said, there has to be price stability: the farmer must receive a price for his goods in keeping with present-day money values. The day is not far distant when an authority will have to consider the need for this nation to produce goods. We will have to face up to a quota system, and it will have to be spelt out that a certain farmer can produce, say, 3,000 lambs and must receive $10 each for them. The Minister wants this legislation passed quickly, but I do not want to cast a silent vote on it. I am grateful that in the dying hours of this session the Government has seen fit to introduce this Bill, which is one of the most important measures we have discussed this session.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, support the Bill. I do not think the Government can justifiably complain that we are delaying its passage. In some instances it thinks this, but as members for rural districts (and many on this side represent those districts) it is our duty to speak in support of this measure. The Minister chided the member for Light for his critical remarks about the record of the Labor Government, but the Minister must confess that there has been some softening in the Government's attitude and that there is a change in its thinking towards the rural community. In his second reading explanation the Minister has said that the position in rural industries has deteriorated in the past four months, but we have been saying, since our election to this House, that there has been a rural crisis for some time, and there is a continuing crisis of major magnitude in our rural industries today.

It is pleasing to realize that the Government, and the Minister on behalf of the Government, has recognized this fact. The word "crisis" has been bandied about in one or two other respects in this House, but there is a crisis of major proportion in rural industries today, and it has not come about in the past four months. Perhaps the position has deteriorated more in that time, but the position has been desperate for some time. It is pleasing to see that the Government is pressing on with rural reconstruction. Perhaps we may not expect to hear interjections from the Minister who has criticized primary producers and has pointed out that if a concession is gained the primary producer gets it. We will not expect this reaction from the Government in future.

The Bill is urgent and should be passed with a minimum of delay. However, I speak on behalf of people particularly in the Murray Plains area of my district. Much has been said about wheat and wool, which are two of our major oversea income earners, but the problems in our fruitgrowing and dairying industries in the Adelaide Hills are acute, and many people are facing difficulties. I think that the maximum benefit that could accrue in my district from this measure would be to people engaged in mixed farming on the Murray Plains. These people depend for survival on making a good profit in a good year, because in some years they experience drought conditions. It is the good years on

which they rely to obtain a better than average return that will carry them through the drought periods. With the present prices for wheat and wool, these people cannot be assured of a good income in any year.

We must recognize that other movements in our economy militate against the interests of primary producers. In Australia we look to the mineral boom to assist us in the balance of payments, but we must not forget that primary producers make a contribution that is undeniable and valuable. The whole economy of this country depends largely on the major contributions made to it by wool, grains, dairy produce, and, to a lesser extent, fruit and other primary produce. We cannot go past the basic point that the overall health of our economy is based fairly and squarely on the primary industry. In these circumstances we cannot allow these people to exist in conditions that cannot compare with conditions applying to other members of the community. At present many of these people are existing below the bread line. We think in terms of many of the smaller farmers leaving the land. In the name of fairness and justice we cannot tolerate this situation. The overall health and prosperity of the community still depend on the contribution these people make to Australia's overall export earnings and to our economy. Whichever way the position is viewed, these people must not be forgotten. I do not think the effect of other movements in the economy on the rural industries is fully understood. I remember a comment made about three years ago in a judgment of a commissioner of the Arbitration Court that the wage increases handed down would cause some difficulty in the farming sector but that this had not been taken into account.

That state of affairs cannot be tolerated. This section of the community makes a massive contribution to the overall state of the economy, yet decisions can be made which do not take these people into account. Although I believe in arbitration, I do not profess to be an expert in it. However, there is something wrong when a commissioner can say that, although harm will be caused to the rural sector, it has been overlooked.

Other movements in the economy are putting primary producers at a disadvantage. People who work in secondary industries generally have their jobs secured by way of tariffs imposed as a protection against competition from overseas. That situation does not apply with regard to primary industries, most of which must sell on the world market against world-wide competition. I wonder whether many of these facts are widely recognized. In the future these matters must not be overlooked. If people are forced off their properties, the whole structure of the rural community will change. It is an absolute farce to talk about decentralization if we do not think in terms of keeping rural producers on their properties. The depression in the rural industries will have sociological effects that are not widely appreciated by people who live in the city. The economic welfare of country towns will decline. Many people in business in rural communities depend directly on primary producers for the welfare of their businesses. If this drift to the city continues, it will not be long before rural life as we know it will cease in this country. I believe it is imperative that real steps be taken to keep these people employed profitably on the land.

In these circumstances, I think that the intention behind the Bill is excellent and that its three major aims are well conceived. The Bill is concerned with rural reconstruction, or the restructuring of debts, and this is desirable. At present many primary producers have debts of such magnitude that they have virtually no equity in their properties. If these debts can be restructured so that they are served and properties remain profitable, the farmers will have been done a great service.

The second concept in the Bill is to build up properties to an economic size, but that provision is fairly difficult to implement. Over the years there has been a slow aggregation of properties, but we always come up against the problem of deciding when a farm is big enough. I can remember when in certain areas 500 acres of broad-acre farming was enough for a secure living, but those days are gone. How big is big enough? We encounter this sort of problem when talking about farms of an economic size. If the production of wool is unprofitable, the size of the property does not matter, so it is nonsense to talk about getting a property of viable size. The third proposal in the Bill, which we hope would not have to be implemented, deals with the rehabilitation of farmers if they are forced off the land. Something must be done to re-employ them.

Mr. Nankivell: Would you agree that it will not be easy to make an assessment of what is a viable unit, without much information as to returns from the unit?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I agree. That is the second provision in the Bill and it will be most difficult to implement. The third provision will be needed only as a last resort in the case of retraining people who have been forced off the land. Such a situation would be deplorable. This Bill has been introduced at short notice. However, I would be neglecting my duty to those in farming areas in the Adelaide Hills and Murray Plains and in the other parts of my district, if I did not speak on this measure. I commend the Government for introducing the Bill, which I have pleasure in supporting.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I, too, support the Bill, knowing that it is really a first attempt to help farmers who are in a most difficult situation which will get much worse yet. That is the thought that dismays us when we consider the rural problem. Statistics show that the pressures on rural districts will be much worse in five years' or 10 years' time. In moving the censure motion on land tax, I gave figures of increased costs that showed clearly that the dramatic cost increases are continuing and that the rate is probably accelerating. Therefore, these problems will be magnified. Where, by additional finance provided under the scheme, properties are purchased to enlarge other properties, the increasing cost of inflation will continue, with rural products having no real prospect of enjoying an automatic price rise. This interim measure does not really solve the problem of the cost-price squeeze as it applies to primary producers.

That is not to say that we should not have the Bill or that we should not welcome the assistance provided by the Commonwealth Government, which I congratulate on making this money available. I am sure that, having got into this matter, the Commonwealth Government will find that it must provide much more money as the years go by. After the Second World War there was a period when prices were stable and when rural producers and their successors or newcomers to the land believed that prosperity was a permanent feature of rural production, but today that belief is shattered. I remember some of the warnings given that have been ignored over the years. Hardly anyone foreshadowed the problems that would arise. I remember speaking in a debate on the Rural Advances Guarantee Bill in 1963 and, with some other members, giving diffident support to that Bill, because we said that these guarantees would set up producers on a high percentage of borrowing on their properties, with an uncertain future from farm production for a time that could not be foretold.

Wellknown areas, as well as new areas, are in trouble at present. Some areas face the ultimate disaster that the land cannot afford to produce. Some semi-cleared blocks in South Australia at present are going back to scrub because it is not economic to proceed with them. The cost of freight in some parts of South Australia is bringing those areas close to the stage where every animal or product they turn off the land is turned off at a loss.

These circumstances, considered with the rapidly accelerating costs, are dramatic. However, we must do what we can. I hope that the trend that those of us from country areas see today of people adjusting, deciding to hang on, and curtailing expenditure and readjusting production to meet the circumstances, will be as widespread as possible. In other cases, we see a move from the land, and this brings a personal problem. However, some persons have done this to obtain reasonable jobs as an alternative to a declining rural situation. I hope that as many persons as possible will be kept on the land by this Bill, but the facts must be faced.

Mr. Venning: The people can't starve there.

Mr. HALL: No, and I hope that the Bill gives real assistance to the rehabilitation of those who face the ultimate. We need to consider other avenues of the rural sector. Education, in both the adult and the Matriculation spheres, is one of these. Both of these areas need serious assessment. The upgrading of these facilities may not be achieved in the short term, but in the long term we hope that these people from the country areas will be able to obtain their share of jobs in Australia.

The Commonwealth Government must not be neglected when we are supporting this Bill. Over the years the Commonwealth Government has been criticized about the results in agriculture, yet, in the main, it has acceded to what the rural industries have asked for. Again today that Government shows that it is willing to help in a major way. Whilst $1,000,000 will not go as far as this legislation would carry the need for finance, at least the Commonwealth Government is giving the industry a substantial sum and I hope that the South Australian Government matches the Commonwealth Government's generosity by proper and sympathetic administration of the Act. That will be the Minister's real responsibility.

If we want more money for this purpose, we will get it much more easily if we administer the legislation properly and effectively. This State must establish a good reputation so that, if we want more help, we shall be able to get it because of our record. I deeply regret the necessity to pass this legislation, as I think every other member does. Five years ago, who would have thought that this legislation would be introduced? However, here it is and the need is urgent.

Every member who represents a country district or who recognizes the problems of country areas today can cite instances to back up the need for this Bill in practical terms. I support the measure and trust that it will pass before Parliament prorogues. I also hope that the steps necessary to finalize the matter (as the Minister has said, this is an interim measure) will ensure that the legislation is continuous in operation.

I am concerned about the unsecured creditors of rural producers. I do not know the full implications of the certificates of protection and I should like the Minister to say what they mean to the many country traders who have extended credit liberally to rural producers. Will these traders be left out of the legislation? I do not think the countryside wants these businesses to be in liquidation merely because certain parts of rural industry have been forgotten.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill. As other members and the Minister have said, it is regrettable that we find it necessary to pass this legislation, and the unfortunate state of our rural industries is a matter for regret. I sincerely trust that, small though the amount allocated for the whole Australian rural debt reconstruction is, it will relieve the situation. It is unfortunate that, from the inception of the idea of this legislation, the former Minister for Primary Industry (Mr. Anthony), as quoted in the *Advertiser* of October 3 last year, stated that there was to be a hard line so far as rural debts were concerned. The reports that the Minister of Lands, who conducted the negotiations on behalf of this State, has given us show that it was only after hard bargaining and putting up a strong case that the States made the Commonwealth Government realize that much more than $100,000,000 would be required to do the job in the proposal.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): After giving us a lecture, doubtless the Leader of the Opposition expects the Government to be jumping up and down and doing everything possible to help the rural industry in its time of need. However, I assure the Leader that we do not need a lecture from him about that. I was amused to hear him congratulate the Commonwealth Government and speak of that Government's generosity in advancing $100,000,000 over four years to assist rural industry. The Government has advanced that amount, but $75,000,000 of it is loan and $25,000,000 is grant and in 23 years the States will pay to the Commonwealth Government $133,800,000. That is how generous the Commonwealth Government is!

Mr. Hall: What is the interest rate?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The interest rate on the $75,000,000 will be 6 per cent. The remainder of the money is a grant, but the overall result to the State over 23 years will be that it has paid back to the Commonwealth Government $133,800,000. We should not, therefore, run away with the idea that the Commonwealth Government has been generous. As the member for Mallee said, the real problem with primary industries today is that they do not want handouts: they merely want a market on which they can sell their goods at reasonable prices. We are not tackling the source of the problem by passing this legislation, and I do not want the South Australian public to be deceived; this legislation will not assist many people. That must be made perfectly clear, and the Government is not trying to deceive the primary producers of this State. South Australia has $12,000,000, which is to be split up over four years in three different ways, unless (as is possible, the Minister for Primary Industry having said that the Commonwealth Government will review the situation) the Commonwealth Government comes to the party. I hope it does not have to, and I hope that our markets will improve to such an extent that this State's primary producers will do what they want to do and what they have always aimed to do: stand on their own feet.

Mr. Hall: Perhaps you could give a lead by abolishing land tax. That would be a help.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not want to enter into that argument, but the Leader knows, having been told so many times in this House, that 80 per cent of the people who pay land tax pay less than $25 a year, and he is saying that we should abolish it! That would not even touch the surface, as the Leader knows. I appreciate what members opposite have said about this problem. I want to emphasize that this is not a write-off

scheme; the Government is requiring people to pay, in certain instances, 6½ per cent on the money they are given in order to meet Commonwealth Government regulations.

Mr. Hall. Some of which can be used to pay their land tax.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the Leader would listen to the points I am making, he would realize that the Government understands the problem and that it is trying to attack it in a more reasonable manner than his Party would. I do not think any member opposite would be happy if the people who get this money had to pay 6 per cent interest on it. Surely they would not agree to that. In other instances, people will have to pay 4 per cent a year. I warn members that, although the Government has agreed to this scheme, it is not happy with it. The member for Mallee criticized the Government for not accepting his motion to launch an inquiry into the rural industries of this State. I clearly pointed out to him then that, no matter what sort of inquiry we in this State set up to examine the problems confronting our primary industries, it would quickly become out of date. Also, we must convince the Commonwealth Government that it must act in this respect. I point out to the members for Murray and Light that I am convinced that the departmental officers are sufficiently well informed of the problem facing this State to enable them to put a case to the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Nankivell: Now, but not last September.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member fully realizes, the officers in the Government departments have been fully aware of the problem throughout.

Mr. Nankivell: But you didn't say that before.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have said nothing to the contrary; these officers have always been well informed.

Mr. Nankivell: Why didn't you make an announcement, then?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What point was there in making any announcement? Can the honourable member tell me that?

Mr. Nankivell: Yes.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the conferences that have taken place with the Commonwealth Government on this matter, this State has submitted its case as effectively as have any other States. I believe this may even have made the Commonwealth Government realize that it must tackle this problem in another way so as to get at its source.

Mr. Nankivell: I agree.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is what should be done. I do not criticize members opposite for what they have said. However, I make it patently clear to the people of this State that this legislation will not solve the problems of most people, and I do not want the masses believing that it will. I have explained to the Leader the situation regarding the Commonwealth Government's generosity and, if he wants to do so, he may congratulate the Commonwealth Government.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Financial provision."

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question concerns the balance presently standing in the trust account under the Primary Producers Debts Act. Will this be the first money used in the implementation of this legislation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): This money will be transferred. I was also asked whether this had anything to do with the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act. Of course, it has not: it is a separate fund, the $800,000 contained in which can be transferred immediately the Bill is assented to and becomes law. This means there will be funds on which the Government can operate and, so far as I am aware, this will be the first money available in the fund.

Mr. VENNING: I understand that this $800,000 is in addition to the $12,000,000 in the next four years.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is correct.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Does this mean that the money presently standing in credit in the Primary Producers Debts Fund can be applied only to debt reconstruction and does it also mean that this Bill applies only to debt reconstruction?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I understand it, the money to be paid into the fund will be for the complete scheme. We have separated this into three stages so that the public can see that three different aspects are to be dealt with. The money to be provided under the Bill can be used for any one of those purposes.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has a provision been enacted that the money allocated to the States must be used in a certain way? I understand that some of this money must be apportioned for debt adjustment and some for farm build-up.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is correct, but the $800,000 would be taken as

part of the total scheme and it would not be isolated for one operation. True, money is apportioned to certain activities and, because I am not certain of the exact figures (although that is the principle that has been laid down), I will obtain that information and inform the honourable member accordingly.

Clause passed.

Clause 9—"Functions of committee."

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say how many people will be involved with the committee and who may be appointed to it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government has made no final decision on this matter, but there will be a committee of three, and at present it is considered that one of the members will be a representative of rural industry; the second will be a representative of people engaged in financing rural industry; and the third will be a Government representative.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Abandonment of farm."

Dr. EASTICK: This clause povides that a certificate shall be cancelled in certain circumstances, provision being made in clause 22 for the Minister to give a direction in writing. I believe that the most satisfactory method of approach would be by direct contact.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the honourable member would have had personal experience of departmental officers' making personal contact with some people, and even that has not succeeded. The requirement to put it in writing is necessary to put the matter on a firm basis, but at the same time I expect that the department will be making the sort of contact desired by the honourable member, particularly in difficult cases. I assure the honourable member that the matter will be administered adequately.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 21 passed.

Clause 22—"Directions of Minister."

Dr. EASTICK: Apropos what I said just now, I take it that, although the Minister may give notice in writing, there will be physical contact in respect of a farm and of the assistance provided from time to time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes; first, the Minister might not be able to determine whether or not he should write unless there had been personal contact on the farm.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister say who will police this matter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Lands Department will be responsible for administering the scheme. No doubt the Director of Lands will decide which officers will be competent to handle the matter.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am sure that the services of Agriculture Department officers may be required here.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am sure this could be so, but it would be at the request of the Director of Lands, no doubt on the advice of some of his officers. I am certain that the services would be sought of competent officers of the Agriculture Department to assist in these investigations.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister say whether, as a result of this, there will be a servicing charge in respect of a farm?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I understand it, there will certainly be no servicing charge to the farmer concerned.

Clause passed.

Clauses 23 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—"Regulations."

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister say why it is necessary to provide for the appointment of the committee personnel by way of regulation?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not sure why this has been provided, but I will inquire for the honourable member and let him know. However, I take it that he is otherwise satisfied with the provision.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Juries Act, 1927, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for (*a*) the selection of the annual jury lists by computer as an alternative to the present method of random selection by ballot; (*b*) the discharge of persons from jury service, in the first instance, by the sheriff. At present applications for discharge can be heard by only the court concerned; and (*c*) a revision of the classes of person exempt from jury service. Of the three main matters covered by the Bill, the new provisions relating to the preparation of jury lists by computer is perhaps the most significant. While the costs for the first year of operation may be marginally greater than those for selection by the method of ballot, it is

anticipated that substantial savings can be effected in subsequent years. This is, of course, aside from the great savings in time that can be effected by use of the computer.

To consider the Bill in some detail, clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that applications for discharge from jury service may be made to the sheriff. By subsection (2) of proposed new section 16, there is a right for a person to apply to the court directly for a discharge where there was a good reason for the person's not applying to the sheriff. In addition, there is provided a right of appeal against a refusal by the sheriff to grant a discharge. Clauses 3 and 4 make amendments consequential on the amendments made by clause 5 which sets out the procedure for preparation of the annual jury list by computer. It will be noted that this is an alternative procedure; that is, the method of selection by ballot has been preserved.

Clause 6 makes an amendment to section 32 of the principal Act that is consequential on the amendments made by clause 7, which provides for the completion of jury panels by computer. Clause 8 recasts the third schedule to the principal Act by bringing it up to date and by adding some new classes of exempt person, being, amongst others, (*a*) persons in the employ of commercial airlines; (*b*) ambulance personnel; (*c*) persons in the employ of the Electricity Trust of South Australia; (*d*) opticians; (*e*) physiotherapists; (*f*) veterinary surgeons; and (*g*) persons with an inadequate knowledge of the English language. In addition, Part II of the old third schedule, which exempted persons having a connection with the Commonwealth, has been omitted. These exemptions are now provided for by the Jury Exemption Act, 1965, of the Commonwealth and the regulations made thereunder. The retention of this Part could only result in confusion as to the jury status of persons having this connection with the Commonwealth.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the second reading. If my recollection serves me correctly, it was at least mooted when we were in office that the computer lists be used in relation to jury service. This matter must have had a low priority on the Attorney-General's list to be brought in at such a late stage of the session. However, we on this side will assist the passage of the Bill through the various stages. First, I refer to new section 16 (2) (*a*). In due course, I intend to take some action with regard to this, because I cannot see why a person who had not applied to the sheriff to be excused would have to satisfy the court that he had a good reason for failing to apply before the court could decide whether he should be excused.

A person may have a good reason to be excused but may not have had a good reason for failing to apply to the sheriff. Although this is only a minor point, it appears to be an imperfection in the scheme of the Bill; I think we could do without the words "but that there was good reason for his failure to apply". This would mean that in the normal course of events people would go to the sheriff to apply to be excused. If they did not go to the sheriff for that purpose they could still go to the court. There seems to be no harm in doing this and no reason why they should go to the court only if they have a good reason for failing to go to the sheriff. I point out that this is a new departure. In the present provision it is the court which excuses a person from jury service.

I query some of the categories of exemption in the third schedule. I suppose that, as we have already included licensed pilots, and the masters, officers and crews of trading vessels and of tugs, it is reasonable to include "airlines, commercial, persons in the employ of". Why we could not have had "persons in the employ of commercial airlines" I do not know. A more serious matter to which I direct the Attorney's attention is the reference to ambulance brigade members. As I understand the position, most ambulance brigade members are volunteers on a part-time basis. They go to the football on Saturday afternoons as ambulance men, but work in some other occupation during the week. I do not think that it is the intention to excuse from jury service such persons merely because they happen to belong to the St. John Ambulance Brigade.

Mr. Coumbe: Some are full time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I think it should only be those who are excused. Perhaps the Attorney-General in his reply could say what is his intention. If his intention is that only full-time members are to be excluded, I think we should clear this up in the schedule. I cannot see why people who work for the Electricity Trust should, simply because they work for the trust, be exempt from jury service, yet that item has been added to the schedule.

Mr. Coumbe: What is the difference between those employees and employees of the Engineering and Water Supply Department?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know. The scheme of the schedule originally was to exempt people who worked in organizations

which it was vital to keep going for the purposes of the community. I think that in this day and age that is not really the appropriate principle on which to work, and I query the addition, to the already fairly long and not very logical list, of employees of the Electricity Trust. Why an accountant who works in the trust's building at Greenhill Road should not be liable for jury service but an accountant working for the South Australian Gas Company should be liable, I do not know. It is a good thing that we have added to the list persons who have an inadequate knowledge of the English language, and I warmly congratulate the Attorney on that addition to the list.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The honourable member made a good point in relation to new section 16(2)(*a*). This provision was inserted to attempt to discourage people from by-passing the sheriff and cluttering up the courts with applications. On the surface, it appears to be salutary from that point of view. However, I am impressed with the difficulty that could arise if a person who could not show that he had good reason for not applying to the sheriff nevertheless had good reason for being exempted. That would mean that the exemption would be refused, although it should have been granted, merely because the person had not applied to the sheriff. As the member for Mitcham has said, the schedule is illogical; it is difficult to try to make sense of it. I suppose that one could never draw up a list of exemptions about which someone could not say, "If so-and-so is exempt, why is not someone else?" The honourable member gave the example of an Electricity Trust employee being exempt and a Gas Company employee not being exempt. A series of exemptions is granted to employees of public instrumentalities where it is thought that the carrying on of an essential service must take priority over jury service. An example is the transport industry including employees of the airlines, the railways, and the Tramways Trust.

Mr. Coumbe: And Crown employees generally.

The Hon. L. J. KING: There is no exemption for Crown employees generally. The view has been taken initially by the sheriff (and the Crown has agreed) that employees of the Electricity Trust have to carry on quite essential services, and there is a good case for giving them a similar exemption to that enjoyed by employees of the Tramways Trust, the railways and fire brigades. I agree that, no matter where one draws the line, someone on the other side of the line can make out as good a case, but on the whole I consider that there is justification for exempting Electricity Trust employees.

Regarding ambulance brigade employees, the case for the full-time brigade members is obviously much stronger than is that for the part-time members. However, part-time members are on call from time to time to discharge duties in connection with their ambulance work, and there could conceivably be a conflict between jury duty and the requirements of the ambulance service. Perhaps the conflict is less now than it was when juries were locked up overnight but, nonetheless, perhaps it is asking too much to ask a person who may be called out on ambulance service in his own time to accept the burden of jury service. After all, these people give much of their time voluntarily to a service vital to the community.

Mr. Coumbe: Including training.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes and, if the matter is considered from the point of view that the community, in exempting them from jury service, is giving something back for the time they give up, I think it is justified on that ground alone.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Power to discharge juror."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new section 16 (2) (*a*) to strike out "but that there was good reason for his failure to apply".

I raised this matter during the second reading debate and the Attorney-General has replied, so I think it unnecessary to go over the ground again.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): For the reasons I gave in replying to the second reading debate, I accept this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Repeal of third schedule of principal Act, and enactment of schedule in its place."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was considerably mollified by the Attorney's conciliatory tones when replying to some of the points I made regarding the list in the third schedule. I agree that it is impossible to get any logic into the list. However, I still wonder about members of the ambulance brigade. However, this Bill must go to another place, where

doubtless it will be reviewed, and the Attorney may then consider, on reflection, that there is case for a change.

Dr. EASTICK: The schedule refers to medical practitioners, dentists and pharmaceutical chemists, registered and actually practising, and it also uses the words "registered and actually practising" in dealing with veterinary surgeons or practitioners. Veterinary surgeons employed by the Crown do not need to be registered, but they are often practising. Can the Attorney-General say why this qualification is made, particularly in relation to veterinary surgeons?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think the reason for qualifying this category with the words "actually practising" is that the exemption is based on the fact that the citizen is performing the functions of a veterinary surgeon, or as the case may be. Exemption does not attach to having the qualifications. The fact that a man may be qualified should not give him exemption if he is carrying on another occupation or living in comfortable retirement. I think the exemption must depend on the fact that the citizen is performing the function at the time. Consequently, one finds the exemption extending to barristers and solicitors who are actually practising. If the barrister or solicitor is ever able to live in comfortable retirement, he may be called on to sit in the jury box. That also applies to the veterinary surgeon. I realize that there may be anomalous cases but I do not think that any form of drafting can overcome these. I think it is necessary to confine the exemption to those carrying on a profession.

Dr. EASTICK: There is such a dearth of veterinary surgeons in the Government employ that those veterinary surgeons who are rather thinly spread in this State may be withdrawn from the service.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will inquire whether there is any real problem, and perhaps that matter can be considered in future. However, I should be reluctant to deprive the administration of justice of the wisdom of veterinary surgeons.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I move:

That, pursuant to the final proviso of section 16 (5) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, 1966-1968, this House hereby authorizes the sale by the Aboriginal Lands Trust of sections 147 and 149, hundred of Seymour, to Alan Reginald Sheppard and Lena Mavis Sheppard, of 35 Grenfell Street, Adelaide.

The reason for this motion will appear from the facts that I am about to give the House. Wellington East (hundred of Seymour, section 147 and 149, a total area of 48 acres) was proclaimed an Aboriginal reserve on April 14, 1938. This area is also known as The Pines. Wellington East has little tribal significance. Aborigines who travelled on foot in former times used to regard it as a camping ground. With the improvement of transportation and the increase of sophistication of the Aborigines, fewer and fewer people camped on the reserve.

In 1941 an Aboriginal named G. E. Muckray, who held section 150, hundred of Seymour, which was adjacent to the reserve, under perpetual lease, was given a licence to farm on the reserve. Later in the same year Mr. Muckray decided to offer for military service and sublet section 150 to a W. J. Trevena, who later rented the reserve from the Aborigines Protection Board. The reserve has since then been leased to various people who held the adjoining section 150, as the reserve was of little value except when used in conjunction with section 150. The Aborigines Protection Board, however, reserved five acres in order that some houses could be erected on it if required. In 1956 the Aborigines Protection Board erected three prefabricated houses on the reserve. But this housing scheme was proved a failure because of lack of water and distance from normal facilities. As a result, the houses were removed to other reserves during 1963.

The reserve was transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust on September 9, 1967. It was leased to Mrs. D. E. Webb by the trust. The lease was transferred to Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Sheppard on June 9, 1968. An offer was received from Mr. Sheppard to purchase the reserve on June 30, 1968. Negotiations subsequently took place and agreement was reached on a price of $50 an acre, which price is in excess of the Land Board valuation. The Aboriginal Lands Trust desires to sell the land to Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Sheppard for the above price. The action contemplated by the trust is based on the following reasons:

1. The land in question would be unsuitable for development to allow the settlement of an Aboriginal, due to its size, lack of assured water, problem of sand drift, and the very strong nature of part of the area making it unsuitable for cropping.

2. Sale to an adjoining owner offers the most attractive sale possibilities (Mr. Sheppard is an adjoining owner).

3. The sale of the land would not impede the long-term plans for development of the trust.

4. The money received could be used as capital for other projects.

5. The land in question is of little or no tribal significance.

6. Mr. Sheppard is anxious to purchase to ensure security of tenure and expand his existing holding.

Under the provisions of the subsection of the Act referred to in the motion, it is necessary for the trust, in order to carry out this sale, to have the approval by resolution of both Houses of Parliament. Therefore, I ask the House to carry the motion.

Later:

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I rely on the information given by the Minister in moving this motion and, in doing so, am willing to support it. Having made some independent inquiries, I am informed that $50 an acre is a good price for the land. I look forward to the day when it will not be necessary for motions of this kind to come before the House and when Parliament will have sufficient faith in the Aboriginal Lands Trust to allow it to run its own affairs without any oversight such as this. However, for the time being it is necessary under the Act for such a motion to be moved and carried by both Houses.

I should like the Minister to clarify one matter. I am not sure whether the Minister got these notes together himself or whether he relied upon one of his officers to do so. I do not know how great his acquaintance with this land is, but I should like to ask what on earth he means by the phrase "the very strong nature of part of the area". I think that has something to do with soil. I have asked many of my farming friends on this side what this means, but they cannot make sense of it either. Although the Minister said it with serious mien, I hope he will be able to tell me the meaning of this phrase, which must be based on something more than a mental aberration.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I support the motion. This land could be put to much better use than that to which it has been put in the past. I have known this land for some time. I, too, fail to understand the phrase to which the member for Mitcham has referred. It would be obvious to anyone interested in land that the productivity of this land was poor and that it was inclined to drift. Indeed, this small parcel of land is of no real agricultural importance, and, bearing in mind its productive capacity, $50 an acre is a good price for it. In 1956, when I was the Clerk of the District Council of Meningie, it seemed from the outset to be a strange thing for the Government to place cottages on this land. No reticulated water or power was available, and it seemed as though the cottages were being placed in no-man's land miles from anywhere. If the Government wanted to improve the development and housing conditions of these people and to accustom them to living with improvements (such as septic tanks and so on), this seems to have been a strange experiment in that development. It was pleasing eventually to see the cottages shifted to a locality in which a reticulated electricity and water supply could be connected to them. This land has no significance to Aborigines as sacred ground and it would be an asset for the district council as a whole if this land were added to the other property owned by Mr. and Mrs. Sheppard.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I must confess that when I first came to the passage in the explanation to which the member for Mitcham referred I was puzzled about it. However, I felt reasonably confident about it when I initially read the report: it seemed then to make more sense than it did when I gave my explanation. I think if the word "stony" were substituted for "strong" it might make a little more sense.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and desiring its concurrence thereto.

Motion carried.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 16. Page 4074.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill gives effect to something that the Government has given notice of for a few months and follows what at least one other State (Western Australia) has done regarding industrial development. However, I do not know whether the Bill goes further than the legislation in that State. The Premier, in his explanation, has indicated that the previous system in South Australia in regard to industrial promotion has worked well and that we have been able, under policies followed by successive Governments, to build up an industrial base in which the rate of increase has

for several years been the envy of other States. Recently, that rate of increase has fallen and, because it is one of the facts of life that the rate of industrial development has fallen, it is still too early to blame the Government for it, even though it has done very little in this respect yet. The Government's two years of administration before the next election will give the basis for proceeding with industrial development in its own right, away from the negotiations that were begun or significantly carried on by the previous Government. Many of the announcements made by the Premier have related to industries (such as the Apcel mill, about which the Government made an announcement shortly after assuming office at the beginning of June) in relation to which the previous Government had been negotiating.

The attractiveness of a State to industry will not depend alone on the factors referred to in the second reading explanation supporting the Industries Assistance Corporation. Indeed, the same attractiveness that has applied in the past will apply in the future, although costs of operation, a sympathetic Government attitude in its day-to-day contact with industry, and a sensible attitude in relation to the demands made on industry by those who work in it will still be important. The Premier has said that the legislation is filling an important gap. However, I suggest that that gap is not as large as he would have us believe. From my two years in office, I know that South Australian industries were not inhibited in setting up in this State because of a lack of finance, although one or two smaller industries experienced difficulties that were ultimately resolved in their own private fashion with the assistance of the Industries Development Branch. However, I know of no worthwhile industry that was turned away from this State because it could not get financial backing. Therefore, the gap to which the Premier referred is not as great as he would have us believe.

I fully agree that there needs to be a system that is not limited by an artificial line drawn at the edge of the metropolitan area because, as all members know, the metropolitan area boundaries, in relation to the qualifications needed for guarantee in the past for the building of a lease-purchase factory, were artificially drawn, and the old metropolitan boundaries were taken as the demarcation line. That is completely artificial, and does not relate to the present metropolitan area, including those parts that were treated as country areas for the purpose of industrial development. By and large, those engaged in South Australian industry support this measure, which, after all, aims to reorganize, formalize and perhaps make it easier for the Government, the Minister of Development and the commission that will be set up and, ultimately, the Treasurer (who is also the Minister of Development) to encourage industry on a comprehensive basis. In other words, there will not be an artificial line, and the Treasurer will be able to examine all aspects of industrial development.

Great emphasis is placed on the small industry which needs financial assistance that cannot be provided by any non-financial institution. If carefully administered, this provision could be a valuable incentive for innovation, which is one of the most important aspects of industry. This State must develop specialized industries. Over the years we have been proud of the new products and techniques which have emanated from South Australian inventors and which have been fostered by various firms and factories. However, often an individual finds it difficult to assemble enough equipment to pursue his idea through to a point at which it can be proven and at which industry will take it up on a full manufacturing basis.

One such instance was drawn to my attention when I was Minister of Industrial Development. A small, one-man operator in South Australia, along with many others who submitted their types of a similar product, supplied samples of his product to a large industrial user for the evaluation of the prospective purchaser. As this person could produce only a limited number of his product each week, he was astounded when confronted by the large firm with an order that completely overtaxed his productive capacity. He contacted the Industrial Development Branch and asked for assistance to enable him to meet the unexpected windfall in demand; because of the restrictions that then existed, he could not obtain finance on the first approach. However, he was eventually led to contacts and was able to obtain the assistance he wanted, full details of which I cannot now remember. However, he persisted with his project, which would no doubt have fallen within the ambit of the provisions of this Bill. That is the sort of industry that I would certainly commend to the Treasurer as one for which the Bill has been framed. However, having said that, and having related this matter to a practical instance of which I was aware, I must draw attention to some matters that could prove difficult. For instance, I see no reason why the commission should not have to refer to

the Industries Development Committee applications for loans not exceeding $75,000. That committee is not overtaxed with work.

Mr. Coumbe: You're joking!

Mr. HALL: I am sure that the members of that committee, well paid as they are, would not mind devoting a little more of their spare time to their responsibilities. I am sure, too, that the number of applications for loans and grants that may be made in this category will not overtax the members of that committee. I will certainly move an amendment in Committee to reduce to a smaller figure the amount of loan that can be made without oversight. I see no reason why Parliament should not have the say regarding applications for assistance for amounts much lower than that provided in the Bill.

Some problems also exist regarding non-repayable monetary grants to enable industries to be established outside the metropolitan area. I know that on the surface this is a well-meaning provision of the Bill. Indeed, one cannot really criticize the Act, the administration of which will be paramount to the reputation that will accrue to the department or the commission. The Administration will hail this Bill as a sensible one that will develop South Australian industries even further; this will be established even more with the passage of time. However, the making of non-repayable monetary grants is raising an entirely new system or principle in relation to industrial development, and I am not sure that this provision should be included in the Bill. I say this on the basis that it could, in effect, be there; but, if an industry should, after some years, become immensely successful as a result of the original grant or loan (this is possible) I believe it should over-state that money that was put into the industry in its early formative years. If, however, an industry were not successful and was unable after a period to meet the initial grant, it might be fair to write the sum off.

However, I do not believe that we should start off on the basis that it is a grant: I think we should ensure that the money should be returned to the State on the industry's becoming a real success. I think I could go three-quarters of the way regarding what the Premier has said about grants. I should like to see the backing, properly handled, for these country industries that may want the resource, which for all practical purposes a grant will provide. However, as I have said, I believe the State should ultimately retain the right to recover the sum if the industry concerned becomes a multi-million dollar success. I know that those involved in industry generally and those who are represented in this State approve of this measure.

As I say, I could find certain faults regarding the details, but it is perhaps unfair to refer to those faults at this stage, as no doubt the measure will be subject to amendment in the future, as is the case regarding other legislation. No doubt, as further power is required to strengthen the measure, or perhaps as controls are required to safeguard the public purse, these amendments will be made. However, the success of the measure will depend largely on its administration by the Minister and on the efforts of the five members appointed to the board. I support the second reading, reserving the right to ask questions in Committee.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the principle of the Bill. For many years, as a back-bencher, I supported the principle of giving greater incentives to secondary industries in South Australia, and I referred on several occasions to the assistance given to rural industry, in which assistance I fully concur. We have an Agriculture Department which provides many extension services and in which expert officers are available to give advice to sectors of rural industry. However, in the secondary industry sphere this is somewhat limited. Of course, there is a different concept here: in rural industry, a man may be growing wheat, as may also his neighbour, but they are not in competition with each other, whereas in secondary industry men engaged in similar operations may be in direct competition with each other.

Having supported the principle of providing more assistance for secondary industries, I have been in close contact for many years (even before I was a member of this House) with, for instance, Mr. Hal Dean of the Premier's Department and other officers in this field. I have seen at first hand how this works. I support the principle not only because of the pleas I have made in the past, or because of my interest in industry generally and my desire to see secondary industry expand in South Australia, but also as a member of the Industries Development Committee.

Mr. Keneally: With plenty of time on your hands!

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. As Minister, I was directly involved in enticing (if I can use that word) oversea industries to come to South

Australia, and some of my efforts in that regard were successful. Previously, there were some remarkable and worthwhile incentives for industry to come to South Australia, apart from the assistance given under the provisions of the present Act. I refer to the actual physical conditions existing in South Australia, including lower costs in this State of freight, power, production, water and various rating schemes. These were the stable conditions that existed in industry for many years. I include also employer and employee relationships and also State taxation which was generally (not always) lower. We had a healthy industrial climate in South Australia that enticed industries to come here.

Unfortunately, however, I consider that some of these advantages have disappeared under the present Government; if they have not entirely disappeared, they are well on the way to disappearing. As I have said, I agree with the Bill in principle. It will undoubtedly mean more work for the Industries Development Committee and, although I will not suggest that the stipend of committee members be increased, that matter will have to be looked at one day. As I understand the present Act, there are certain limitations regarding this matter, and the Act in general has worked fairly well. Where an industry or prospective industry is unable to obtain bank finance either by equity or loan, the committee, in examining a certain project, if it comes within the committee's ambit, can make a recommendation to the Treasurer of the day who will, if the committee recommends accordingly, provide a guarantee.

In most cases the bank or financial institution concerned will then provide the overdraft or will make the financial arrangement desired. Without that guarantee, however, the lending authority may not agree to the proposition's going forward as a viable one, and I have seen this happen. I do not think it is the function of the committee, under the present Act, to provide bridging finance. Sums have occasionally been provided (and there was a case recently) to a country industry to enable it to get over a difficult financial position concerning its budget, the bank in question not being prepared to provide anything further than a certain sum. In the case I have in mind, the committee made a recommendation, and the Treasurer agreed, with the result that I believe that the industry concerned, which shall remain unnamed, will eventually become a viable proposition. This industry operates in a major country town. One of the reasons that influenced me and, I believe, other members of the committee in this regard was that the people concerned were prepared to help themselves.

I am not greatly enamoured of people who are willing only to sit down on their backsides and let someone else do the work for them. In this case, the industry had gone to much trouble and expense and had used its initiative and application in regard to effecting improvements. I am glad to see that that industry has recently secured several contracts within South Australia which will enable it to operate and, more importantly, maintain its work force. It even gained contracts in Whyalla.

The provision in the original Act was that a proposition had to be scrutinized and a recommendation made for the Treasurer to give a bank guarantee, and this usually is given. An extension of the existing Act is now proposed. This will mean a consolidation of the Country Secondary Industries Fund, and I think that is a good thing. The fund is getting low, and it will be possible to consolidate it under the new corporation. The corporation will have definite powers laid down in clause 7, one of which will be to subscribe equity capital. I boggled over this for some time because I wondered whether the Government should participate in equity capital. I know there has been a precedent for this in the case of Cellulose Australia Limited. If the Government of the day had not subscribed to this undertaking, it may have been lost to South Australia. Eventually those shares were disposed of by a later Government.

I have no great objection to this, but part of my makeup is to wonder whether a Government should enter the field of equity capital in private organizations. The non-repayable monetary grants, to which the Leader referred, are really gifts. I had an amendment on file to this clause but I do not now wish to proceed with it, because new section 16g(6) gives the committee an oversight of the matter. My original objection was that the effect of new section 16g (*d*) would be that a gift would be made of the money. In other words, to set up an industry in the country the corporation will be able, within the limits set out in the Bill, to make a gift to the applicant to set up such an industry. There would be no interest and the money would not have to be repaid. This is not the normal type of financing, although I am aware of the position in Great Britain.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: In some of the other States, too.

Mr. COUMBE: I was about to say that it applied in some of the other States. I have no objection to the remaining part of the clause. I understand that the matter is subject to scrutiny, and that is a safeguard. The Treasurer could not of his own volition give this non-repayable grant under $75,000. New section 16g (1) (*a*) provides that the corporation may make loans upon such terms and conditions as the corporation thinks fit for the purpose of assisting in the development of any industry. In this case, the corporation would be making a loan with a low rate of interest, or it could even defer payment of interest. I know that taxation comes into this, but the corporation could say, "We will charge you 1 per cent interest, or we will give you a moratorium of interest for 10 years." If one gives a loan at less than the current rate, one is making a gift. I am now prepared to accept this, although I consider that an industry that makes a success of its operation, in fairness to the taxpayers of the State, should be under some obligation to pay back to the State the moneys advanced to it.

It is interesting to note not only the composition of the corporation but also its powers. The new corporation will be able to borrow as a semi-government authority, which means that it will rank with our present semi-government authorities. I hope it does not impinge on or influence the success of our major semi-government authorities in this State: I am referring to the Electricity Trust and the Housing Trust. This is not to be a trustee investment under the Trustee Act, and I hope that it will not affect the raising by public float of Electricity Trust loans. Local councils within the State are also semi-government bodies, and I hope that the total moneys available to them will not in any way be diminished. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the total funds were to be $3,000,000 for the time being. As I read the Bill, this amount could be increased. Besides the $3,000,000, under the present arrangements with the Australian Loan Council the corporation will be able to borrow up to $300,000 in any one year. As I understand it, that means that it will not affect the other semi-government borrowings.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It will not affect semi-government approval.

Mr. COUMBE: That is what I hoped.

Mr. Hall: It will affect the market.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Anyone coming into the market can do that.

Mr. COUMBE: I hope the Housing Trust, the Electricity Trust and local government will not be cut back as a result of the $300,000 provided for here. Several provisions are wise. First, no one application may be granted more than $200,000; and secondly, no one application may be granted more than $75,000 without prior approval and recommendation of the Industries Development Committee. Also, the $75,000 is still subject to scrutiny by the committee if it is a non-repayable monetary grant.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Or the taking up of equity capital.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. I referred earlier to the Country Secondary Industries Fund, which will come under the control of the corporation. In the circumstances I have outlined, provided the conditions are observed, I think this will be a worthwhile project. However, although I support the Bill and hope that this scheme works well, it will be worth looking at the matter again in one year's or two years' time to see how these applications have worked out. Amendments may be required in connection with the way the corporation or the committee works or in respect of the extent of the sums provided. However, I think we are on the right track.

Despite the fact that assistance will be provided in this way, we cannot get away from the fact that the State must provide conditions that will attract industries here or help existing industries to expand. We must provide suitable labour conditions, with good employer-employee relationships: this is extremely important. It is common sense that no industry or part of an industry will come to a State if there is industrial strife in that State. Another factor that influences industry is the cost level in a State. Taxation is considered, as are the concessions available in respect of freight, water rating and so on. In the past this State has had low costs. At present freight concessions, for instance, are available from the Railways Department, and these are most valuable, especially to the rural sector. The present difficulty being experienced by some secondary industries has become more apparent in the last month, and I believe it is the result of trouble experienced in the rural sector, the effect of which is only now being felt in the city.

Over many years (and Sir Thomas Playford must take much credit for this), diversification of secondary industry has occurred. Whereas, in the past, the moment that rural industry went bad the State also went bad, today, because of the diversification that has taken

place, there is a slowing down of this process, and the impact of what happens in the rural sector is not felt so quickly in the city. Unfortunately, I have seen some signs recently of a slackening in some sectors of secondary industry. Some factories are busy, but I am afraid that others are not so busy; several have completely cut out overtime. In giving my blessing to the Bill, I sincerely hope its provisions will work to the benefit not only of secondary industry but of South Australia as a whole. I repeat that this will mean much more work for the committee, which has been working solidly of late. For 10 years, I was a member of the Public Works Committee, which used to meet at least twice a week (sometimes more) and which did much solid work for the State. I have noticed that lately the Industries Development Committee has sat frequently, and it seems that it will sit much more often. I support the Bill, and may have one or two things to say in Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I, too, support the Bill, but I point out that this is what is now, as I understand it, conventional Labor doctrine. Having failed to achieve any significant measure of nationalization by legislative means, the Labor Party in the United Kingdom (and I presume in Australia as well) now has the doctrine of trying to get hold of what are euphemistically called the commanding heights of the economy by buying into various concerns, and this measure will allow of that process. Although I support the Bill, I think that we should realize that we are in fact advancing the doctrines of the Labor Party in so doing. As previous speakers have said, how this thing works depends on the composition of the board. At present, I point out that, pursuant to new section 16a (5), the Government has in fact totally unfettered discretion as to whom it appoints. If it appoints a body of people who are dedicated Socialists and are on the board merely to further the aims of the Socialists opposite, we will have trouble. On the other hand, if we get a board of more reasonable and balanced composition—

Mr. Hall: Non-Socialists, you mean.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. If we get such a board, the scheme will work. To support what I have said, I point to the way in which the new section is presently drawn. Paragraph (*a*) provides:

One must be a person with extensive knowledge of, and experience in, financial matters.

That sounds very good, but there is no sanction as to how he is elected. If the Government appoints a trade unionist or the member for Heysen, it can say that this is a person with extensive knowledge of and experience in financial matters.

Mr. Coumbe: It may be you or me.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was going to say that if the Government appointed the member for Heysen it would be accurate, but if it appointed any of its political friends it would not be accurate, and there is no-one to gainsay it. This is a legislative trick that I have noticed in several Bills we have had this session. It is mere window-dressing so that the Government can put on boards anyone it likes to put on them. Paragraph (*b*) provides:

One must be a person with extensive knowledge of, and experience in, engineering or industrial science nominated by the Minister of Development.

Again, that means nothing; the Government can put whom it likes on the board and it cannot be gainsaid. In relation to paragraph (*c*) there is some small sanction. That paragraph provides:

One must be an officer of the Public Service engaged in the department of Government relating to industrial development.

With that I have no quarrel. However, in respect of the other positions, the Government can please itself. Whether or not this scheme will be a success will depend entirely on the composition of the board. I consider that we should provide for commerce and industry to participate in the appointment of members, and I will move an amendment accordingly in the Committee stage.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): This Bill could have tremendous effect on and benefit for my district. The District of Murray comprises three large towns which have a large labour force, are favourably sited in relation to road and rail transport, and have a water supply (irrespective of the quality at the moment) and an electricity supply. The Bill could readily give an advantage to the small manufacturer who is experimenting in a small way with a product and who now finds it difficult to get sufficient capital to launch out into the mass production that will in a short time bring about the expansion of his line that will help him financially to employ more persons.

There are several small industries in my district. The larger industries that we have had small beginnings, but if they had the

kind of capital that this Bill can supply they would have been able to expand more quickly. Many of the small industries have battled along without any great expansion over the years, because sufficient capital has not been available. I am pleased to support the Bill. Many people are coming from the country areas to the larger towns because of the amalgamation of farms and the lack of opportunities for share farmers. Single men cannot be employed, because farmers cannot employ them. Persons are coming to my district regularly from the Mallee area seeking employment, and this Bill could assist the development of secondary industries in the District of Murray.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Repeal of sections 16a-16b of principal Act and enactment of sections in their place."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new section 16a (5) after paragraph (*b*) to strike out "and"; after (*c*) to insert the following new paragraph:

and

(*d*) two shall be selected by the Governor from a panel of three names jointly chosen by the governing bodies of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated and the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce Incorporated and submitted by those associations to the Minister.

and in new section 16a to insert the following new subsection:

(5a) If the Minister has given to the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated and the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce Incorporated notice in writing requiring those bodies within a time specified in the notice (being not less than two weeks) to submit to the Minister the panel of names referred to in paragraph (*d*) of subsection (5) of this section, and those bodies fail to submit the panel of names to the Minister within the time so specified, the Governor may, on the recommendation of the Minister appoint suitable persons in place of the persons referred to in that paragraph.

The amendments are in a usual form, containing provisions similar to those in other legislation. They give the two chambers an opportunity to nominate three persons. Although the Government does not have to accept those persons straight out (it can pick two of the three names), the provisions will provide some brake or fetter upon the Government's present unfettered discretion. New subsection 16a (4) provides that the affairs of the corporation shall be administered by a board of management appointed by the Governor, but new subsection 16a (5) does not spell out the qualifications for two of the members of the board, and for all the good they are the qualifications for the other two members may just as well not be there. If the amendments are accepted, they will not affect the provisions in the Bill, but, instead of giving the Government a completely unfettered discretion, they will ensure that South Australian industry and commerce are represented. It seems to me, apart from any theoretical objections to those whom the Government may appoint, to be entirely desirable that the industry and commerce of this State should be directly represented on the board and that the organizations into which industry and commerce in this State are grouped should have a direct say regarding those who are appointed. On the other hand, I agree that the Government should have the choice of accepting or rejecting those nominated on the panel.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I regret that I cannot accept the amendments. Earlier the honourable member said that he was moving this amendment on the basis of some doctrinaire fear that the Labor Party was going to put on the board persons who were not connected with industry and commerce but who would implement some dastardly Socialist policy.

Mr. Millhouse: Everything you do would relate to that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The purpose of this Bill is clear: to assist industry effectively and flexibly and to carry out the sort of thing of which the member for Murray spoke so sensibly earlier.

Mr. Millhouse: How would that be affected by my amendments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We want enough flexibility to appoint people of sufficient knowledge, capacity and imagination to be able to carry out the sort of policy which the corporation is designed to carry out for the advancement of industry. With respect, I cannot say that about all members of the Chamber of Commerce. Indeed, the Agent-General recently had some things to say about the outlook of some South Australian manufacturers. I think the Agent-General was correct. That view is widely held by those people who have been most successful in the expansion of South Australian industry. I point out to the member for Mitcham that he cannot cavil at the qualifications of the persons appointed to the Industrial Development Advisory Council, for example. I refer to its Chairman (Mr. Roscrow) and to Mr. Rothauser and Mr. Kinnaird, whose appointments have not retarded

South Australian industry. Indeed, these are people of energy, vision and capacity, who have proved themselves in the area of industrial growth and innovation. The appointees to the Industrial Design Council will perform a most important task for South Australia, giving the kind of assistance about which the member for Torrens spoke earlier. No-one could suggest that the nominees of the South Australian Labor Government were nominated so that they could carry out some dastardly Socialist plot. Indeed, these are people who would have the complete confidence of those who are interested in getting effective design services to South Australian industry. I do not want to be confined to a small group of people (a panel of three) who may be chosen at any time by the governing bodies of the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce and the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures. In the first place, the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce does not represent the whole of this State. The honourable member will know that the Federated Chambers of Commerce outside the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce are also representing commerce in South Australia. Secondly, there are times when the governing body of the Chamber of Manufactures is putting forward views that are entirely contrary to the expansion of industry in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: That's absurd.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When I was previously in Government—

Mr. Millhouse: You're getting anecdotal.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not getting anecdotal at all. The honourable member has put this up and I am telling him why I do not like it. When I was previously in Government, I found that the then President of the Chamber of Manufactures was going around Australia, and industrialists from other States told me that he was trying to persuade them not to come to South Australia while a Labor Government was in office. I do not want someone like that on a board such as this.

Mr. Millhouse: You could hardly blame him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I blame him, because he was being anti South Australian purely for partisan purposes politically. I want to be able to choose from people who are already working in the area generally in South Australia and who are not partisan politically. They will not necessarily be supporters of my Party but will be there to help the State. I assure the honourable member that it will be on that criterion that people are appointed to this board.

Mr. COUMBE: The Chamber of Manufactures, despite what the Premier has just said, is vitally interested in this legislation, and no doubt the people taking the risk in this matter will eventually become members of the chamber. The amendments are so worded that none of the three suggested members of the panel has to belong to the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures or the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce; he can be from an outside body, such as the South Australian Chapter of the Institution of Engineers. I should hope, for instance, that one of the three people concerned would have a knowledge of and experience in engineering. Further, there is no suggestion that one of the panel should be a member of the Industrial Design Council, of which I have some knowledge. I am approaching this matter from the point of view of providing a backing to industry in South Australia. The suggestion, which is not unreasonable, will, if implemented, give the Premier some area in which to manoeuvre.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier is utterly antagonistic to the Chamber of Manufactures, and he does not scruple to belittle the work of a recent President of the Chamber. I am getting rather sick of the talk we hear from the Premier only too frequently about people being anti South Australian, as though the Premier were the only champion for this State. I believe, in view of the Premier's attitude, that it is important that we provide that industry and commerce, as organized in this State, have a say in the board of management, and I hope the Committee will accept the amendments, which are reasonable and which will not fetter the Premier's discretion, if he is afraid of being fettered. The amendments will leave the Premier entirely free regarding the appointment of the other members of the board.

The Committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller),

Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Gunn. No—Mr. Virgo.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendments thus negatived.

Mr. COUMBE: I shall not proceed with my amendment on file because, although it may be against some of my personal inclinations, I believe, after further considering it, that, if my amendment is withdrawn, more benefit will be given to industries in country areas of this State. In supporting the Bill, I desire to give every inducement and support to industry generally throughout the State, and, in those circumstances, I withdraw my amendment in the interests of South Australia.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Concerning the question of the corporation taking up shares in industry, can the Premier say whether the corporation will recover the value of its shares as soon as it can without harming the industry so that funds will be available to help start small industries or to help those in trouble?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not intended that we should keep shareholdings in industry beyond the time necessary to develop the industry. It is intended that the corporation shall dispose of shares at such time as will be convenient to the industry, and that we should not have tied up in industries money that could be used to help other industries which need equity capital at an early stage and which cannot reasonably face fixed interest charges.

Mr. HALL: Concerning non-repayable monetary grants, can the Treasurer say why it is necessary to make grants when some industries receiving them will become prosperous later? Is there any need to make this an absolute grant?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We wish to keep grants to a minimum but, in some cases, we need to be able to compete with competitive facilities offered by other States. In addition, in undertaking research we can encourage it on the basis of a grant, but an industry would be loath to undertake it if, in future, it had to repay the grant. It is a question of effctive inducements. We do not expect that this aspect will be a large part of the work of the corporation, but we want to be able to compete with what can be offered in Victoria and New South Wales, in order to attract industries to this State. Naturally, although I should want to keep our payments of inducements to a minimum, I do not want to lose industries that could be given a better advantage by other States, which have these provisions now. In country areas of New South Wales and Victoria it is possible to receive extensive inducements. I do not want to go to that length, but I want flexibility in order to be able to put to the corporation that it is a reasonable thing for us to do to ensure development in this State.

Mr. HALL: I accept the Premier's contention that, to compete with the other States, it may be necessary to have some factor such as this in our armoury of developmental weapons. However, this can be a two-edged sword. When I was Premier, I remember the representatives of one industry asking me, within the first two minutes of our meeting, for a grant on production basis. In the next minute I said "No" and then said that we had no power on that basis to make a grant. Also, we did not want industries in South Australia that were not viable. We wanted industries that could stand on their own feet within the framework of the State. That industry still came here and has been successful. However, if a similar approach is made to the Premier after this Bill has been passed, he will find it much harder to reject.

The industry to which I have referred had received a production-basis subsidy in New South Wales. I believe it was wrong for the New South Wales Government to saddle taxpayers with a subsidy on that basis. I do not think New South Wales will continue to be involved in that type of subsidy. In the case I have referred to we did not believe in the principle of this subsidy as applied to that industry; I do not say this is our attitude in respect of every industry. Also, we were protected by the fact that we did not have machinery to enable us to make the subsidy grant. There will be a need to curb an over-enthusiastic approach towards subsidizing uneconomic industries. I warn the Premier that the Opposition will not support any proposal to subsidize uneconomic industries with taxpayers' money. We will support subsidies to get industries going, but we will not support uneconomic production. A firm subsidized on a production basis would have difficulty in maintaining employment.

If the diversification of industry to some strategic area were being considered, that could possibly justify a subsidy on political and practicable grounds, but there is an inherent danger in this practice. When we see some of the industries that are now in trouble, we wonder how far the Government

will have to go in supporting some of the industries that are now propped up by Government guarantee. The only reason the Premier gave for the fact that the grant should not ultimately be tied to a repayment if the industry was successful was that he must be able to compete with the other States. We need a clearer definition of the goal we want to achieve with regard to industrial development. That goal is not clear at present to industrialists or members of the Government or Opposition. I think the time is coming to an end when we could provide for completely indiscriminate industrial development.

I remember the investigation surrounding the establishment of a new steelworks in Australia, considerable information being collected about the advantages of various places in Australia. The north of South Australia became the second choice to Jervis Bay of an oversea consortium interested in establishing this company, which was to be mainly concerned with the export of steel, using coal from New South Wales and Queensland or Western Australia. Several leading industrialists in South Australia told me that that industry would not have been good for South Australia, as it would have unbalanced the industrial scene and would have created much concern in relation to pollution of the countryside outside of Adelaide. The South Australian Government at that time made every attempt to get that industry for South Australia (and we were within a toss of the coin of getting it), yet many people believe that it would not have been good for the State. When we make grants, we must have in our minds a clear definition of what type of development we want in South Australia, and that definition is still lacking.

Mr. SIMMONS: The Leader is unduly concerned about this matter. The provision dealing with the Country Secondary Industries Fund was put in the Act in 1943 by that arch-Socialist Sir Thomas Playford. As far as I know, the State has not lost too much money through having this weapon in its armoury, and we should not be concerned about this now. The Leader referred to completely indiscriminate industrial development, but I point out that the Industries Development Committee consists of five members, two of whom are Opposition members. I shall be surprised if committee members such as the member for Torrens and the Hon. L. R. Hart go in for indiscriminate industrial development. In addition, I point out that under the Bill a decision is required by four out of the five members of the committee, and I think this is a reasonable guarantee that the development will not be indiscriminate. I am happy to say that, in the time I have been connected with the committee, more than 10 projects have been supported and, on each occasion, the decision has been unanimous. Parliament appoints this committee to carry out this legislation in a responsible way, and any decisions made will be for the betterment of South Australia. The concern about the provision for making loans is completely unnecessary. The provision has not caused harm in the past, and I am confident that it will be a valuable weapon in the future.

Dr. EASTICK: I see inherent weaknesses in the Bill. New section 16c (3) provides that three members of the board shall constitute a quorum. There is no problem there. Any decision of the board must be supported by the votes of at least three members and, if only three members of the board are available when an important decision must be made quickly, this provision could nullify action. If an organization desires to make available additional shares to all the present shareholders, the shares could be made available without the right of "rights" transfer. Should the amount of money in the fund (having regard to the maximum of $3,000,000) be inadequate or only two of the three members available agree, the situation could arise where the corporation would lose its right to shares. If the "rights" are transferable, the corporation may still obtain funds by selling its right and then not have to spend more funds in taking up the shares. Although there are dangers in the present provisions, I have not an amendment that will improve the situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not ignored the difficulties that can arise, but we consider that the safeguards that we have provided are preferable. If the situation is not working out properly, we will make an amendment. We had to balance the safeguards against the possibilities that situations such as the honourable member has mentioned would arise.

Mr. HALL: I move:

In new section 16g (5) to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "twenty-five".

I do not think that the amount below which the Industries Development Committee will not have an oversight should be as high as $75,000. The member for Peake, who is Chairman of the committee, has told us that 10 proposals have been approved since he has been on the

committee. That is an approval rate of about one a month, and I do not think the committee is overloaded with work. It is an interesting and useful committee and I do not think the member for Mitcham, who has been a member, or present members such as the member for Torrens and the Hon. Mr. Hart are complaining that the committee is overworked.

In some organizations, an amount of $75,000 is not large having regard to the amount of money involved in the total operation, but that sum is important to a smaller organization in which the total capital may be that amount. I do not think the number of proposals is such that the committee could not consider matters involving more than $25,000. If the generator of industrial enterprise is to be effective, it must deal with many smaller matters than the Bill contemplates.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot accept the amendment. The committee's work has increased recently and is still increasing. Applications for Treasury guarantees are coming in at a considerable rate and large sums (in some cases, vast sums) are involved. Whilst the committee is already busy, it must carry out the additional investigations that will arise under these new provisions. This will inevitably mean that there will be a backlog. One matter that has been put to us strongly by those who have made submissions to us originally about this form of industrial assistance in South Australia is that one must ensure that there is as little red tape as possible. As is the case with the Public Works Committee, it is desirable for Parliament to have a scrutiny when larger sums are involved, but applications involving smaller sums must be dealt with by the corporation, which will make a recommendation to the Treasury before approval is given. The amount of $75,000 was decided after much discussion in the department.

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

Mr. SIMMONS: Before the dinner adjournment the Leader referred to the number of times on which the Industries Development Committee meets. I should therefore like to put this matter in its proper perspective. Although there is nothing sacred about the limit of $75,000 provided in the Bill, the Leader's figure of $25,000 is ridiculous. This committee does much work. It met on average 22 times a year before last year; in the second half of last year it held 20 meetings; and in the first quarter of this year it has already met more times than that. Therefore, the amount of business it is conducting has obviously increased considerably.

I do not know why this should be: perhaps it is because of the increase in industrial activity under the present Government. The committee has this year approved 10 applications, and it has met 17 times to deal with an application involving $3,000,000, the largest guarantee it has ever considered. It is necessary to impose a reasonable limit on applications for guarantees. If one extrapolated the experience of the last 12 months, one would see that the committee would be meeting almost every day to deal with the increased volume of work that would ensue if the legislation were kept in its present form. I therefore appeal to the Committee to reject the Leader's amendment which would increase the committee's activities to an unreasonable extent.

Mr. HALL: Although I appreciate the attention that the Chairman of the committee is giving to his work, I merely want to ensure that his committee's activities are limited to a lower level of financial supervision than that provided in this Bill. I do not know the details of the application for a $3,000,000 guarantee, which the Industries Development Committee is now considering. Although I hope that industry comes to South Australia, there must be a limit to the guarantee the Government can give. The Premier will realize that substantial sums are involved in guarantees for other industries. A guarantee is needed for one of two reasons. The first of these is that the industry concerned wants a cheaper interest rate, or that its financial prospects are not good enough to attract the ordinary avenues of financial assistance. A Government guarantee therefore carries with it a risk additional to that which would be borne by financial institutions. However, because that is the whole purpose of the scheme, one cannot decry it because of that.

At the same time, there is a limit to the State's guarantee capacity, and one cannot foretell the success of such industries. Indeed, members would realize how far out have been the recommendations for guarantees made by the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement in respect of applications under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act. I told the House when that legislation was passed (when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier) how impossible it would be to foretell what the agricultural circumstances would be up

until when the guarantee given by the Government expired. Unfortunately, my forecast in this respect has come true. The same applies to an application for a $3,000,000 guarantee; we do not know whether the State will eventually have to pay $1,000,000 of that sum. The Government should therefore be careful how it commits this State in relation to the guarantees it gives.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ELDER'S TRUSTEE AND EXECUTOR COMPANY LIMITED PROVIDENT FUNDS BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Elder's Trustee and Executor Company Limited Provident Funds Bill has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its investigations your committee held two meetings and examined the following witnesses:

Mr. R. W. Gayler, Manager of Elder's Trustee and Executor Company Limited.

Mr. J. F. Astley, Q.C., counsel for Elder's Trustee and Executor Company Limited.

Mr. I. E. Crossing, Superintendent (Administration) of Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited.

Mr. A. E. Davies, chairman of a meeting of male staff members of Elder's Trustee and Executor Company Limited.

Mr. E. A. Ludovici, Parliamentary Counsel.

2. Advertisements were inserted in both Adelaide daily newspapers inviting persons desirous of submitting evidence on the Bill to appear before the committee.

3. On the evidence placed before it, your committee is satisfied that the merger of funds as provided in the Bill will be of benefit to those employees of Elder's Trustee and Executor Company Limited at present covered by that firm's provident funds and will not deprive any persons of their rights or interests in settlements made to establish the funds.

4. At a meeting of members of the male staff of Elder's Trustee and Executor Company Limited, it had been unanimously agreed as follows:

This meeting is in favour of the merging of the members and assets of Elder's Trustee Provident Fund with the Provident Fund of Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited.

5. Your committee is of the opinion that there is no objection to the Bill and recommends that it be passed without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later, Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 23. Page 4271.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the Bill. I doubt whether any vigorous debate will be generated as a result of its introduction, because it is not a controversial measure; it is the result of several years' intensive work by a special committee set up by the Council of the University of Adelaide to investigate the provisions of the present University of Adelaide Act. I think it is probably true to say that the initial undertaking was conceived in the light of considerable student unrest; there was general dissatisfaction among many students regarding the composition of the Council (the governing body) of the University, and I think this possibly sparked off the original investigation and the formation of the committee by the university to consider submissions for changes not only in the personnel of the council but also in the Act, which largely governs the operations of the university.

Therefore, the first point I make is that the Bill is not an ill-conceived measure but is the result of sustained investigations and submissions by various organizations associated with the university, all of which have contributed largely to the ultimate form of the Bill. Submissions were received from the Adelaide University Graduates' Committee, the Senate, the Union Council, the Education Committee, the Ancillary Staff Association, the Students Representative Council and the Staff Association of the University, and many of their recommendations have been incorporated in the Bill. I think it is true to say that many people are interested in the operations of the university and that, indeed, members of the general public have a vested interest in its operations and in the legislation governing those operations. In fact, I see in the Supplementary Estimates that $10,000,000 is allocated to the operation of the university so far this

financial year, this massive contribution being made by the taxpayers towards the running of that institution.

Mr. Venning: Was Medlin paid?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Although we have our views on whether he should be paid, that is not really pertinent to this discussion. Nevertheless, I think it is a pertinent point when one considers universities as a whole. I should think that the student unrest was aimed mainly at getting student representation on the council. One of the submissions made by the Students Representative Council would not have been generally acceptable to the public. The committee submitted no fewer than three drafts of the new measure, and the S.R.C. held a meeting at which, I think, 120 students of the 8,000-odd who attend the university were present. I think the import of their recommendation was that the council should consist entirely of staff and students, but in my view this would not be acceptable to the general public. The committee saw fit to reject the suggestion, which I do not think one in all conscience could consider seriously.

I think the Bill should go a long way towards satisfying those students who at the time were dissatisfied with various provisions. My own view is that the allocation of four seats on the University Council (to be filled by undergraduate election) is, in the light of all the representations and the situation existing elsewhere in the Commonwealth, an adequate and, in fact, generous provision. I believe there was a precedent for including students on the council; in fact, at the recent elections two students were elected to the council, as a result, I believe, of their not being opposed in the elections by the senate.

I believe further that the student member of the council in regular attendance at present makes a worthwhile contribution to the council debates. At the meetings I have attended one of the representatives has been there regularly, and his contribution has been worth while and has provoked considerable thought in the deliberations of the council. If this is the standard we can confidently predict from the students, they will make a worthwhile contribution to the operations of the council. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, the council has been enlarged fairly considerably, mainly to include the four undergraduate students, a postgraduate student, and a member of the non-academic staff. This move should be widely acceptable.

There was a precedent in that councils of all other universities of Australia had included students as members. I do not have the most recent information, because some changes have been made, but in 1968, when the Bill was being actively considered by the committee of inquiry, there were students on the councils. However, at that time no university had four students on its council. In most instances there was one student representative, and in some cases there was the qualification that he must be 21 years of age.

I consider that the public would desire that people not actively associated with the university as staff or students should constitute a major (although not an overwhelming) proportion of the council. I do not think anyone can justifiably claim that the people who are elected from outside to the governing body of the university have any particular axe to grind. Certainly to my observation that does not apply, and I include in that category the Parliamentary members, whatever their political complexion may be. In these circumstances I think that the people who are elected by the senate are responsible and bring an independent approach to the deliberations of the council; this is widely accepted by the public and that is the way it should be. In the short time that I have been a member of the Adelaide University Council I have not detected any indication that the personnel of the council (and I am referring particularly to those outside the university) have any axe to grind on behalf of any organization. The Melbourne University has representatives of industry and other organizations.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The same is true at Flinders.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps, but it is not the case at Adelaide. I think people from outside the university are readily accepted by the public, who would consider that they should have not an overwhelming voice but a voice that could not be overwhelmed by other members of the council. I believe a genuine attempt has been made by the special committee set up by the council to resolve any conflicts that existed. To my mind the major conflict was representation on the council. The council as suggested in the Bill will have a democratic representation. The other change, which one could call a major change in relation to the Bill, is that the senate, which has the major election powers with respect to most members of the council, has been enlarged. It previously consisted of graduates of three years' standing. It now includes all graduates, postgraduates

and graduates in the employ of the university, and I am sure that we cannot complain about the enlarged senate.

The remainder of the Bill relates to the working of the university regarding by-laws, Statutes and regulations, and I think it is largely as it was in the previous Act. Some discussion has been generated about the position of the university concerning disciplinary measures. Questions have been asked and it has been discussed whether the university should exercise disciplinary powers or whether they should be left to the laws of the land. The university is not classed as a public place: I am told that the gates of the university are closed one day a year in order to retain its legal status as a private place. It is not a public place, but if the authority considers there has been some action requiring investigation the police can investigate the matter.

We cannot complain about the powers given to the university to make regulations regarding its affairs and to make by-laws. I think the elections will become more cumbersome, as the senate will be required to elect members of the council from different categories, different numbers of people at different times, and the term of election varies in some instances. Nevertheless, there are enough mathematically-minded people at the university to solve that problem. I commend the Bill to members. As the Minister said (and rightly so) when introducing it, it should go a long way towards overcoming any complaints that may have been made in the past. I think all parties concerned have done much work on the three drafts, and the third draft was revised as a result of submissions made by interested people. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): I, too, support the Bill. The member for Kavel has discussed it in general terms, and I shall not speak on the aspects covered by him, but the provision that has created most interest is that which gives students a place on the council. This decision was not arrived at hurriedly, because discussion on it goes back over a period of years and actually brings the Adelaide University into line with most other universities throughout Australia that have student representatives on their councils. It was, as the member for Kavel said and as the Minister said in his second reading explanation, the result of a feeling by students that they should be included in the membership of the council. Several meetings were held and eventually the council appointed a committee to consider the question of representation on the council.

I remember that when I was Minister of Education the Vice-Chancellor discussed with me several times the progress that had been made at these meetings, and told me of the drafts that the council was preparing in order to bring about this innovation. This legislation brings the University of Adelaide into line with other universities, and I remember that in 1966, when we were debating the Flinders University of South Australia Bill, there was much discussion on the question of representation on the council and on the specific aspects of student representation. In the course of the debate in this House, it was then said that the Adelaide University would be practically the only university in Australia that did not provide for this kind of representation. I had the honour of being appointed by this Chamber as one of its representatives on the foundation Council of the Flinders University. The Flinders University of South Australia Act provides for only one student member of the council. In fact, several conditions are attached to his position on the council, and this is in contrast to the situation in this Bill. The student representative in the case of Flinders University was definitely named as the President of the Students Representative Council. The relevant subsection states:

The President of the Students Representative Council shall not by virtue of his membership of the council be entitled to be present at a meeting of the council when matters relating to the appointment, conditions of service and discipline of members of the academic staff and matters relating to academic courses are being discussed or decided and the council may order that he is not to be present at any such meeting when such matters are being discussed or considered or may be present subject to such conditions as the council may determine.

In contrast, five years later the only qualification attached to the representation of students on the Adelaide University Council is in clause 12 (4) of the Bill, which states:

A person shall not be qualified to be elected as an undergraduate member unless he has been enrolled as an undergraduate for two academic terms last preceding the date of the election and he shall not be entitled to continue in office unless his enrolment is renewed when it falls due for renewal from time to time but an undergraduate member who graduates during the term of his membership of the council may continue as a member of the council until the expiration of his term of office.

I think the Minister will probably agree with me that at some future time it may be necessary to amend the Flinders University of South Australia Act to allow the appointment

of more than one student member of the council and, at the same time, it may be that the conditions that apply to student representation on the Flinders University Council will be brought into line with those in this Bill.

While I was Minister of Education, there was a movement afoot for the Director-General of Education to be appointed an *ex officio* member of the Adelaide University Council. I know that this view was strongly held by the Director-General of the day (the late Mr. John Walker) who believed that the Adelaide University should follow the lead of Flinders University and make this *ex officio* appointment. The only two people to be made *ex officio* members under this Bill are the Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor. However, in its wisdom, the council has decided that the Director-General of Education shall not be an *ex officio* member of the Adelaide University. While I was a member of the Flinders University Council, I know that the then Director-General of Education (Mr. Mander-Jones) was present at some (not all) of the meetings of the council. I do not know whether or not it is a good thing, but the Adelaide University Council has decided not to follow the lead established by the Flinders University in this respect.

I am glad to see that the Bill provides for student representation. Clause 12 provides that two members shall take office on an appointed day in October, 1971, and that in October, 1972, two more members are to be appointed. I believe that one student representative member on the council, as pertains at Flinders University, does not give proper student representation. However, at least that appointment paved the way for the Adelaide University's agreeing, after much discussion and many meetings, to appoint student representatives to its council. It has gone much further, because this Bill provides for four members of the council eventually to be provided by the undergraduates.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I, too, support the Bill. The Minister knows that on two or three occasions this session I have asked when the Bill would be introduced, and I am pleased to see it here now. I know the difficulties that have caused the delay in the Bill being introduced. When I was Minister, I discussed the matter with the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor (Professor Badger) and the Chief Justice. At that stage things were in a state of flux, so I asked them to come back when they had finally decided on a draft Bill. As we know, this is the third draft. I have had fairly intimate knowledge, not only as Minister but through having a son at the university at the time, of some of the difficulties that arose from the composition of the earlier drafts of the Bill. Some of them were almost hair-raising to say the least.

Mr. Clark: Fairly lengthy, too.

Mr. COUMBE: I think that what has happened is that the council has now come up with a draft which, although it does not contain, as the Minister has frankly admitted, all the points raised by various sections of the university (the Minister referred to these at some length), is a workable compromise and well worth considering. The composition of the University Council has been referred to. At present, where Flinders University has one undergraduate member on its council, Adelaide University will have four undergraduate members on its council. The Director-General of Education is conspicuous by his absence from the Adelaide University Council, whereas he is an *ex officio* member of the Flinders University Council. I well remember the embarrassment caused to a former Director-General when he tried to get elected to the Adelaide University Council. This difficulty has been overcome in respect of Flinders University. Perhaps, when he replies, the Minister can say why the Director-General will not be on the Adelaide University Council, which is to be increased from 27 members to 33 members, with two *ex officio* members. Flinders University Council has 18 members plus four *ex officio* members. Adelaide University Council will have no co-opted members, whereas Flinders University Council has three co-opted members. Included in the 33 are four undergraduates, whereas in the case of Flinders University there is only one undergraduate. I ask the Minister to say why the Director-General should not be on the Adelaide University Council. I am not canvassing the question, but I should like the Minister to explain that.

Secondly, why is it that, in the case of Flinders University, provision is made for three co-opted members whereas in the case of Adelaide University no provision is made for members to be co-opted? As the member for Kavel has pointed out, in the case of Flinders University representatives of industry and commerce are spelt out in detail, as you would recall, Sir, having been a member of this House when the then Minister of Education (Mr. Loveday) introduced the Bill in 1966. Specific details are lacking

in the case of Adelaide University. Regarding clause 3, I presume that the postgraduate member of the council could include an *ad eundem gradum*, but I do not know, because the Bill does not say.

I should also like to know whether, where previously the senate consisted of all groups of three years' standing, why it is to be changed to one year. I am not cavilling about the changes but, as the Minister has not explained them, I think it would be wise for him to do so. There is no way out of the complicated system of retirement of members and we must accept that. I support the Bill, but should like the Minister to explain some of the points I have raised.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): It is considered more appropriate that the Director-General of Education be involved on the Board of Advanced Education as a direct member, and on the Tertiary Advisory Committee, again as a direct member, so that whenever the issues involve tertiary education as a whole, he is part of the process.

It seems inappropriate that the Director-General should be involved as a member on every tertiary council, and this is not necessarily the appropriate way to improve relationships between the Education Department and the tertiary institutions. Certainly there is no evidence that this has assisted greatly so far as Flinders University is concerned. At university council meetings, which are held once a month and extend, in the case of Flinders University, in my experience, for three hours, the amount of time that must be given by a conscientious council member to council meetings and any committee work excludes the Director-General effectively from active participation in the deliberations of council. The definition of "postgraduate member" states:

"postgraduate member" means a member of the council appointed under subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (*c*) of subsection (1) of section 12 of this Act or under subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (*d*) of subsection (2) of that section:

The definition of "postgraduate degree or diploma" states:

"postgraduate degree or diploma" means a degree or diploma (not including a baccalaureate with honours) for which a candidate must, under the statutes, regulations and rules of the university possess the status of graduate of the university or qualifications that are in the opinion of the university of equivalent or higher academic status:

Mr. Coumbe: They could come from another university.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, they could be of equivalent status, described as *ad eundem gradum*.

Mr. Coumbe: Why is the senate to be appointed for one year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The one significant change made in the Bill relates to the definition of the convocation of electors, and the convocation of electors involved in the election of all graduate members of the council, all staff members, both postgraduate student members, and all the ancillary staff representation on the council comprises all the people in all those categories. The ancillary staff of the university get a vote for the election of the academic staff, the graduates, and postgraduates. Only the election of undergraduates is confined to the undergraduates at the university. Apart from that, whilst there are representatives to come from various categories, the electorate comprises everyone involved in those categories. It would be hard to suggest that a graduate of two years' standing should not get a vote, whilst an ancillary staff member should. I think that is the simple answer to that question.

Regarding the other matter raised by the honourable member, in relation to student representation, it will be necessary to amend the Flinders University Act in that respect. I think the point arises if one considers what is necessary to have effective student participation in council deliberations, and the argument advanced by the students is not centred on the question of representation *per se*. There is a whole controversy concerning notions of participatory democracy. If we had only one student member on the council, it would be impossible for that member to be on all the committees of the council. Therefore, it is necessary to have more than one student member if any effective participation in committee work is to take place, so I accept the point made by the honourable member.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Constitution of council."

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister say whether the members of the committee are likely to represent industry or commerce, or will they represent other interests? What is in his mind in this respect?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): It is not so much what is in my

mind but what has been built up as a tradition within the university. The members of the council who are not full-time members of the university are those people that were elected previously by the senate and, traditionally, these have been professional people such as headmasters, doctors, judges, lawyers and so on. They are likely to be not direct representatives of business but representatives of the professions that have been fed, as it were, by graduates of the university.

Mr. Coumbe: They would have to be graduates, anyway.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

Mr. Coumbe: And they would be elected by the senate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They will automatically come from the group of graduates not in the full-time employment of the university.

Clause passed.

Clauses 13 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Conduct of elections."

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This clause does not specifically provide for postal voting. The final draft of the legislation, which was submitted to the Government by the university, explicitly provided for this. Under clause 16 (4), the university would be permitted to make its own regulations and to provide for postal voting in any election. However, it has been pointed out to me that there was considerable controversy on this point. It is a matter on which the University Senate has traditionally felt strongly that the right (although not an automatic right) to a postal vote should be given. Therefore, the amendment to this clause will be moved to make this explicit.

Mr. Millhouse: You are going to provide for postal voting, are you?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We are going to provide that the statutes, regulations and rules of the university shall include a provision for postal voting.

Mr. Millhouse: If the senate wants it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No. This matter was included specifically in the draft Bill submitted to the Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Why was it cut out?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Simply because it was held that clause 16 (4) would permit this, anyway. However, it has been pointed out to me since that, as it was an explicit matter included in the original draft, and as it has in the past been a matter of controversy between the council and the senate, it would be more appropriate to adhere to the draft Bill on this point.

Mr. Millhouse: Didn't you stick to the draft Bill?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member would appreciate that in any draft legislation submitted to the Government by an outside organization changes are always necessary, and the Parliamentary Counsel, who is competent to draft provisions of this nature, must tackle those changes. I imagine too, that Mr. Jacobs had a fair bit to do with this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you reflecting on his competence?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No, I am merely saying that the Parliamentary Counsel is as competent in general drafting as is Mr. Jacobs.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! The Minister must not refer to the Parliamentary Counsel in this debate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is being provocative and, one might almost say if one did not want to be insulting, catty. It might be unparliamentary to describe the honourable member as catty, as it could be taken as a reflection on him. I move to insert the following new subclause:

(5) Provision shall be made in the statutes, regulations and rules relating to elections for postal voting in accordance with those statutes, regulations and rules.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the amendment. From discussions I had with the Registrar, I understood that there would be postal voting. I think the Senate of the University was pressing for postal voting, and I can see no serious objection to it; indeed, it may result in a larger vote than has been recorded in the past.

Mr. SIMMONS: I support the amendment. Many years ago, at an annual meeting, the senate resolved that there should be postal voting at elections, but this was not given effect to, even though the decision was, I think, reaffirmed at more than one annual senate meeting. Provision having been made for postal voting at all the discussions that took place within the university over the last two or three years when the various drafts were being considered, I believe that it is desirable that this provision should be written explicitly into the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As a senator of the university (the only sort of senator I am ever likely to be), I take my duties seriously. I am not at all sure, unlike my friends from Kavel and Peake, that postal

voting is a good thing. Admittedly, it will get over the situation which is almost a farce that we see now of all the dentists or of all the medical practitioners, etc., turning up to support a special candidate for election to the council; then, immediately the elections are over (there is always a motion that the election should be taken first before any of the other business), they get up and walk out. As a result, about 10 per cent of those originally present remain to transact the remaining business of the senate. That is a bad thing but, on the other hand, lawyers never do that, of course. Postal voting will certainly affect the composition of the council, because it will greatly widen and facilitate those who can vote. At present people have to take some trouble to exercise a vote; they have to turn up at meetings, and that has its virtues. While I do not oppose the amendment, I consider that there are arguments against it, and I have therefore spoken to put those arguments.

Mr. COUMBE: Although I am not a senator of the university, I have colleagues and friends who are senators and who, frankly, attend meetings when a friend of theirs is up for election. I think that is doing a disservice to the senate; although many people find it awkward to attend meetings, others are just too plain lazy. This clause deals with elections generally: occasionally, vacancies may occur unexpectedly through, say, sudden illness or death. Can the Minister say why only eight members of the council out of 33 members will constitute a quorum?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although it is somewhat different from what would apply in this Chamber, where the provision is much stricter, I presume there are occasions when attendance at council meetings of members would be doubtful; for instance, all of the Parliamentary members might be absent because of the sitting of Parliament, and other members might be in another State or in country areas. I believe it was considered that eight members of the council could effectively conduct the business.

Mr. Coumbe: As long as it does not become a rubber stamp.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Quite.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I think previously there was a quorum—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Although I tried to attract the attention of the member for Torrens on this point, without succeeding, I point out to the member for Kavel that this clause does not deal with a quorum: it deals with the conduct of elections. The member for Kavel must link his remarks to clause 16 and to the amendment under discussion dealing with postal voting.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should like the Minister to reinforce my own view, if it is correct, that to get a postal vote under the statute one must apply first to the university. I do not think that the university would send every member of the senate a postal vote.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's right.

Mr. SIMMONS: One of the first jobs I was given when I joined the university staff about 16 years ago was to go through the statutes relating to the elections at the various universities in Australia. In those universities that did allow for postal voting there was some provision for exactly that sort of thing. There are many thousands of graduates of the Adelaide University, and it would be impracticable for the university to send a ballot-paper to each. This would also place an intolerable financial burden on the university. I am sure that under the rules and statutes in this provision an application could be made to the university for a ballot-paper in a way similar to that in which an application is made for a postal vote for Parliamentary elections.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 17 and 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Conduct of affairs of senate."

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister clarify what appears to be some confusion between subclauses (1) and (3) relating to a quorum and a vote by at least 25 members of the senate?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There could be 50 members present when a vote was taken on a matter, the vote being 20 to 16, with 14 members abstaining. In those circumstances, that would not be a valid decision of the senate, as a valid decision requires a vote of 25 members.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (20 to 28), schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (POINTS DEMERIT)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 25. Page 4413.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Mainly, I support the Bill, which is very similar to the original Bill introduced by the Hall Government. We

all know that that Bill was passed by the Upper House and introduced in this House; a Select Committee was then appointed to investigate the pros and cons of the points demerit scheme. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

It is hoped that the points demerit scheme embodied in the present Bill will prove to be both effective and just and will achieve the vital aim of greater road safety without improper restriction of personal rights and liberty.

The last part of that statement is most important. In this Bill we should consider not only the rights and liberty of the driver of the vehicle, but also the rights and liberty of the other road users in the community, including pedestrians.

I disagree with one or two points in the Bill and in Committee I will move one amendment that I hope members will accept. The Select Committee took evidence from various groups of citizens, especially from the South Australian branch of the Transport Workers Union. I believe the members of that union raised some most important points that have been considered by the Government in drafting the Bill. The Bill gives the opportunity to the magistrate to impose up to the maximum number of points; in other words, he may consider factors such as triviality or a person's employment (although the Bill does not refer to that, it mentions "other factors"). That part of the Bill is most important. Most commercial drivers would be members of the Transport Workers Union and would drive buses, taxis, fuel tankers and so on, and they should have their employment protected as much as possible. If such a person lost 12 points under this scheme, he would lose not only his licence but also his source of income. He could lose his long service leave, holiday pay, superannuation and even his employment. It is important that the right of appeal be provided in the Bill. As often as possible in legislation the Government should make the right of appeal available.

In the evidence before the Select Committee, concern was expressed (as it had been expressed by other people) by the Royal Automobile Association about the cost of registration plates if the Registrar of Motor Vehicles or the Government decided to change the plates. The association stressed strongly that it considered that the Government, not the owner of the vehicle, should bear any such cost. In the debate on the Bill before the Select Committee was appointed, the member for Adelaide in this House and the Hon. Mr. Bevan in the Upper House put this strongly. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles, in reply to a question by the Chairman of the Select Committee, as reported at page 35 of the transcript of evidence, stated:

Clause 5 of the Motor Vehicles Act, which is an amendment to section 24 of the Act, with regard to the allotment of new numbers: it has been suggested that, where you vary the number, the department should bear the cost of new registration plates. What is your view on that? . . . The purpose for which this was recommended is lessening. This was first recommended about 18 months or two years ago and it was our intention, having the particular circumstances in mind, to pay the cost.

The Registrar then referred to the interstate plates allotted to vehicles at that time and said that, when his officers made an error, the cost was borne by the department. His evidence on that point states:

We bear the cost now in these circumstances. Occasionally a clerk makes an error and the number is duplicated, so that a person is allotted a wrong number. I have Treasury authority to pay the cost.

There would be no problem in practice in inserting such a proviso, because it would accord with what you are doing now?—Yes, unless in the future it could happen as a matter of policy that a Government could say, "We want to change all the numbers over to *alpha numero*." If we had 100,000 of those left, it could be costly. This is one reason why there could be an objection, and it may be argued that we should not commit any future Government to having to pay.

The present practice of the department is always to pay in these circumstances?—Yes. In the case of Western Australia, which has just changed over to reflectorization, the public is paying $1.50 a time; about 75 per cent of them have been changed already over a 12-monthly period.

I consider that we should provide that the Registrar be compelled to pay for any new plates in cases where the department is at fault or the Government changes the number plates held by the owner of the vehicle. Otherwise, some people could be treated unjustly. I do not intend to move an amendment but I should like the Minister to say why that provision has not been included. Another matter which needs consideration and on which I shall move an amendment relates to the number of points a person may lose before he is told by the Registrar that he may have his licence taken from him if he loses any more points. The number specified in the Bill is "in excess of six", which is half the number a person acquires before losing his

licence. The present Minister for Conservation asked the Registrar of Motor Vehicles a question about this, as reported at page 30 of the transcript, and that evidence states:

I can see that point. It worries me, however, that it has to exceed half the number. I should have thought it would be a good idea if a person were warned when he had accumulated six points. Is there any real reason why it must exceed that number?—No, there is no real reason. Of course, one could argue about this for ever. Naturally, we are looking for something that is reasonable as well as being administratively streamlined. We are trying to avoid the type of procedure which, I am surprised, Western Australia has adopted. In that State they have to advise the person when he records his first points, when he has accumulated six points and then when he has accumulated nine points. Of course, a terrific amount of paper work is involved.

Earlier, the present Minister for Conservation, referring to the old Bill, which was similar to the present one, asked the Registrar some questions. That evidence, as reported at page 28 of the transcript, states:

If the Bill later becomes an Act, would your department experience many difficulties in carrying out its provisions?—No, we visualize two methods of operation—a manual operation or the computer method. The Police Department is geared with its traffic records to record the demerit points as defendants are found guilty, and it is merely an automatic calculation with a progressive total, followed by advice to the Registrar, when a driver reaches a certain number of demerit points. It is then purely administrative action to serve a notice on him . . .

Would that be a relatively simple operation?—Yes, especially with the way this Bill is framed, and there would be no administrative difficulties. I think I would need an additional two or three staff members, although I believe the Police Department may need more.

This shows that the Registrar would have no real problem in administration if we required notification to be given when the person had equal to or in excess of half the required number of points. I will move an amendment in those terms later. As most other matters involved have been debated previously, I state my support for the second reading, but I will try to amend the clause that I have mentioned.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): The major aspect of this Bill has been aired considerably since September, 1968. Indeed, one can clearly see this if one takes a summary of the articles that have appeared in the morning press. Articles on it have occupied many front pages, and the various pros and cons of the measure have been put forward. Also, in 1969 there was considerable opposition from the members of the Minister's own Party in another place. Documentation of this is available in the *Advertiser* files for the Minister and others to see. I commend the principle of the Bill, which is aimed at promoting road safety. However, I find it difficult to understand some features, which I hope the Minister will explain when he replies.

As the Bill is aimed at reducing road fatalities and improving general road safety, the findings of another State in this regard are interesting. Information I have received from Queensland indicates that in that State, in 1967, there were 12,663 traffic violations; during 1968, that figure fell by about 17.5 per cent to 10,450. In the 12 months to December 31, 1967, there was a total of 502 deaths; whereas in the 12 months to December 31, 1968, that figure decreased by 5.97 per cent to 472 deaths. Although one would be unwise necessarily to accept that those decreases were totally as a result of the points demerit system, it could conceivably be accepted that a percentage of those reductions was brought about by a greater awareness by drivers that they must be mindful of their activities on the roads. I ask the Minister why one of the recommendations made by the Victorian Joint Select Committee on Road Safety has not been adopted. The report of that Select Committee stated that State and Commonwealth Ministers of Transport were considering making the demerits registered in one State registrable in other States, and it was hoped that on a Commonwealth basis consideration would be given to the points demerit scheme.

From looking at the legislation that has been passed in various States, I realize that the schedules used for determining the points are different, and it may well be that the South Australian schedule has a different rating from that of a similar offence in another State. Because this legislation has been promoted as a means of making the public more aware of its responsibility on the roads, thereby improving road safety, I believe that, if a person has shown any irresponsibility in another State that has caused him to have points recorded against his driving ability, at least that number of points should be recorded in other States so that the authorities in his new place of residence have some indication of his driving ability. I realize that, because there is more than one piece of legislation, difficulties may arise. However, it might certainly be expected as a result of the discussions between the Ministers of Transport that this matter had been considered further,

as a result of which the Minister could give the House some information.

In his second reading explanation the Minister said that it was hoped that the points demerit scheme embodied in the present Bill would prove to be both effective and just, and that it would achieve the vital aim of greater road safety without improper restrictions being placed on personal rights and liberties. This situation is not new: it applies to practically every measure introduced. It appears that it is impossible to get a self-examination of the situation without getting some self-justification. This State will have a points demerit scheme which will benefit the State but which, by the same token, will not unduly interfere with the rights of individuals. The Lyrup Village Association has been referred to in the Bill; however, I can find no reference to this association anywhere else.

The member for Fisher has referred to certain other aspects, and has said that he has an amendment on file. I support the proposal he has put forward. In some other areas we will require further information than the Minister has given at this stage, and we will seek that information in the Committee stage. In clause 11, the powers of traders are further reduced. I accept this in the main, having personal knowledge of instances in which plates have been used illegally and of the disadvantage and concern of people involved in accidents with vehicles to which those plates have been attached. Hoping that the system will be to the overall advantage of road safety in this State, I support the second reading.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the Bill. I think every member will agree that the most important part of the measure is that relating to the points demerit scheme. Although I think the most optimistic member will agree that this will not mean the end of road fatalities in South Australia, we are all hoping that it will reduce them to some extent. Fatal accidents have been occurring on the roads right from the early days when bullock drays were in use. In the horse-and-buggy era there were accidents on the roads; in fact, I was only eight years old when my father was killed when, travelling on the road with his horse and dray, he fell asleep, and the dray ran off the road and overturned. I think we could go right back through history and read about road fatalities, and I imagine that road fatalities will continue. However, it is up to Parliament to try to keep the number of fatalities down as much as possible.

I am pleased that the Minister has seen fit to amend section 31, which relates to the registration of vehicles used by councils for civil defence purposes and weed control operations. Councils have been considering this provision for some time and, as it seems that they will be hard pressed to make finances meet in the coming year without increasing rates, I consider that they will have to cut down on spending. This provision will give some relief whereby a registration fee will not be paid in respect of the vehicles concerned. Clause 3 amends section 12 of the Act relating to the exemption of field bins and bale elevators in respect of the payment of a registration fee. On November 12, 1968, the Hon. Mr. Casey asked a question in this House about the registration fee payable on field bins, and on December 6, 1968, the then Premier replied, at page 3055 of *Hansard*, as follows:

Cabinet has given this matter careful consideration and has directed that a Bill be introduced in the near future to amend the Motor Vehicles Act to exempt bulk grain bins from registration.

It seems that the previous Liberal Government was drafting a Bill dealing with this matter. The present provision will help the primary producer considerably. We are told that farms must be enlarged for the primary producer to survive, and it will therefore be necessary for farmers to buy adjoining farms. As a result, it will be necessary for machinery and farm vehicles to travel either across roads or along a road for a mile or two, and their exemption from registration will considerably help primary producers. I have on file an amendment to clause 3 with which I will deal in Committee.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I, too, support the Bill. I welcome the introduction of the points demerit system, because undoubtedly it will have some restraining influence on incorrigibly bad drivers, although just how much a restraining influence it will have remains to be seen. We live in a society where a driver's licence is looked on not as a privilege but as a right, and many young people, especially, tend to forget the responsibilities that go with the holding of a driver's licence. For that reason I have always been in favour of having a provisional licence. However, as I have said earlier today, some research and assessment undertaken in this matter have shown that the use of the provisional licence has not been the deterrent that

it might have been expected to be in reducing bad driving and, therefore, in reducing road accidents.

I think there is a great need for much more research into all these matters. Many of the people involved in accidents are young people. Most people obtain their driver's licence at an early age, and youth, linked with inexperience and with making, under pressure, bad decisions on the road, naturally gives rise to a higher number of offences and often a higher number of accidents. I think all members would agree that the introduction of the practical test of driving ability, as well as the written examination, was a necessary step that was long overdue. Further, those people who have committed so many small offences (those, in fact, which have been detected) as to warrant three months' suspension under the points demerit system should be required to undergo another test of practical driving ability and perhaps even a written examination on the highway code before their licence is restored, because these people must surely be badly trained or incorrigibly bad drivers.

I think we owe it to the community to ensure that these people are tested and that they are safe on our roads. It is no good waiting until they go out on the roads again and perhaps kill someone; it is better to find out their faults and, if possible, correct those faults; and, if they are not correctable, I do not believe that the people concerned should be on the roads. We tend to have a double standard, especially when it comes to driving, and we have a double standard when it comes to drinking and driving. We tend to say that everyone else, if he drinks, should not drive but that, of course, we are all right because, if we drink, we can drive quite well. As I think someone in an article in *Punch* pointed out some years ago, we can accuse a man of being a bad tennis player or golfer but we cannot accuse him of being a bad driver, because this is something that he resents. We have double standards, because we do not see our faults in driving.

The people who are likely to be picked up by the points demerit scheme will be the very people who will not agree that they are bad drivers. I think it is important to bring this fact home to them by requiring them to undertake a practical test of driving ability before their licence is restored, and I think that we should be tough and firm about this. If the people concerned cannot pass the test or meet the requirements, they should be kept off the road. We have been told many times that prevention is better than cure, and I am the last person to need to be told that. I have dealt with the effects of alcohol on driving; no doubt it is a major factor in road accidents.

In Victoria it has been proved conclusively that this is so, as figures show that over 60 per cent of all victims of fatal road accidents have blood alcohol contents in excess of the prescribed limit. The chronic alcoholic, because he is so used to taking alcohol, behaves relatively normally and, indeed, drives relatively normally, even with a high blood alcohol level, until an emergency situation occurs and something out of the ordinary happens; it is then that his alcohol level blots out the additional circuits necessary for instant decisions to be taken to avoid accidents. When the unexpected happens the alcoholic may be involved in an accident. Errors of judgment occur when the level of alcohol in the blood is low; fine steering movements change to gross movements, and accidents happen far more easily when it is higher.

We must be careful indeed with our points demerit system, especially as it refers to offences relating to alcohol, that we do not let the system detract in any way from the penalties already provided for those offences. I think that it is a great pity that, for research purposes, blood alcohol estimates are not taken from all people connected with fatal road accidents. This would give a great wealth of information which would guide Parliament in framing legislation and which would perhaps protect people on the roads, reducing the road toll. I point out that in the table it is possible to lose many points for offences associated with alcohol. Presumably if one gets a total of 12 points from two offences relating to drunken driving one would also have been subjected to a gaol sentence and a long licence suspension anyway. As I find this provision indefinite, I should like the Minister to clarify the point. I understand that the mandatory licence suspension for a first offence of drunken driving is three months, and certainly there is a mandatory suspension for a second offence. Is the penalty for a total of 12 points counted in addition, or is it taken into account in the suspension already imposed?

The points demerit scheme will be important in sorting out incorrigibly bad drivers. It is aimed as a deterrent and, if it is to do any good, it must lead to the retraining of drivers,

who must be taught to change their bad habits. Therefore, I strongly believe that there should be a further test before people have their licences restored to them. In addition, I believe the time will come when there will be a psychological test of a suitable temperament for driving. That may sound far-fetched, but it could happen. The leader of the *Medical Journal of Australia* states:

Deterrent countermeasures can have no effect on accidents suffered as a result of inexperience, because the drivers concerned are not able to change their behaviour, even if they should wish to do so. On the other hand, there will be young people—young, exuberant, seeing rewards in a flamboyant style of driving which may be associated with a high accident risk, whether this risk is perceived or not—who do not wish to change their behaviour. If the chance of apprehension is low, then the immediate benefits perceived will outweigh the distant threat of sanctions imposed through the licensing system.

Efforts to improve the behaviour of errant drivers have been notably unsuccessful through the years. Research must continue, because the more that is known about human attitudes and human behaviour, the better will system planners be able to design cars and road systems which are compatible with the behaviour of "average" human beings, whatever their shortcomings, so that the occurrence rate of "accidents" will thereby be minimized.

Unlike the Minister of Education, I believe it is worth spending money to provide better roads and to straighten out potential accident situations. I think much more research must be done on vehicles. The points demerit scheme must be regarded purely as a small factor in the overall programme of road safety. We must overcome the overcrowding on inadequate roads, as well as provide for a deterrent system such as the points demerit system. Nevertheless, I support this system. I look forward to a day when better roads, the provision of tests to regain a licence, a psychological test of temperament, and perhaps the points demerit system and other factors will reduce our road toll to nil.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the Bill. Like the member for Bragg, I believe that prevention is better than cure. I support the remarks of previous speakers. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

Clause 5 makes two amendments. It enables the Registrar to vary the registration number allotted to a vehicle.

I agree with the member for Fisher that, where this is done because the department has made a mistake, the costs should be borne by the Government. Clause 10 deals with hire-purchase transactions. The Minister said:

Section 61 already takes care of this situation. However, occasionally the vehicle is registered in the name of the person who lets the vehicle on hire. Where this occurs the registration must be transferred when the vehicle is paid for to the purchaser. The amendment is designed to cover this kind of transfer under a hire-purchase agreement.

I think that anyone who has purchased a car under hire-purchase and the hire-purchase companies would agree that this was a worthwhile amendment. The main feature of the Bill is the introduction of the points demerit scheme. As this is an entirely new approach to road safety in this State, one wonders whether the fines that normally are imposed for traffic offences will be continued and the amounts of the fines maintained at the past level. I believe that motorists generally will be made more road-safety conscious after committing a traffic offence, because they will always bear in mind the number of points they have lost and the number of points they have left to lose. I hope that the fact that the motorist will be continually reminded of the number of points he may lose will not demoralize him and make him over-anxious. This can happen with nervous and sensitive people, but I hope it is not reflected in driving ability.

In the third schedule, the penalty for driving, or attempting to put a vehicle in motion, while under the influence of liquor or drug is six points. Further, if a person refuses to have a breath analysis or to exhale into a breath analysing instrument, the penalty is five points. I think there is an anomaly there. I think the penalties should be the same, because we are creating a situation in which someone could decide not to take the breath test and thus lose only five points instead of six. Perhaps we can clear this matter up in Committee.

Another clause deals with speeding over a school crossing, which carries a penalty of three points. I should like to see this penalty increased, because I think all members appreciate the valuable work that children do as monitors at these crossings. Some drivers do not heed the warnings and speed through. Some accidents have occurred in this way during the past few months but, fortunately, none has been fatal. The last clause in the third schedule deals with driving a vehicle without the prescribed rear lamps. This relates to section 111 of the Road Traffic Act, which provides:

A person shall not drive a vehicle or cause a vehicle to stand in a road between sunset and sunrise or during any period of low visibility if in any respect the vehicle or any lamp or reflector thereon does not comply with the requirements of this Part relating to lamps or reflectors, or any regulations relating to lamps or reflectors on vehicles.

Members who travel outside South Australia would know that the Australian Capital Territory, Western Australia and Tasmania now have reflectorized number plates, and it is interesting that, where tail lamps are not working, the reflectorized number plates are a help. These plates have proved their worth in those places. They cost about $3 a set and I consider that they should be included as a safety feature on new motor vehicles. We often witness or hear of accidents occurring at night time involving semi-trailers and vehicles without lighted tail lamps, and I consider that the introduction of reflectorized number plates in South Australia would increase road safety. We cannot measure road safety in dollars and cents.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to number plates.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Exemption of farmer's tractors and implements."

Mr. ALLEN: I move:

After "harvested" to insert " , a mobile fuel tank used for agricultural purposes,"

A mobile fuel tank is a vehicle that has come into use in agriculture in recent years. In the early days when small tractors were used, these tanks were not necessary but now, with large tractors being used, it is necessary either to bring the tractor to the homestead for fuel or to take the fuel to the paddock. It is necessary to keep the fuel well settled and clean, and it has been found that putting the diesel fuel in the tank, towing it to the paddock, and allowing it to settle, is the best way to deal with it. Most farmers can do this without taking the fuel tank on to a road. However, some farmers have to cross a road or travel along it for perhaps a mile or perhaps two miles. As farms become larger, more of these mobile fuel tanks may have to be carted on roads. I liken the mobile fuel tank to the fuel bin and the grain elevator. I ask the Minister to accept this amendment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): I cannot agree to this amendment. Several factors are associated with the matter, not the least being that I would want a careful and thorough examination of the question made. It has not been possible to do that since the amendment has been placed on file. Further, and more important, I would want to be satisfied that these mobile fuel tanks were used only to convey from the farm depot, homestead or main shed to the tractor in the field, and not used to go to the local station and refuel, and so on. It is impracticable for members opposite to expect the Government to accept this amendment. However, we can examine it and, if it is worth while, it can be re-introduced when the Bill is being further considered.

Mr. ALLEN: What does the Minister think is the difference between a fuel tank and a field bin? Although it could be argued that the tank could be taken off the chassis and be used for something else, the same applies to the field bin. A fuel tank is not suitable for any other purpose.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not want to argue about this matter. If the honourable member continues in his present fashion, he will convince me that the provision should not have been introduced at all.

Mr. FERGUSON: I am disappointed that the Minister cannot accept this amendment. The fuel tank referred to by the member for Frome is similar to those used by district councils, which take them out on the road to service their machines. It must also be remembered that, if a farmer has to travel along a road with such a vehicle, he is on the road for only a short distance.

Mr. VENNING: I do not think the Minister realized the situation when he said that a farmer might have to go into a town to get his fuel, as that does not happen: the fuel is delivered by the agent to the property, and is then taken in tanks to the places on the farm where it is needed. As such an implement can be used solely for taking fuel to a tractor on the farm, I should appreciate the Minister considering the amendment now.

Mr. McANANEY: I support my colleagues. The Minister should be convinced, having heard so many experienced members in this field, that such a vehicle is used entirely on a farm or on a road running through a farm. It would be unjust for a farmer to have to pay the registration fee for a vehicle from which he gets no return.

Mr. RODDA: I hope the Minister will open his charitable heart and accept the amendment, as a fuel tank is such a necessary adjunct to a successful farming operation. If he would accept the amendment, the Minister would be making a big concession to these people—a concession that they have not needed more than they do now.

Mr. McANANEY: I am sure that if members persist long enough, the Minister might accept the amendment. A fuel tank is used for a specific purpose and is taken on the road for only a short distance. As an exemption similar to that sought by the member for Frome applies to buckboards, I can see no reason why the Minister should refuse it in this respect. This is not a new concept but is one that has been in force for many years. Primary producers should not be expected to pay something that is unjust and unreasonable. I hope the member for Chaffey, to whom the Minister is now speaking, will convince him to accept the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON: The Minister, in opposing the amendment, is not keeping up with modern uses and modern times. At one time, fuel was delivered in drums and used as such by primary producers and industrialists, but the Minister knows that fuel today is delivered in bulk and that this fuel is often poured directly into two-wheel transports for delivery to various parts of a farm. The amendment will benefit many primary producers.

Mrs STEELE: I support my farming colleagues. If I, with a name like Steele, can be softened, I am sure the Minister can be softened also.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said earlier that it had not been possible in the short time available to have a thorough investigation made into the proposal. I repeat that I expect that a similar measure will be before members for amendment in relation to other matters and, in the meantime, the point raised can be properly examined. If, as has been claimed by several members, there is justification for accepting the amendment, it can be given effect to. However, until now I know of no request being made in this matter and, if the amendment had any validity (I do not question this) I would have expected a request to be made previously.

Mr. COUMBE: As this Bill will go to another place, the Minister may be able to consult with his officers today, and at a later stage perhaps the matter can be considered when the measure is before another place.

Mr. ALLEN: We are considering a comparatively new farm vehicle, which has been in use only over the last two or three years. The people concerned have approached me as their member, and I raised the matter personally with the Minister last week, the Minister having said he would examine it; so a request has been made.

Mr. VENNING: United Farmers and Graziers has made an approach on this matter, so I do not think it is correct to say that a request has not been made.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I know of no request.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen (teller), Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Gunn. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

While the division was being held:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): The honourable member for Ross Smith must record his vote: he is within the Committee.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Duty to grant registration and allot number."

Dr. EASTICK: As no information seems to be given in the second reading explanation about new subsection (1a), can the Minister explain its purpose?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Originally, this provision was included in the Bill introduced by the former Government to deal with the problem that arose concerning interstate plates. Through the effluxion of time, this problem has largely solved itself. However, a further matter is associated, namely, the decision made some four to five years ago to introduce the *alpha numero* system of number plates; the Registrar believes that for this purpose it is necessary to retain this

provision in the Bill. I think we have now reached the stage where most plates are under the *alpha numero* system. As time progresses, the number of plates under this system will increase. At some future time we will probably reach the stage when more than 80 per cent of vehicles registered in South Australia are under this system. At present, it is felt that, rather than let evolution take care of the situation, it is desirable for the Registrar to say, "Let us not have any more humbug with two systems operating; let us have *alpha numero* complete." He then has power to issue *alpha numero* numbers in place of the old-style numbers. He will have this authority under the Bill, but he will use it with discretion. In the next session of Parliament this provision may be completely redundant.

Dr. EASTICK: I take it that in no circumstances is it intended to go back to the system whereby one number could be retained by an individual.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No.

Mr. EVANS: The previous practice has been that, where officers of the Registrar have made a mistake, the replacement plates are paid for by the Crown. I take it that that practice will continue.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is correct.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 and 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Registration without fee."

Mr. EVANS: Exemption is made in the case of any motor vehicle owned by a council or controlling authority under Part XIX of the Local Government Act and used solely or mainly in connection with the eradication and control of dangerous and noxious weeds under the Weeds Act. Why is exemption not also given to a private contractor who uses a vehicle solely in connection with the eradication of noxious weeds? As private contractors sometimes contract with councils to control noxious weeds, can the Minister say why they are not exempt?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is difficult to give an answer that would satisfy the honourable member. Perhaps few, if any, engaged on private contract work would meet the requirement about their vehicles being used solely for that purpose. However, if the honourable member gives instances, we will consider the matter. Regarding the other point the honourable member has raised, the Lyrup Village Association is an organization similar to the Renmark Irrigation Trust, but it operates at Lyrup.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Power to test applicants."

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister say whether it is intended that physical tests or, perhaps, mental tests be made of applicants for licences?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think this clause will have limited application, and I regret to say that. I look forward to the day when medical practitioners will give the Registrar of Motor Vehicles the wholehearted support they owe to society, as a responsibility. I am sure the member for Bragg would agree, privately at least, that the medical profession has a responsibility to the public of South Australia to ensure that no-one who has a physical or mental impediment is permitted to retain a driving licence unless the medical practitioner has divulged the deficiency to the Registrar. Regrettably, that is not the case at present, although I give credit to the President of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association.

Negotiations are proceeding between the Registrar and the President and, despite what has been said earlier and what has been said at a Commonwealth level, the South Australian President is alleged in a press statement to have said that he supports the view that I am expressing, and discussions are taking place as a result. I consider that there is a direct responsibility and I should not like to be the medical practitioner who knew that a person was not capable of driving a vehicle and who failed to divulge that to the Registrar, and someone was killed as a result.

Dr. TONKIN: I reassure the Minister that his attitude, which I find a little paranoiac, is not really necessary. The medical profession has grown up from the time of Hippocrates with a great respect for an individual's privacy. I think the man who reveals his medical history to his doctor must know that he can tell his doctor in confidence everything he wants to tell him. The medical profession has a keen awareness of its public responsibility, and this matter is now receiving the profession's deep attention. Doctors are not policemen and they will not take the responsibility of saying to a patient, "You are not allowed to drive." Whenever this arises, they will say, "You would be unwise to drive, because something could happen." I understand that on many occasions doctors go further and notify the person's family, and I

can see the day coming when they may well notify the Registrar of disabilities.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Let us speed the day and save some lives on the road.

Dr. TONKIN: It is interesting to hear the Minister.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Interjections are out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, Sir, particularly when they are so off the beam. The Minister is very touchy in this respect. I can see the day coming when we may be doing this. The profession is giving much attention to many other matters. Only recently, the Minister received a communication from the Australian Council of Ophthalmologists regarding visual standards for drivers. This exhibits the interest the profession is taking in matters relating to drivers' health. A responsibility to the community sometimes overrides a doctor's special responsibility to his patient, and I am sure that every Government member (obviously the Minister does not) will understand the need for professional secrecy, and that a doctor-patient relationship depends to a great extent on the trust that exists between the doctor and his patient. This is, therefore, a matter of educating the community. It is better for people to be educated in the proposed school, by which the Minister sets such great store, regarding their responsibility to disclose defects and to accept that their medical adviser may, in the interest of public safety, be allowed to disclose defects that affect driving ability.

Mr. EVANS: I was pleased to hear the member for Bragg say that the medical profession is examining this matter, and I agree with his comment that unsuitable personal behaviour (although they were not his exact words) should prevent a person from driving a car. The honourable member will realize that only his profession can in the end decide whether a person is capable physically or mentally to drive a motor car safely. As much as we may desire professional secrecy regarding an individual's physical and mental condition, sometimes this information is important to the community. I believe the time has come for the medical profession to say that it is willing to set up a council to which certain people can be referred. If such a panel existed, we would have a safer standard of driving from at least that section of the community.

Dr. TONKIN: If the Minister really wants something like this to happen, instead of standing up and making noises about it he should do something practical.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Such as?

Dr. TONKIN: Give some degree of protection to the medical practitioner who discloses facts about his patients. This is essential because, if a medical practitioner discloses facts about his patients to anyone, including a member of the patient's family, he is possibly subject to litigation. I understand that such protection was given during the last session when Parliament was considering the Children's Protection Act.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister say whether, when applications are made for renewal of licences or the granting of licences, any points demerit history recorded in other States will be taken into account? This was one of the features of a Victorian Select Committee report.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 and 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Cancellation or suspension of licence where driver disqualified in another State."

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister say whether he or his predecessor has considered at Commonwealth level reciprocal action between the States regarding persons who have had demerit points recorded against them?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not possible to have a reciprocal arrangement between the States, as there is not a common scheme operating. If that happens, it may be possible to consider this matter.

Mr. EVANS: I take it that when a person applies for a licence he will be asked whether his licence has ever been suspended and, in the case of a person who has arrived from overseas—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He makes a declaration.

Mr. EVANS: I know, but I believe it would be difficult to check on this type of person. In certain countries (India, for example), a person can lose his licence for a trivial offence. Will the Registrar take this into account?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The number of people coming here from other countries is relatively small, and the number of those whose licence has been suspended would be even smaller: in fact, I suggest, infinitesimal.

Mr. Evans: Is there much purpose in the clause, then?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. Many people come here from other States and from the Territories, and this clause removes an anomaly under which at present the Registrar

may suspend the licence of a South Australian who is disqualified but cannot refuse an application for a licence by a person from another State.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the international driving licence?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is something that we are required to accept, and I think that in certain respects it is desirable to accept it, but there are deficiencies in that type of licence.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Points demerit scheme."

Dr. TONKIN: I move:

In new section 98b (2) to strike out "for a period of three months" and to insert:

"until such time as he has satisfied a local court—

(*a*) that he has passed a test of his ability to drive a motor vehicle prescribed by the Registrar;

and

(*b*) that he is otherwise a fit and proper person to hold a licence,

and the court has ordered that the suspension be terminated."

This is the first of two amendments, one dependent on the other. It provides that someone who is disqualified from holding a licence must undergo a practical test of driving ability and possibly a written test of the rules of the road before his licence can be restored. I think we all agree that the whole object of the points demerit system is the deterrent effect it will have on the incorrigibly bad or careless driver. It seems to me that the imposition of this further requirement will act as a further deterrent to the person who really should not be driving, anyway. Also, I think the person whose driving habits are such that he commits a series of small offences, and thus amasses a total of 12 points, is possibly in need of some correcting, and I think this will persuade him to do something about his driving habits, namely, study them, think about them, learn the rules of the road, and generally improve his driving. If a person cannot pass that test, I think he should not be on the road, anyway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I oppose the amendment. I think we should not allow our emotions to make us unrealistic. First, there is no way in which the Registrar can provide for a driving test to be undertaken other than through the Police Department, and heaven forbid that we should use the department any more in that field than we are using it at present; I think we are using it far too much. I hope that soon the driver education centre that we are establishing will relieve the police of some of this work. I certainly would not be a party to passing this on to the police. Whilst I expect that at some future stage a person who has had his licence suspended under the points demerit scheme or by the court, or for any other reason, will be required to undergo some sort of test and prove his ability, I think that to try to introduce something at this stage is unrealistic.

Dr. TONKIN: I am amazed that the Minister should go so far as to say that we have got to the stage where emotions have made us unrealistic. I should have thought it was unrealistic to say that the Police Department was being over-worked and could be further over-worked by testing drivers who had been suspended. I wonder how many drivers the Minister suspects will be disqualified under the points demerit system. I think the system should be extended to all drivers who have been disqualified; in fact, this whole idea was the idea of my teenage daughter who has just had to go through this (to her) traumatic experience of passing her practical driving test, and she said "I think people who lose their licences for driving offences ought to have to do this, too. It might make better drivers of them." I could not agree more. If the Minister expects that large numbers of drivers will have to be tested because they will lose their licences, surely this is the best possible argument for having those drivers tested. I cannot follow the Minister's reasoning.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Gunn. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. EVANS: I move:

In new section 98b (5) after "any person" to insert "is equal to or".

I believe that it may be difficult for the Registrar to carry out this requirement. As I see that the Minister is indicating that he

will support the amendment, I will say no more.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—"Claims against nominal defendant."

Mr. EVANS: In this clause and in clauses 21 and 22, the word "Treasurer" is changed to "Minister". What is the reason for that change?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reason is that, at some time in the past (I thought this happened during the term of the previous Government), the operation of this Act was transferred from the Treasurer to the Minister of Roads and Transport. As the necessary amendment to the Act has never been made, this is merely a machinery measure giving effect to this change.

Clause passed.

Clauses 25 to 31 passed.

Clause 32—"Enactment of third schedule to principal Act."

Mr. BECKER: Why does the offence of refusing to take a breathalyser test carry five demerit points, whereas the offence of driving or attempting to drive a vehicle while under the influence of liquor carries six demerit points?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A person driving or attempting to put a vehicle in motion whilst under the influence of liquor or drug is doing something in connection with a charge that has been proved, whereas a person who refuses to comply with a direction to take a test to find out whether he has a certain level is in a vastly different category. The important point is that a person trying to put a vehicle in motion is one who has been convicted of a contravention of the Act.

Clause passed.

New clause 8a—"Number plates."

Mr. BECKER: I move to insert the following new clause:

8a. Section 46 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after subsection (7) the following subsection:

(7a) Where a motor vehicle is first registered after the commencement of the Motor Vehicles Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1971, every letter or figure on a number plate that the vehicle is required to carry must consist of, or be defined by, reflecting material in accordance with the regulations.

The Australian Capital Territory, Western Australia and Tasmania have recognized the value of reflectorized number plates. Serious accidents occur on our country roads, involving semi-trailers and other vehicles parked on the side of the road, and these vehicles do not always have lamps operating in terms of the law. Approaching motorists would see reflectorized plates and, as these plates cost about $3 a pair, South Australia should not hesitate to do what has been done elsewhere. Costs should not be considered in road safety. The ultimate would be to fit this type of plate to all new vehicles, and the price of the vehicles should not be affected.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although much of what the honourable member has said is sound, I consider it inappropriate at this stage to jump in without knowing the answers to the questions that would be asked. I think it is significant that the three most populous States, namely, New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland, have not adopted them. That is not an argument against them, but the honourable member has not stated what they will cost the motorist.

Mr. Becker: I understand they cost about $3.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: From the quotations we have obtained, it would cost South Australia more to get these plates in Adelaide from Western Australia (and that is where they will come from) than it would cost to land them in Tasmania. I think it unwise to proceed until we know that the motorist is protected, because I can imagine the screams that would come from the corner where the honourable member sits if the farmers suddenly had to provide these number plates at about $5 a pair. I suggest we defeat the amendment, in the knowledge that the Government is considering the matter.

Dr. TONKIN: I understand that facilities for the manufacture of the plates exist here.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member understands that, but he does not know. No facilities are available in South Australia. The only company with successful facilities for these plates is the 3M company, which has a monopoly on them, unfortunately, and can charge what it likes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is finding excuses for not accepting the amendment. He wants to bring this in himself later. This is the same as the principle in the Bill. We could have had a points demerit system in operation in South Australia 15 months ago—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —if it had not been—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —for the obtuseness of the Labor Party.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with reflectorized number plates, and the honourable member must keep to the point.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I have made the point.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: That reference is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think it was sufficient to drive home the point.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have ruled those remarks by the honourable member for Mitcham out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not going on with it. I have said that I have said enough.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Any such remarks by the honourable member for Mitcham are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been interested in the matter of reflectorized number plates for years, having unsuccessfully tried to persuade Sir Norman Jude, when he was Minister of Roads and Transport, to introduce them. I am surprised at the Minister's attitude, because, even at $5 a pair, this would be a cheap safety factor. I hope the Committee accepts the amendment. I suppose that it will not and that the Minister will have the glory of bringing it in later, but he will also have the knowledge that we will have gone the extra few months without this additional safety factor.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I want to make clear that there is no glory in introducing this or any other measure designed for safety protection. I am delighted to know that the honourable member has gone on record as saying that, even if they cost $5 a pair, he believes motorists should pay for these number plates. I am sure the motorists and the motoring organizations in this State will be delighted to read his comments and to know the honourable member's views!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot support the amendment because I cannot see how it will improve road safety. Indeed, I believe it would be an unnecessary burden to impose on the motoring public. If it contained a significant safety factor, I might support the new clause. However, it does not do so. The number plates put on vehicles as a result of this provision might help one pick up numbers at night, but, as the inclusion of this provision will achieve nothing more than that. I oppose the amendment.

New clause negatived.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CONSEQUENTIAL)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following suggested amendment:

Page 2, line 8 (clause 2)—After "person" insert "or by any two or more of them".

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be agreed to.

This amendment will make the clause apply to a descent from people who have held farming property in partnership.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RETIREMENT)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LIFTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 17. Page 4137.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. I have discussed with the Minister some aspects about which I am concerned and in relation to which, when in Committee, I will move the amendments standing on file in my name. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that the Road Transport Association and the trade unions had made representations for this type of legislation. Because I believe it is necessary, I support it. However, some old cranes used for lifting on building sites have possibly never been inspected in relation to their safety. It could be that many such cranes could cause serious injury or death. My main objection to the Bill is the definition of "crane" or "hoist", which is as follows:

"crane" or "hoist" means any apparatus or contrivance (not being a lift) that is driven or worked with the aid of any power other than hand power, by means of which goods or materials are or can be raised or lowered or otherwise moved in conjunction with raising or lowering, and includes the supporting structure, machinery, equipment and gear connected therewith.

I believe that definition could be interpreted in a wider manner than that originally intended by the Minister. I should also like to raise a point regarding tip-trucks. If one wanted to extend the definition that far, one could include tip-trucks with the gear or equipment used to raise the body of the truck with the goods in it. I hope the Minister will refer to this aspect later. If he does not, I will raise it again in Committee. I realize that some farm machinery is exempt from the provisions of the Act. Indeed, this is desirable for the rural community. As it now stands, the Bill could include mobile forklifts, earth-moving equipment, and conveyor belts or chains. As there is an amendment on file in my name concerning that matter, I will have no more to say at this stage other than that I support the second reading and hope that the Minister will reply to my remarks about tip-trucks, namely, whether they will be exempt.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill, the preparation of which I, as Minister of Labour and Industry, authorized. My reason for approving this measure was that I considered that certain aspects of safety in industry should be improved and loopholes closed. We know that cranes in factories and warehouses are covered in regard to inspection and that where new cranes are to be installed the details of stresses and strains, etc., and design details must be submitted to the Department of Labour and Industry before they can be approved, and a testing procedure is laid down regarding this type of crane. Furthermore, under the Construction Safety Act, cranes used in building construction work are similarly covered. There is a type of crane that until now has not been covered: that is, in the main, the mobile crane that is not necessarily used on building construction work under the terms of the Construction Safety Act.

It is my belief and philosophy that these cranes should also be covered, because they can be dangerous in many respects either in regard to their construction or if not being driven correctly. In addition, a crane can become worn or may be damaged in some way. This was the thinking behind my having the Hall Cabinet approve the measure to be introduced. If this Bill passes, mobile cranes will be covered, and I think they should be. Provision is made whereby a new crane being brought into operation or an existing crane that is being altered should be referred to the department for its approval, the same as when, in 1968-69, I introduced the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Bill: when a pressure vessel had to be altered, I insisted that this matter should likewise have the department's approval.

The provision regarding lifts has been tightened up here, certain anomalies having been found regarding the construction of major 20-storey buildings, for instance. It was necessary to determine who was responsible for the lifts: the contractor or the owner. The ambiguity that has existed here is now being removed. The Minister was kind enough to give me a preview of the Bill, and I made a couple of suggestions concerning how it could be improved. As a result, the definition of "lift" excludes a conveyor belt. As the definition originally read, a conveyor belt could be described as a lift, but members know that a conveyor belt used in a factory does not carry people. We are not dealing here with a chair lift or moving footway. A conveyor belt should never require registration, and there is no need to check it for this purpose.

I believe the member for Fisher is suggesting that the exclusion applying to a conveyor belt should also apply to cranes, and I think this is logical because, after all, a crane, as we understand it, is either fixed to a structure or mobile, and it was never intended (certainly not by me, and I am sure the Minister did not intend this; I know the department did not) that a crane should be a conveyor as such. We know that small cranes used on building construction work are covered by the Construction Safety Act, and I think the suggestion made by the member for Fisher in Committee should be considered sympathetically, as also should the amendments regarding earthmoving equipment and forklift trucks, which I do not think were ever intended to be included in this legislation.

The Lifts Act will now be known as the Lifts and Cranes Act, and I think this spells it out more clearly. It will be necessary as a consequence to amend the Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, because some of the provisions in that Act dealing with certificates of competency of crane drivers will be treated differently. At present there is an anomaly under which the Director of Marine and Harbors has indicated his agreement to the proposals that cranes on wharves come under the control of the Secretary of Labour and Industry; in other words, the Crown is to be caught, yet the other evening when we were discussing a similar matter the Minister said the Crown should not be bound. In this case, I agree that the Crown should

be bound, and I am glad that the Minister is sufficiently enlightened to accept this principle. Various types of crane on wharves should be covered, and I support this aspect also.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): True, the member for Torrens, as Minister of Labour and Industry, set the wheels in motion to have this Bill introduced, and I am pleased to say that the Bill is now being considered and that members opposite, including the honourable member, support it. I support the remarks made by the member for Fisher in regard to excluding conveyors, forklift trucks and earthmoving equipment, the honourable member having discussed with me the problems that exist in this regard. However, I appreciate the co-operation of members opposite in this matter.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. EVANS: I move:

In the definition of "crane" or "hoist" after "therewith" to insert:

"but does not include—

(*a*) a conveyor belt or chain;

(*b*) a mobile forklift as defined in section 5 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, as amended;

or

(*c*) an apparatus or contrivance in the nature of earthmoving equipment."

I appreciate the co-operation of the Minister and departmental officers in discussions we had on this subject. I understand that it is difficult to deal with tow-trucks in this legislation, because the manufacturer and the owner are involved in the registration. At the time of manufacturing the equipment, the manufacturer cannot know whether it will be used solely for tow-truck work or whether it will be used for another purpose, such as in connection with lifting equipment on building sites. The definition in the Act relates solely to the purpose of towing damaged or immobile motor vehicles. Will the Minister give an assurance that the Chief Inspector does not intend to use the provision in the legislation in the case of tow-trucks? Also, will he give an assurance that the Chief Inspector does not intend to use this provision in relation to the hoist on tip-trucks?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): The member for Fisher has discussed with me the problem regarding tow-trucks, which are really cranes mounted on a truck. There are two main groups of truck-mounted cranes in this State, namely, those which are normally used on vehicle break-down work, and the power-operated, fully articulated type, which permits a motor truck to be used as a mobile crane. It is important from the safety aspect that these trucks are kept in good condition and are subject to inspection. The cranes can lift loads of at least three tons, can luff and slew and travel with a suspended load. They are often used on cottage construction work for placing roof trusses, and are thus liable to be swinging loads over the heads of workmen. It is necessary that the Act should apply to them. However, I agree that there is no need for this Act to apply to any tow-truck which is used exclusively for towing vehicles. Because the necessity for applying this Act to tow-trucks depends on the type of tow-truck and the use to which it will be put, it has proved impossible to exclude them by definition. I give my assurance that the Chief Inspector intends to exercise his power of exemption under section 4 of this Act, which power he is being given in this Bill, to exempt all tow-trucks which are used exclusively for towing motor vehicles.

Mr. EVANS: I take it that the hoist on tip-trucks is also excluded.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4—"Application."

Mr. COUMBE: These provisions bind the Crown. I believe this principle should apply in other legislation.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 17. Page 4137.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support this short Bill which is consequential on the Bill we have just passed. Its effect is to bring the legislation into line with the amendment we have just made to the Lifts Act. Apart from the definitions, which are being struck out because they now apply under the Lifts Act, the Bill also strikes out reference to the crane drivers' certificates of competency, which will not apply now. It is incongruous for them to remain.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I am indebted to the member for Torrens for his brief explanation of the Bill.

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

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's alternative amendment:

Page 2, line 27 (clause 3)—After "output" insert "and that all information upon which the data was prepared was preserved for a period of at least twelve months after the day on which the data was prepared".

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

That the House of Assembly agree to the Legislative Council's alternative amendment with the following amendment:

Strike out all words after "and" and insert ", where the output is tendered in evidence within twelve months after the preparation of the data from which the output was produced, that the information on the basis of which the data was prepared has been available for inspection by all parties to the proceedings".

The Legislative Council, in its original amendment, sought to have preserved the data from which the computer output arose. This Chamber disagreed to that amendment, on the basis that it was inconsistent with the principles in the Bill. The whole object of allowing computer output to be admitted in evidence is precisely to enable the material on which the computer output is based to be destroyed, so the information can be retained in the computer. The Legislative Council has adhered to the view that, at least to a limited extent, the information should be preserved. The alternative amendment of the Council provided that computer output would be admissible only if the original material had been preserved for 12 months. The consequences of that would be that, if it were sought to tender as evidence computer output on data that came into existence, say, 10 years ago, it could be admitted only if the party seeking to tender it could prove that it had been preserved for 12 months 10 years ago. This seems unsatisfactory, and it could be difficult to prove. It seems undesirable that the computer output should not be available to the court simply because someone had failed to preserve it some years ago.

The necessity for the amendment to the Legislative Council's alternative amendment is unfortunate, particularly because the obligation to preserve information may react to the detriment of persons who have no control over the preservation of that material. If one citizen sues another, either of them may wish to rely on information that is in possession of a third party, such as an institution, bank or an insurance company, which has preserved the information in a computer. If that third party has failed to comply with this provision, innocent persons who have had no control over the matter may be prejudiced in presenting their case. It is unfortunate that I have to move this amendment, but it would be more unfortunate if the Bill were lost entirely, and the Council has been firm in its attitude that there should be an obligation to preserve material for at least some time. I have had discussions with members of the Council privately and I think that, if the Committee agrees to this amendment, the Council will also agree to it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This amendment is almost as silly as if it had come out of a formal conference. Many of the compromises that we get at these conferences are as stupid as this amendment is. I cannot see any point in saying that the information must be preserved for 12 months. The only possible justification for agreeing to this amendment is that it will save the Bill. If we rejected the Legislative Council's amendments, and had a conference, we might get somewhere. However, the Attorney is the Minister responsible for the Bill and, if he gives in and accepts a silly amendment, it is up to him. I only hope that it will not be too long before we can examine this matter again and look at the provision suggested by the Law Reform Committee, upon whose suggestion this Bill was based. I cannot help thinking that what has happened is an insult to that committee which I very much regret.

Motion carried.

UNFAIR ADVERTISING BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 9 (clause 2)— Leave out "or" and insert "and".

No. 2. Page 2, line 22 (clause 3)—Leave out "prove" and insert "satisfy the court before which those proceedings are brought".

No. 3. Page 3, line 3 (clause 3)—Leave out "prove" and insert "satisfy the court before which those proceedings are brought".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The effect of these amendments will be the same as that of the amendments which were moved in this Committee previously but which were rejected. The Legislative Council seeks to substitute for the present provision of the Bill, which proscribes advertisements that contain untrue or misleading statements, a provision that would require a statement to be both untrue and misleading. Some of the most dangerous and harmful advertisements are those in which it would be impossible to identify any misstatements of fact but which, nevertheless, from their whole tenor, are greatly misleading. Those advertisements must be struck down by this legislation if it is to be effective. It would be ludicrous for this Parliament to enact legislation that purported to strike at unfair advertising when it allowed to continue advertisements that had the effect of grossly misleading the public, simply because it was impossible to identify any actual misstatements of fact. It would only be misleading the public, and I therefore ask the Committee to disagree to the amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney has taken the wrong tack on this Bill, also. I would accept the amendments for the reasons I gave previously in moving them myself. I regret that the Attorney is not willing to see reason. If these amendments were accepted, we would be going as far as it is prudent to go at this stage. I hope the motion will not be accepted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I, too, hope that the motion will not be accepted, as "prove" has much more meaning than "satisfy the court". It is essential that there be some flexibility in this matter. I support another place in its moderate attitude to this Bill, which could have a damaging effect if wrongfully applied.

The Hon. L. J. KING: "Prove" means (as it has always meant) that something must be proved on the balance of probabilities, and "satisfy the court" means exactly the same thing. This is a pointless amendment which, in my view, is less correct technically.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The Minister made a vicious attack on the Legislative Council.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I certainly did not: I did not address myself to this aspect of the amendments. I addressed myself to the first amendment, which has the effect of requiring that, in order to offend, an advertisement shall contain a misstatement of fact and shall be misleading. As it left this place, the Bill provided that it would be an offence for an advertisement to contain misstatements of fact or to be misleading.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments seriously weaken the effectiveness of the Bill.

JUDGES' PENSIONS BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's suggested amendments:

No. 1. Page 3, line 31 (clause 6)—After "6" insert "(1)".

No. 2. Page 4 (clause 6)—After line 5 insert new subclause as follows:

> "(2) Notwithstanding anything in subsection (1) of this section, in the case of a judge who has contributed for a pension under an Act amended by this Act for not less than ten years, where that judge retires he shall be entitled to a pension of sixty per centum of his salary."

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be disagreed to.

Really, there is one substantial amendment, which undoubtedly seeks to meet a special case, and it is a case that has been put and most fully considered. The advice of the Under Treasurer has been taken, on the basis of his great experience of pension schemes and the proper principles that should be applied in relation to them. I am satisfied that his view of the matter is correct and that we cannot act on a wrong principle in this matter. One always feels sympathy for the point of view of an individual, but there is really no justification to make the amendment sought by the Legislative Council. The judges of the court will be taking what amounts to a notional reduction in salary in the sense that they will not be granted the increase in their salary that might normally be expected as a result of the 6 per cent national wage increase.

As a result, the judges will, over the period of years that they serve, earn their non-contributory pension in this way. There is no justification for treating service in the past as justifying the application of the 60 per cent rate. The Bill provides for a rate of pension related to the period of service, and there is just no justification in principle for saying that, because a judge has already served 10 years on the bench, he should retire on a rate of pension which is not applicable to that period of service but which exceeds it. I do not want to discuss an individual case, for I think it would be invidious to do so, but I am bound

to say that, taking the best advice available to the Government and examining it carefully, I am convinced that there is absolutely no justification for this amendment, and the Government is unable to agree to it, as it would be quite wrong in principle to do so.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the suggested amendments vary the principle of the pensions scheme to meet an individual case and would involve appropriation of general revenue for a purpose which has not been recommended by the Governor to the House of Assembly during the current session.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (POOLS)

Adjojurned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 30. Page 4462.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): This is a small Bill, which is merely up-dating a previous amendment to the Lottery and Gaming Act dealt with earlier in the session. When introducing the Bill, the Minister said, in essence, that the main purpose was to enable small on-course totalizators and dividend pools conducted by or on behalf of country clubs to be amalgamated with metropolitan on-course dividend pools. This is important to the operation of the Totalizator Agency Board and provides a great advantage to the small country clubs. For example, regarding country clubs such as the club operating at Millicent, where there is a small number of entries, if the T.A.B. decides to conduct the totalizator at the course (and it can do this economically), the money invested at the meeting conducted by that club is transferred to the T.A.B. headquarters pool.

This saves the country club the additional expense of having to employ staff to work out the dividends. It can work in reverse: T.A.B. agencies in various parts of the State can remit their pool to the T.A.B. headquarters and this, in turn, is remitted to the country racing clubs, the dividends being worked out at the racing clubs concerned. I do not know whether members have had an opportunity to inspect the T.A.B. headquarters, but the board is run efficiently, and I know that this is one of the schemes it has been keen to implement in order to help country racing clubs. The country racing clubs will benefit from commissions allocated at the end of the year. The Bill helps the country racing clubs and the T.A.B. to continue to operate an economical system.

The other alteration made by the Bill will allow jackpot dividends to be carried from one day to another and from one club to another. A situation could arise where a meeting was held at Millicent, a jackpot totalizator operated and no-one won the pool. The next race day the meeting might be held at Mount Gambier and, under the Bill, the pool could be transferred to that meeting. Similarly, if and when the jackpot totalizator operates in the metropolitan area, the pool could go from week to week from Morphettville to Victoria Park, to Cheltenham, and so on. The jackpot totalizator proved profitable in New Zealand but was not quite so popular in Sydney. However, it could be of great benefit to country racing clubs. The most important thing for any racing club is the number of spectators who attend a meeting, because money received in admission fees is almost complete profit to the club. That money can be used to increase stake money and improve facilities. If Parliament can authorize the T.A.B. to assist country racing clubs, as is provided in the Bill, we have no alternative but to do so.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support fully what the member for Hanson has so ably said.

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

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 31. Page 4590.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I do not like this Bill, which will increase revenue by $250,000 a year. There is no reason on earth why this should be done. In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General had the gall to say:

In view of the obvious benefits derived by persons who take advantage of the protection and facilities afforded by the Companies Act, it is considered that the proposed increases are by no means unreasonable.

He said that as though people enjoyed paying taxation. When the so-called uniform Companies Act first came into the House in 1962 I complained, because for the first time the companies legislation was being used as a revenue-raising measure. Before that, our own Companies Act fees had been kept down to a level that would merely cover the cost of administration. When we had the uniform Act the fees were immediately raised to a substantial sum, and I remember getting information a year or two later to show that. Now the Governments of Australia are going even further in increasing the fees to a most unreasonable extent.

It is extraordinary that, if anyone in the outside community suggests increasing charges,

immediately the Premier or someone else announces that the matter will be referred to the Prices Commissioner to see whether the increases are justified, but the Government and semi-government instrumentalities are able to increase charges at will, without anything being said. In fact, in this case, people are supposed to enjoy it. I doubt whether the uniform companies legislation offers any benefits. There may be some benefit through uniformity although even here we do not have uniformity between the States; this State has certainly departed from the uniform standard. I know that it does not matter what I say about this. The Attorney-General has committed himself, his Government and his Parliament to these increases in fees, and he will get them through the House; he may well get them through another place. It is no use talking about them. I oppose the Bill.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Lawn. No—Mr. Gunn.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Attorney-General say when this measure is likely to come into operation?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): We desire to have regard to what is done in the other States. A Bill is before the Victorian Parliament and one is either before the Parliament or about to be introduced in Queensland. My present information is that these Bills will become law and come into effect on July 1. We do not know yet when the Bills in the other States will come into effect, but all States indicated at the conference of the Attorneys-General that they intended to proceed.

Mr. COUMBE: I ask the Attorney not to bring this Bill into operation before the end of the financial year. If he brings it in about that time, I ask him to consider not bringing it in before July 1.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—"Repeal of second schedule of principal Act and enactment of schedule in its place."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I oppose the clause. Whilst there was plenty of justification for uniformity on the general principle of the uniform Companies Act when it was first enacted, there is no justification for uniformity in a scale of fees. Some fees have been increased by 150 per cent, such as the fee for approval of deeds, which is being increased from $20 to $50. If these increases are considered justified because of additional work, they must have been far below what they should have been previously. The money collected will go into the coffers of this State and has no relation to what is collected in other States.

Mr. McANANEY: I strongly oppose the clause. The Registrar of Companies has reported an excess of receipts over payments in the year 1969-70 of $660,000, and these large increases are not justified. The fee on annual returns has increased to $12.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Commonwealth Government is participating in this proposal and whether these fees will also apply in the Australian Capital Territory? I ask that because of the peculiar position of the Canberra stock exchange.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot say whether the Commonwealth Government intends to apply this scale of fees in the A.C.T. I have not been able to get a definite indication of intention from Canberra in this regard. The suggestion that the increased scale of fees has been fixed on the basis of uniformity is incorrect. There are solid grounds for making these increases, apart from considerations of uniformity. The increase in fees in all States was really prompted by the increase in the cost of administering the companies legislation in those States. In South Australia, the cost of administration for the year 1966-67 (and I quote that year because the last increase in this State was in April, 1967) amounted to $90,000, and it is estimated that the cost in 1971-72 will be $180,000—an increase of 100 per cent.

Mr. Millhouse: Have you had the Prices Commissioner conduct an investigation to see if that increase is justified?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Registrar of Companies is perfectly able to supply the information and, indeed, he has done so. It would seem odd to call in one public official to check the calculations of another.

Mr. Coumbe: But the Auditor-General does that.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Auditor-General must fulfil his functions in relation to all Government departments, but that has nothing to do with what we are discussing now, as the honourable member fully realizes.

Mr. Millhouse: Whenever anyone outside says that he is going to raise charges, the Premier says that he will have the matter investigated by the Prices Commissioner.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! That interjection is out of order.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Thank you, Sir. In deference to your ruling, I will not refer to it; it was irrelevant, anyway. The Registrar of Companies is well able to advise the Government on the cost of administering the Companies Act, and I am happy to rely on his ability and integrity. The member for Mitcham, however, may have other feelings about that, but I am confident that, when the Registrar says that the cost of administering his Act in 1971-72 will be $180,000, or an increase of 100 per cent on the 1966-67 figures, he is providing accurate information upon which members can rely. If the security industries legislation planned for next session is enacted, it will necessitate the appointment of additional staff to implement and police it, and that will result in a further increase in administrative costs of the Companies Office. In answer to the honourable member for Alexandra, who has said that this State is not concerned about what the other States do, I emphasize that the Grants Commission would certainly consider what the other States do when it is considering South Australia's case. This is just another area in which this State must make the same effort as is made in other States and, if the other States are recouping more in the area of companies administration than is this State, that factor might react adversely against South Australia before the commission.

What members opposite have said regarding increases being unreasonable is difficult to follow. About 90 per cent of new companies incorporated have a nominal capital not exceeding $10,000, and it is intended to increase the cost of incorporation from $60 to $100. That $40 increase would represent only a small proportion of the total cost of the incorporation of the company, including legal fees and so on. I should be surprised if strong objections were raised by any quarter to an increase of that magnitude. Indeed, so far as I am aware, in Victoria (where a relevant Bill was introduced last December) there has been no reaction critical of the Government's decision to increase charges and, indeed, it has been generally recognized that increases of this kind have to be made under current circumstances. The fees paid by most companies will increase by only a few dollars, and this will do little more than cover the loss of value in the dollar in the last four years. The remarks of the member for Mitcham and other members opposite, in opposition to the Bill, are unjustified.

Mr. COUMBE: I listened with interest to the Attorney saying that the cost of administering the companies legislation had increased from $90,000 in 1966-67 to an estimated $180,000 in 1971-72. To give the Committee a complete picture in this respect, will the Attorney say what income was received by the Companies Office in those two periods?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have not got those figures.

Mr. McANANEY: The income increased from $657,000 in 1969-70 to $790,000 in 1970-71, a gain in revenue of over $130,000, while costs rose by only $13,000. That is a fair increase in profit for that period. This is merely a revenue-raising measure, without any rhyme or reason behind it.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman (teller), Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Gunn.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.54 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, April 7, at 2 p.m.