

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, June 29, 1965.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

### ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Statutes Amendment (Industries Development and Land Settlement Committees), Supply (No. 1).

### QUESTIONS

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: In last night's *News* there appeared a report regarding a visit by the Minister of Works to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and it was stated that the completion of the work on stages I and II would bring the bed accommodation to 1,050, at a cost of £12,000,000. Last session the Public Works Committee reported on this project, and said that stages I and II would bring the establishment to 1,067 beds at a cost of £8,444,000. Can the Minister of Health say whether stages I and II, as reported on by the Public Works Committee to bring the establishment to 1,067 beds at a cost of £8,444,000, and as approved by the previous Government, have been modified in any way?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I regret that I know nothing about the article that appeared in the press or whether it is true or not. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member and let him have it as soon as practicable.

#### RURAL ADVANCES.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Chief Secretary, who represents the Treasurer in this Chamber, a reply to the question I asked on June 17 whether there had been any modification of the advances available under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Treasurer has advised as follows:

The Treasurer places no specific limit on the amount of the loan which he will guarantee under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act. He must be assured that the conditions laid down by the Act as to price, valuation, experience of the applicant, and adequacy of the land are satisfied and that the guarantee is recommended by the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement. However, there must in addition be

a leading authority able and willing to provide the loan. Up to the end of last week in a period of just over a year the Treasurer had agreed to guarantee 68 loans aggregating £838,304, of which 44 loans aggregating £561,569 are being provided by the State Bank. The Savings Bank of South Australia is providing 22 loans aggregating £263,435, and one private bank two loans aggregating £13,300.

In view of the very heavy proportions called for from the State Bank amounting to almost 70 per cent of the total, and the continuing heavy calls upon that bank for seasonal and developmental finance for other rural customers and for co-operatives, wineries and other processors of primary produce, the bank has recently adopted a policy of general limitation of long-term farm advances of £15,000. This limitation applies whether the loan is sought under Treasurer's guarantee or otherwise. It is not an entirely hard and fast rule, but a deviation is permitted where the bank board is satisfied that the circumstances are sufficiently unusual to warrant it. The aim of the bank board is to give financial assistance in the maximum number of worthwhile cases within the capacity of its available funds.

#### STURT HIGHWAY.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Highways Department is engaged in much work in widening and reconstructing the Sturt Highway. I am somewhat perturbed, as I think others will be, at the amount of destruction of trees as a result of this work. I question whether it is necessary to destroy as much natural timber, which has a great binding effect on the edges of the highway, as is being destroyed. Will the Minister of Roads be good enough to ascertain from the department the reason for this carnage (which I think it is) of natural timber? The location of this destruction is between Lowbank and Waikerie, in the vicinity of Blanchetown, and for about 15 miles from Blanchetown towards Truro.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member stated that a considerable amount of work had been carried out by the Highways Department on the Sturt Highway. I am not aware of any undue removal of trees or natural flora. However, I will call for a report from the Highways Department on this matter and inform the honourable member later.

#### TIMBER FOR CASES.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Over recent years market gardeners in South Australia have developed a valuable export industry in

tomatoes going to the Eastern States, to the extent of about 750,000 cases, or possibly more, the annual value being anything up to £1,000,000. One reason why we have been successful in developing and holding this market is that we have been able to control fruit fly in South Australia. However, at present the industry appears to be in jeopardy because it is possible that insufficient containers will be available for the marketing of tomatoes this year. The existing market demands that all tomatoes exported to the Eastern States must be in new cases. At the moment it appears that there could be a shortage of between 200,000 and 300,000 cases through lack of timber. That has been gauged on the present timber available.

Last night, when I was at a meeting at Loxton, I was informed that in the River Murray area possibly a similar position existed in regard to the availability of cases for oranges. The oversea market demands that oranges be exported in new cases. It is feared that insufficient cases will be available for the marketing of oranges this year. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture (who is also the Minister of Forests) ask his colleague if he will have a survey made of the requirements of the tomato and citrus industries for this coming year to try to ascertain their full requirements, and, if possible, to make available to them sufficient timber to cover their needs?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the honourable member's request to the Minister of Agriculture and get a reply.

#### BORDERTOWN POLICE STATION.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on June 17 about the Bordertown police station?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I have the following reply from the Deputy Commissioner of Police:

The Bordertown police station is attached to No. 19 (South Eastern) Division with headquarters at Mt. Gambier, and following the completion of a new police station at that town a re-assessment was made of the police requirements for the district. Prior to April 21, 1965, the police strength at the station was one sergeant, one constable and one motor traffic constable. On that date a detective commenced full-time duty in that district and on June 1, 1965, a further constable was stationed there for relieving duties at other police stations, which take up about six months of the year, and for the remainder of the year he assists the Bordertown police. The present staff comprises one sergeant, one detective, one constable, one relieving constable (available for

about six months of the year) and one motor traffic constable. This is sufficient to meet existing police requirements in that area. No further increase is warranted at present and it is not proposed to establish a divisional headquarters there. The present accommodation is quite adequate for the foreseeable future.

#### SITTINGS OF THE COUNCIL.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I refer to a report that appeared in the *Advertiser* of last Thursday stating that the Legislative Council was not sitting last week. I point out that members of this Chamber have been patiently waiting for legislation to come before them for their consideration. It is understood that Parliament is to adjourn soon for a second period during this session, and that follows upon many statements that have been made that the House would sit more frequently than in the past. Will the Chief Secretary say whether the Government is having difficulty in drafting its legislation and will he take steps to bring business before this Council instead of having these frequent adjournments?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The answer to the first part of that question is a definite "No". When the Government has decided upon the introduction of legislation it will be introduced as so decided by the Government.

#### STAMP DUTIES ON MOTOR VEHICLES.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: During the last session of Parliament in this place the Chief Secretary, then the Leader of the Opposition, made a powerful speech in opposition to a Bill before this Chamber relating to stamp duties on motor vehicle sales. I presume that he was then speaking with the concurrence of his Party. In view of his opposition to that Bill during the last session, is it the intention of the Government to repeal or reduce the financial obligations imposed by that Act during this session?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: As the question of the honourable member affects policy I would ask that he place it on notice.

#### INSPECTION OF DROUGHT AREAS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister of Lands in another place. In last Sunday's *Mail* it was stated that the Minister of Lands would fly over much of the drought-stricken area of this State. I understand that in the past it was Government policy to invite members of the Opposition or members of both Parties to take part in such trips when they were contemplated. Is it the intention of the present Government to invite members of the Opposition, whose electorates cover the drought areas of the State, to accompany them on that visit, or is it the intention of the Government to restrict such investigations to Government members only?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As I understand the position, the Minister is himself making visits to various parts of the State in connection with his Ministerial duties. I would say that it was not the intention of the Minister or the Government to have a Government tour of the northern part of the State at this stage.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question relates to a reply given by the Minister to my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Geddes, regarding the opportunity for members to see conditions in their districts. The reply was that this is a Government matter. The Government is the Executive of Parliament and nobody referred to this point more forcibly than Government members themselves when they were in Opposition. I consider that members have the right to expect the courtesy that, when a Minister is in their areas, they will be given the opportunity to use transport, which is provided at the expense of the taxpayers, in order that they may properly represent their districts. Will the Minister of Mines now say whether he does not consider that members, as constituting the institution of Parliament, which in turn appoints the Government, are entitled to some consideration on these occasions?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not think I intimated that any member was not entitled to consideration, to use the Leader's term, when tours are arranged to a member's district. I understood that the question was in relation to a Ministerial visit by the Minister of Agriculture to various parts of this State in connection with his portfolio and that information was sought on whether it was the intention of the Government to invite members of Parliament also to visit the area when the Minister was on Ministerial business. My reply still

stands, that it is not the intention of the Government at this stage to arrange a Parliamentary visit in conjunction with the visit of the Minister of Agriculture. I do not think that at this stage it is a question of organizing or attempting to organize a Parliamentary visit to the northern parts of the State in conjunction with the Minister's visit. The Leader of the Opposition may as well say that my recent visit to the Far North in connection with mining activities in this State should have been a Parliamentary visit. The same applies in that instance as in this. If it is considered that there should be a Parliamentary visit to the drought-stricken areas of the North of this State, that is a matter for the Government to determine, having regard to necessity, and, perhaps, after a request from members themselves. I understand that in the near future there will be a Parliamentary visit to Woomera and that that visit was organized by the Government for the benefit of members of Parliament.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It was a Commonwealth invitation, wasn't it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I make it clear that it was a Parliamentary visit, organized from here. It has to go through the authorities, of course.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I haven't heard of that one.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Haven't you received your invitation yet? I received mine this morning. You should receive yours this afternoon.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If it is thought necessary that there should be a Parliamentary visit to the drought-stricken areas of the Far North, I am sure due consideration will be given to the request. If an honourable member himself wants to tour his own district, that is his responsibility, in order to make himself familiar with conditions there.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Does the Minister think it fair for the Minister of Lands to take a member from another place with him on the visit? Does he not think that that member, too, could find his way around the district, which is the same district that I and my colleagues represent?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I think the honourable member knows perfectly well the circumstances of that visit. I point out that the Leader of the Opposition in another place accompanied me and officers of the Mines Department on a recent tour of the North.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: I am still dealing with the question I originally asked.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member a moment ago referred to the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford accompanying me.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: On a point of order, Mr. President. My question related to the Minister of Agriculture visiting drought-stricken areas and taking with him a member of another place. I referred also to other members who represent the district.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will try to answer the question satisfactorily. The honourable member asked whether members for the district should receive consideration, and the answer is "Yes".

#### SOLDIER SETTLERS' ALLOWANCE.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: In company with my colleague, the Hon. Mr. Hart, I visited the Upper Murray areas and during the course of discussing problems with various constituents I was reminded that soldier settlers in the area who have commitments to the Department of Lands have a living allowance of £800, prior to the operation of their departmental commitments. I believe that the previous Government, after consultation with the Commonwealth Government, raised the allowance from £715 to £800 some short time ago and I understand that, in view of the increase in costs, it was the intention of the previous Government to have another look at this matter to see whether the amount of the allowance could be raised further fairly shortly. Honourable members will realize that £800 is not a large living allowance and causes hardship to some settlers. Can the Minister representing the Minister of Lands say whether the Government will consider further liberalizing this allowance to soldier settlers?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I shall refer the matter to the Minister of Agriculture and report to the honourable member at a later stage.

#### COOBER PEDY WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question. Leave granted.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: On May 25 I asked a question of the Minister of Mines regarding water exploration in the Coober Pedy area and on May 27 I received a reply that a bore had been put down and that a satisfactory amount of water, which had a salt content, was found. Some time ago, £10,000

was made available by the previous Government for the provision of a desalination plant at Coober Pedy, subject to the finding of a suitable water supply. Can the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Works, say whether it is the intention of the present Government to provide a desalination plant at Coober Pedy and a reticulated water supply for that area?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down an answer as soon as possible.

#### PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Recently I asked a question of the Minister of Roads in relation to the reconstruction of the Port Wakefield Road and his answer stated, in part:

... a road has been constructed north of the Cavan railway to connect the main Yorke Peninsula Road with a diagonal road going to the Main North Road, and the Yorke Peninsula Road has been widened between the railway crossing and the new connecting road to provide storage for turning vehicles. . . .

This arrangement is quite good. However, the only problem is that the traffic is not using the new road but is still taking the short right turn immediately after crossing the railway line at Cavan. People may only need a little education to take the road further north. Will the Minister of Roads consider stationing an officer at this crossing to direct the traffic to the new road further north for a period of, perhaps, two days during peak periods of traffic, say, between 4.30 p.m. and 5.30 p.m.?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Road traffic is now able to use a far better road than was available previously. I do not accept an intimation that the people are not aware of the existence of the new road, which has been built for the convenience of the travelling public. I cannot see that it is the responsibility of the Highways Department to station an officer on the corner for a couple of days for the purpose of directing traffic. In fact, an officer of the Highways Department would not have authority to direct traffic at all. However, I shall refer the matter to that department and see what can be done.

#### EGG MARKETING.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I recently asked the Minister of Local Government, who represents the Minister of Agriculture in this Chamber, a

question about a meeting of egg producers at Murray Bridge called to discuss the proposed C.E.M.A. plan. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, is unaware of the precise number of interstate visitors who attended, but undoubtedly many were present at the meeting. From information gained, he understands that many visitors had been invited by the organizers of the meeting. Mr. Triggs, chairman of the New South Wales board, and Col. McArthur, chairman of the C.E.M.A., were present. Neither was invited by the Government, and the Government did not bear any portion of the cost of attendance of these gentlemen or of any other visitor.

#### DEATH SENTENCES.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (on notice):

1. Is it a fact that prisoners whose death sentences are commuted to life imprisonment are normally released after serving 12 years in prison provided they have been of good behaviour?

2. Since 1940 how many persons in South Australia have had death sentences commuted to life imprisonment? Of that number how many have now been released? What term of imprisonment did each person so released serve? Of those still in prison how many have served more than 12 years?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are:

1. It is not a fact that prisoners whose death sentences are commuted to life imprisonment are normally released after serving 12 years provided they have been of good behaviour. It is not to be taken that a man serving a life sentence will necessarily be released at all. All prisoners serving life sentences are periodically reviewed and each case is dealt with on its merits.

2. Since 1940, 18 death sentences have been commuted to life imprisonment. Five of them have been released and one died in a mental hospital. The respective terms of imprisonment served were: 15 years, 3½ years, 7 years, 10 years, 29 years.

Of those still in prison two have served more than 12 years and one of them has served 24 years. In addition to the commutations listed above, five juveniles were found guilty of murder and ordered to be detained during His Excellency the Governor's pleasure. All of these are still in custody and one has served more than 12 years.

#### BULK HANDLING.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (on notice):

1. With regard to the committee recently appointed by the Government to inquire into additional terminal bulk handling ports for this State—(a) was consideration given to the inclusion of a representative of the bulk handling co-operative and a growers' representative on the committee? If so, for what reasons were such representatives not included on the committee? (b) Will the Government give consideration to the enlargement of the committee to include such representatives?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to submit to similar committees other projects favourably reported upon by the Parliamentary Committee on Public Works?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are:

1. (a) Full consideration was given to the membership of the committee. The Government considered the three persons appointed were fully representative of all interests and capable of assessing requirements on a fair and equitable basis. There is nothing in the terms of reference to prevent any sectional group from submitting evidence to the committee.

(b) No—*vide* reply to 1 (a).

2. No.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: WINE INDUSTRY.

The PRESIDENT: I have received the following letter dated June 29, 1965, from the Hon. C. R. Story:

I desire to inform you that it is my intention this afternoon to move, in accordance with Standing Order 116, that the Council at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 p.m. in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the necessity of widening the scope of the terms of reference of the Royal Commission recently appointed to inquire into the wine grapegrowing industry to ensure that it will have power to deal with all phases of the wine industry.

Under Standing Order 116, evidence of the urgency of the matter is required to be shown by the rising in their places of three members. I ask if there are three such members.

*Four members having risen:*

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I move:

That the Council at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 p.m. in order to discuss a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the necessity of widening the scope of terms of reference of the Royal Commission recently appointed to inquire into the wine grapegrowing industry to ensure that it will have power to deal with all phases of the wine industry.

I think it is well known to all members, and to the general public at this stage, that the Government has set up a Royal Commission. In the *Advertiser* of June 24, under the heading of "South Australian Royal Commission Grape Inquiry Body Set Up", it was stated that the appointment of a Royal Commission into grape production in South Australia was announced by the Premier (Mr. Walsh) the previous night. The press report named the Commissioners as Mr. Jeffery, C.M.G., Mr. T. C. Miller (Chief Horticulturist), and Mr. D. T. Du Rieu, O.B.E, and set out some terms of reference. I do not know whether they were complete or not; I am merely quoting from a newspaper. I wish to indicate one or two things about this matter, as it was the definite policy of the Labor Party at the time of the election that it would have a Royal Commission into the wine industry. I quote from an article appearing in the *Murray Pioneer* of March 4, 1965:

The member for Chaffey (Mr. A. R. Curren) after consultation with the Leader of the Labor Party (Mr. F. H. Walsh) announced yesterday that a Labor Government would immediately set up a Royal Commission to inquire into all aspects of the wine grape-growing and winemaking industries. In view of the present unsatisfactory arrangement of annual bargaining over prices, it was essential that a more definite method of fixing prices at an economic level to the growers be instituted at the earliest possible time.

I welcome the setting up of this Royal Commission, only I wish that the Party governing today had done what it said it would do—appoint a Royal Commission into all phases of the wine industry. It is hopeless to attempt to take a tiny segment out of a huge industry like the wine industry, where we have grape producers on the one hand and winemakers on the other; we have the bottlers and the distribution side, right down to the consumer; and terrific ramifications on the internal side of the industry—the Wine Board, advertising, promotion and the export of wine. I see nothing at the moment that leads me to believe that this is anything other than an inquiry into the grape industry, which, in my opinion, is totally and hopelessly inadequate.

The four points upon which this Royal Commission is to report are, as I understand them: the cost of production of grapes of various types in the different districts; the factors on which the allocations of grapes for drying and for wine production were based; the form of negotiation of the agreement between winemakers and growers; and the effect on existing growers, and in particular on settlers under war

service land settlement schemes, of further plantings of wine grapes.

In my opinion, that is not nearly adequate to deal with a situation such as this. I am fortified in my thoughts on this matter by a comment made by the Senior Vice-President of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association (Mr. J. A. Nelson), who shares my view that this is only an inquiry into the grape industry. He says:

We welcome the Royal Commission which we hope will establish all the facts necessary for the happy relationships of growers and makers. Many of the winemakers are growers and we are all keenly interested in the questions raised by the Commission's terms of reference. We will give the Commissioners every assistance.

I am fortified by that and, further, that in the higher circles of the wine industry they believe, as I do, that this is an inquiry into the grape industry only, because another gentleman, Mr. S. A. Dyer, the President of the South Australian Grapegrowers Council, said that he, too, would welcome any inquiry that would help to guide their organization in establishing a plan to give stability to the wine grapegrowing industry. Further, he added that it was a pity that the terms of reference were not to cover the whole of the wine industry in order that the answers might be given to growers' questions on the difference between prices paid to the grower and by the consumer. He went on further to say that for the unfortified wine the average crush would be 140 gallons. For his share the grower would receive £20, but for this wine the consumer would pay £244. Mr. Dyer went on to wish the Commissioners success. We all wish the Commissioners success.

I believe that the first thing that this Royal Commission should inquire into is the establishment of an equitable formula by which grapes should be purchased by the winemakers. In connection with that, the people who produce the raw materials should receive their just proportion of the money available to the whole industry. This was not the case last year. The previous Government used the good offices of the Prices Commissioner, and agreement had been reached over recent years between the grapegrower and the winemaker. The position this year is that negotiations have broken down, and the Prices Commissioner has no statutory power with which to enforce anything: they are only agreements between winemaker and grower. I do not think that nearly enough thought has been given to this matter because whoever drafted the terms of reference had not a very good grasp of the industry. For a start, there is no allocation of grapes for

drying and for winemaking: it is merely a matter of what a grower decides to do with his produce. It reads as though some formula could already be established, but this is not the case. I should like to see powers given to the Commissioners to go much more deeply into that matter to see whether it is necessary to do in Australia what South Africa and other countries had to do—fix a certain proportion of the grape yield for crushing and a certain proportion for drying. The Commissioners could well examine the matter of contracting between grower and winemaker.

In all my experience in this industry, it has never been the practice to have contracts between the winemaker and the grower. Back in the days when we had a bounty, a price was struck for grapes used in export wine, and that was the formula. It was catch as catch can in the period between the bounty days and the appointment of the Prices Commissioner. I do not think one can talk about supply and demand in these matters, because it does not apply. The industry has reached the stage where I do not think supply and demand operates, so many other factors affecting the whole industry having to be considered. I consider at this stage an inquiry into the method of contracting would be completely nebulous. I do not think the Commissioners would take 10 minutes to work that one out. It seems to me that in dealing with the matter of plantings the Commissioners are being asked to make a decision whether plantings should cease or go on in South Australia.

In my Address in Reply speech I pointed out the position in New South Wales and the utilization of the Snowy Mountains water. A large volume of water recently acquired is available and New South Wales is going ahead with plantings. Therefore, I think the Commissioners in this matter will have to be guided very much by information from outside this State.

No mention is made in the terms of reference, as far as I can see, about whether it would be desirable to have some control on a Commonwealth basis or to have some statutory powers in this State. Some matters are not covered at all and unless the whole of the wine-making industry is considered the information will not be obtained. I refer to the things that the industry needs to know. For instance, unless the terms of reference are widened considerably the Commissioners will not be able to inquire into the export of wine, advertising and so on. All these matters are important. It has been known for some time

that some dual purpose grapes are being used in the industry. In the main, they are sultanas, and if the sultanas this year, a year when a smaller quantity than usual has been processed, were removed from the winemaking industry there would be a shortage of winemaking grapes in this State instead of a surplus. These are factors that the terms of reference should contain, and not just the four points that I mentioned, because they will not take the matter very far.

Another interesting point is the composition of the Commission. The Auditor-General is the Chairman. He is an admirable gentleman and one who would be welcomed by the industry. Mr. T. C. Miller, the Chief Horticulturist, is a man of wide experience in the production of grapes, and Mr. D. T. Du Rieu has for many years played a prominent part in the wine industry of this State as Chairman of a co-operative winery and as Chairman of the body now known as the Wine and Brandy Producers Association. It was known by another name in earlier days.

I wonder how long it is expected that the Commission will take to bring down its report. I have heard that the report is to be presented shortly. If this is so, I fear for the sanity of Mr. Miller. His position will be similar to that of the Minister who was given the portfolios of Lands and Agriculture. I believe he will need to be a strong man to handle the dual position. Mr. Miller is currently engaged as Deputy Chairman of the citrus industry inquiry, which, I understand, is not likely to end for some time. I believe that the citrus inquiry committee will shortly embark upon a survey of citrus markets in other States. Mr. Miller is also Chairman of the Potato Board of South Australia, and I would think that that body would be glad to have his services fairly frequently. I do not know when the report will be presented to Parliament, but it appears to me that Mr. Miller is being grossly overloaded in his job.

I am anxious to see the scope of the inquiry widened so that all phases of the industry can be covered. I do not intend to press this matter to its ultimate, but I have raised it in order to give honourable members and the Government an opportunity to remedy something that is, in my opinion, inadequate. A Commission set up in this manner will not gain anything. The industry is in a difficult and parlous position at present. At the appropriate time, after other honourable members have had an opportunity of voicing their views on the subject, I will move that the motion be withdrawn, having

accomplished the purpose for which I moved it. I thank honourable members for giving me the opportunity to raise the matter as one of urgency, and I believe that they are in agreement with the sentiments that I have expressed.

I could re-hash a number of matters, but suffice to say that this industry needs stability, and needs it more now than at any other time. It is essential that the Commission should have the opportunity to inquire into every phase of the industry, because at present little is known of the activities of many of the offshoots within the industry. The industry has many ramifications, and I do not believe that many growers or winemakers are aware of all of them, right to the export level.

I appeal to the Government to give the Commissioners the widest possible terms of reference in their inquiry into the matter. It is most essential to ensure that the Commission has power to make certain that the producer receives an equitable amount of the money available in the industry. This should not be a hard job.

I was interested to read in the daily press a few days ago the following report headed "Grape men should be grateful":

The emergency co-operative for processing surplus grapes and growers generally should be grateful to the Government for its help with finance, the Premier (Mr. Walsh) said yesterday. He told the Assembly that the Government's assistance had enabled a return from grapes which otherwise would have been wasted. However, the exact nature of the contract for the processing of 3,500 tons of surplus grapes was a matter between the co-operative and Penfold Wines Ltd. "I was never informed as to the precise terms of the contract although I did, at one stage, successfully use my good offices to arrange that a threatened considerable increase in the contract terms be dropped," Mr. Walsh said. "For this intervention I may say I received no thanks and even scant courtesy." The President of the South Australian Wine Grape Growers Council (Mr. Dyer) said in Adelaide last night that growers would welcome any inquiry which would help to bring stability to the industry.

*At 3.15 p.m., the Orders of the Day having been called on by the Clerk:*

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That Orders of the Day Nos. 1 and 2 be postponed until the debate in progress and Notices of Motion: Government Business are disposed of.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I thank the Chief Secretary for deferring Government business to enable this debate to be concluded. Referring to what the Premier said, I think the growers involved are grateful for the provision

of this money, but I do not know that they will be grateful in two or three years' time when we have these huge surpluses building up and not being disposed of. That is why I believe that Mr. Walsh will receive some thanks if he widens the terms of reference of this inquiry to enable the Commissioners to deal with a problem like the one he has on his plate now. The last time I spoke in this place about the industry I said that it was on a disaster course, going full speed ahead. It is doing that, and if this inquiry can be given full rein to enable it to wrestle with the matter I believe that some good will come out of it. I also believe that the Government will have the complete backing of the industry if it widens the terms of reference and gives the Commission an opportunity to bring this whole thing to Parliament, whether merely for report or for statutory action. The position could not be any worse than it is at present. I thank honourable members for the opportunity to put forward my views on this matter.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): I support Mr. Story as strongly as it is possible for a member of this Chamber to do. There are tremendous anomalies in this matter. For instance, the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization and officers of the New South Wales Department of Agriculture recently joined a committee of growers in the Murrumbidgee irrigation areas to assess the extra plantings that can be carried out in that district. The recommendation was made to members that an extra 500 acres of one particular variety be planted. The position in the wine trade is so obscure that the individual members of it cannot see their way out of it. Only an extremely highly qualified and hard-working Commission can help them.

Men with long experience have been heading the co-operatives for many years and they are desperately worried because of the uncertainty as to what will happen when the surplus grapes that have been turned into spirit in the last two years eventually come on to the market. They have already budgeted for every possible market increase in sight in the next few years when these spirits will come to maturity and will be ready for sale. They have stretched themselves to the utmost already in accommodating all the grapes that can be safely fermented. Now they see in the hands of comparatively inexperienced men a large quantity of material that must upset the market over a long, long period. There is no easy way out of the difficulties



facing the wine industry in South Australia, for the simple reason that we are 1s. 6d. a gallon further away from the large consuming markets in the Eastern States. The whole increase in the market is being more than taken up by new production in those States. The larger wine firms, who are also retailers of wines in Australia, must buy near their market and must leave the South Australian growers, who have supplied them for years, because when the excise is taken out of the final price of wine 1s. 6d. a gallon makes a big difference in the profit margin that remains.

Mr. Story mentioned that Mr. Miller, who necessarily must be the technical representative understanding the growers' end, has the specialized knowledge, but is overloaded with duties. Actually, that is not so—he is grossly overloaded. He must fulfil many duties additional to those Mr. Story mentioned and far too many for any individual to sustain. Apart from anything else, Mr. Miller has the responsibility of running a large and important branch of the Agriculture Department and it has long been a matter of concern to everybody interested in horticulture that more and more external duties, not really concerned with his main appointment, are being loaded on to him. This must slow down tremendously the technical investigation that such a Royal Commission must be capable of undertaking. The investigation must be complex if the Commission is to do anything like the work envisaged and bring forward a worthwhile guidance instead of a whitewash report. It is a pity that this matter of grape surpluses has become a political football. I am afraid that so far it has been treated like that. It must be taken out of that category and dealt with conscientiously if this large industry, on which a large portion of our population depends, is not to become even more awfully depressed in the next few years.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I join my friend, the Hon. Harry Kemp, in supporting the Hon. Mr. Story in this matter. I believe that what has happened over the past three months proves its urgency and, indeed, what has tended to happen over recent years has underlined it. We see an industry that is proceeding into difficult times needing a thorough inquiry. My own observations and discussions with constituents in this industry in the Barossa Valley and Upper Murray have led me to believe that the terms of reference should be widened, as outlined by the Hon. Mr. Story. I was interested in the reference that that

honourable gentleman made to a possible proportion of grapes being used for processing and a possible proportion for drying. I believe that one of the troubles in the industry today is that large quantities of grapes considered to be dual purpose grapes are put into the wine industry, thereby causing the surplus. I believe many sultanas and probably gordos that could be dried go into the wine industry and in due course affect the position of the true wine grapes. Although I do not wish there to be any regimentation, it may be necessary for some arrangement to be made whereby a set quantity of these grapes is dried. I support the idea of securing a better term in contracts with winemakers rather than the day-to-day negotiations which happen every year and which, as the Hon. Mr. Story said, are only gentlemen's agreements between winemakers and growers. I wholeheartedly support Mr. Story's contention about the urgency of this matter, and I ask the Government to consider carefully the representations he has made and to endeavour to widen the scope of the inquiry and possibly even the personnel of the Commission.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I join with other honourable members in supporting this motion, and congratulate the mover on raising the matter. There is no need for me to mention the serious position in which the grapegrowing industry finds itself at the moment. Mr. Story has a wide knowledge of the industry. He has resided in the district all his life and has represented it during the whole of his term in Parliament, so no other person is more competent than he to deal with the matter. I, too, am rather alarmed at the terms of reference of the Royal Commission. It seems that one can get practically any answer one wants by confining the terms of reference of a Royal Commission; most seem to give the answer that one already knows. Unless the terms of reference are made as wide as possible we shall find out only what we already know and not get an answer to the great problems facing the industry.

The industry's problems cannot be cured at this moment. Its future will be bound up with its economic success. The more attractive an industry becomes the more people are attracted into it, so the position we are setting out to cure at the moment will be aggravated. We are endeavouring to put the grapegrowing industry on an economic footing. In South Australia hundreds of thousands of acres of land is suitable for grapegrowing. Immediately the industry is put on to an economic

footing more people will be attracted to it. The answer must be a long-range one, bound up with marketing. I think practically every industry now in economic straits is in those straits because it has not got a secure market, and that is the problem with the grape-growing industry. The use of sultanas as wine grapes instead of being dried has been raised, and that is a contributing factor to the present difficulty.

With the influx of migrants to this country the taste for wines has altered over the years; a different type of wine is required now from that which was required years ago. It is therefore necessary for different types of grape to be used in wine production. There are some advantages in using sultanas for wine, one of which is that the product is ready for consumption at an earlier stage. This is attractive to the wine-making industry.

Another problem yet to be faced (and this will aggravate the position because it will increase the quantity of grapes produced over a given year) is that many of the vineyards have outlived their economic usefulness. The vines in them are very old and producing below the quantity being produced by younger vines. Some vigneron are replacing these vines, thereby considerably stepping up their production, but others are still persevering with the old varieties and vines. This is upsetting the basis upon which the cost of production figure can be calculated. The cost of production figure could be placed on a more realistic basis if all vigneron had vines that were producing economically.

Possibly more of the sultanas now being used for wine could be dried. The production of sultanas will increase considerably in future years, and I think we must face up to drying more than we are now drying. I say this for two reasons; one is that this will relieve the wine industry of over-production and the other is that we must secure ourselves on the dried fruits market. It is no good trying to obtain markets for our dried fruits, sultanas in particular, if we cannot guarantee a continuity of supply. To guarantee this continuity, we must have sufficient people drying sultanas. I believe there are two reasons why people are not now drying sultanas, one of which is that sufficient suitable labour is not available. The vigneron may have been in the habit of drying his sultanas in the past but, because of age and of labour shortages and because his racks have fallen into disrepair, he is not able to handle the crop. Drying therefore becomes costly, so he

sells his sultanas to the distillery. This question of labour shortage is not peculiar to the wine industry; it applies to many others. I do not see how more people will be encouraged to dry sultanas unless the labour shortage is overcome and finance is available for producers to build and maintain drying racks. I commend Mr. Story for moving the motion, and trust that the Government will consider his submission that the terms of reference of the Royal Commission be widened.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Council is indebted to Mr. Story for drawing attention to what is no doubt an omission in the terms of reference of the Royal Commission into the wine grape industry. We had an assurance from the Premier early in March that a Royal Commission would be appointed to inquire into the wine industry. Its terms of reference have now been altered to deal with only one phase of the industry, grapegrowing, which does not meet the present problem. As we have a surplus grape production, it is not time for us to be talking about further plantings. We need to discuss our present production, and it is essential for the grapegrowing industry to seek further information on that.

I was interested to read a report in the press in which Mr. Dyer, who was President of the South Australian Grapegrowers Council, said that, whilst they welcomed an inquiry into the grapegrowing side of the industry, what they desired to know was something more about the wine-producing side, particularly as regards prices paid to the producer and charged to the consumer. Surely in all our problems of over-production the first thing to be looked at is marketing. I do not think anybody questions the quality of the wine produced in South Australia. Therefore, we should look to the organization of marketing. Whether it be secondary or primary industry, there must be a marketing organization to deal with production. In secondary industry, the manufacturers issue goods to their salesmen, which they have to sell. We must introduce that type of management into primary industry.

My mind goes back to the 1930's when the price of wheat, virtually because of over-production (and I claim that it was distribution, too), was down to about one-third of the cost of producing it. And before that there was talk of tipping Brazilian coffee into the sea and of doing likewise with wheat, or of converting it into benzol instead of other while millions of people were starving in other parts of the world. These are the things to be

looked at. The amount of planting to be done is nothing to do with the problem. The Royal Commission comprises competent people, but its terms of reference should be extended. The Auditor-General will have the confidence of everybody in this Parliament that he will do his job well, with the assistance of an officer in the department who understands grape-growing, and a wine producer. There seems little purpose in a wine producers' representative being on the Commission if it is not to deal with the problems of wine production, too. Therefore, I support the honourable member in his request that the terms of reference be extended to enable a complete inquiry into the wine industry to take place, as promised earlier by the Premier.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support the Hon. Mr. Story, for two or three different reasons. The first is that I think everyone in this Council will admit that it is the Hon. Mr. Story who has the detailed knowledge of this industry and all its ramifications. Consequently, he is more competent to speak on it than the rest of us. I have listened carefully to his remarks and endorse all of them. I congratulate him on raising this important matter because, if we are to have a Royal Commission, at least its terms of reference should be sufficiently wide to cover the work it is supposed to do.

Although I do not profess to have a detailed knowledge of the whole industry, I know that over the last few years arrangements have been made between the various interested parties by the intervention of the Prices Commissioner. These arrangements were negotiated by the then Premier (Hon. Sir Thomas Playford) and they worked satisfactorily. They resulted in relatively satisfactory prices—at least, an agreement on them between the differing parties.

However, on the day before the election, what I can only describe as a most unfair advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser*. It depicted the results that would ensue if the then Premier was re-elected. Unfortunately for the people of South Australia, Sir Thomas Playford was not re-elected, and the result of that is I think now generally recognized.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are optimistic!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: As a result of that, the former Premier communicated with the present Premier to know whether he could carry the negotiations further, and he was asked not to do so. If he had done so, a formula would have been arrived at and this matter would have been resolved, and there would not have been the urgency for this Royal Commission

that there is now. It is because of the unfortunate position in which the Government now finds itself of not being able to resolve this matter that the only solution for it is to resort to the appointment of a Royal Commission. Now that it has resorted to that, I think it is logical and reasonable to ask that it does not hedge it around with too many restrictions but that it gives it the power to do the job it should.

I have seen what can happen where the terms of reference of a Royal Commission are far too restricted. The former President of this Chamber, the Hon. Sir Walter Duncan, used to say that a Royal Commission was a good way of not finding out what everybody already knew. If the terms of reference of the Royal Commission are restricted, that will be precisely the result. I heartily commend the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Story. I cannot see that it can cause any embarrassment to the Government. It is a reasonable request and one that I am sure will have the support of all parties concerned.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): It appears that the Government has done only two things right. First of all, we have permitted the Council to debate this matter. Let me make my position clear on that. If any honourable member at any time wishes to debate anything within Standing Orders, I shall be the last person to deny him the right of freedom of speech, no matter how much we may disagree with what he says. The second thing that we have done right concerns the personnel of the Royal Commission. It has been stated that Mr. Miller is over-worked, but he is not the only officer of the Public Service who has been over-worked for many years. This applies to members of Parliament, too, particularly Ministers. This is an unfortunate position, but the Government cannot alter things in a few months. However, we are going along nicely. I do not know very much about the grape industry but I do know that it is in a bad way. If something is not done the position will become worse. It is not a situation of our making but a legacy from the previous Government, and we are doing our best to cope with it. I know that members of the previous Government reached some agreement with growers in previous years on this matter, but I also know that they had not reached agreement this year before the election. Last year arrangements were made to process a total of 1,500 tons in excess of what was necessary. This year we were faced with a total of 3,500 tons of excess grapes. I put this question to honourable members opposite: what

would those who support the motion have done today in such a position?

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: There will be much more than that quantity next year.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is the fear, and where will it all finish? It is easy to get up and say this and that, but the facts must be faced. It is not for me to say what the decision will be. Of all the questions that it has been necessary for the Government to face so far—and there have been some serious ones—none has caused more worry than that of the grape industry. In the main it is the small land-holders who are affected.

The river districts have many fine towns. I know them well. I have visited many of them and I enjoy going there. If the industry "goes bush", where will those people be placed and what will be done with them? Somewhere along the line somebody has to do some deep thinking.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: What are you going to do?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: It is all right for honourable members opposite to make interjections, but they should look in the mirror and ask themselves what they would have done with 3,500 tons of surplus grapes.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: The previous Government always got an arrangement that was mutually agreed to.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I remind the honourable member that that Government did not have an arrangement accepted this year prior to the election.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: In every other year we were able to negotiate an agreement and this year we would have got one finalized if we had been returned to office.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The honourable member is over-optimistic. The previous Government had had no success up to the time of the election, and then the present Premier did everything possible to bring the interested parties together, but they said "No". Let us be candid. There has to be a lot of deep thinking on this problem.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: You are not as good a negotiator as the former Premier.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: That is only your opinion.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: It is also the opinion of a lot of other people.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have been around the country a lot and I am pleased to say—and it may be a surprise to some honourable members—that many people say we are not going so badly. I could tell honourable members one or two things that have been told

to me, but they would not be believed by members opposite and therefore I will not waste my breath. When the time arrives we will not be frightened to face the people, unless some other people are not telling us the true political position.

I repeat that honourable members are entitled to their point of view. However, the four points submitted to the Royal Commission in the terms of reference were decided upon after obtaining expert advice from people within the industry and in the Public Service, the latter being the same advisers that were used by the previous Government. I do not know what will happen in future, but I have said that members opposite are entitled to their point of view. However, the Government is entitled to its point of view. We will listen, and we will also put our views. A Royal Commission's terms of reference may be as wide as the ocean, but unless something is done to restrain the human element I do not think that anybody will find a solution to the problem. That is my opinion. The Commission has been appointed to do its best to assist the industry, the wineries and the community. I have only respect for the Premier of this State and the Treasury. If it becomes necessary, the scope of the Commission may be widened, especially if there are reasons put forward by the people concerned or the Commissioners themselves. I am not in a position to say that once the Royal Commission has started the scope of its inquiry cannot be widened. I would be surprised if that could not be done. There has been no criticism of the Commissioners, so let us now let them get on with the job.

Mr. Story said that he did not know when the Commission's report was expected to be brought down. However, if I remember correctly, it was to be brought down by September 30 or as soon after that date as possible. I do not want to prolong the debate, so I will let it run its course.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I thank all honourable members for the contributions that they have made to this debate. I also thank the Minister for his reply to some of the points that have been raised. I want to make it clear to him that this motion is not a gimmick. This is a definite matter on which he implied that we did not know our business, but I can assure him that we do know it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I did not imply that at all.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is a serious matter, and we are not turning it into politics.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: We are not, but you are.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I refer to an advertisement of the honourable member's Party. If this industry was not turned into a political football by his own Party, as he says, he can read on page 115 of *Hansard* of this year the exact wording of the advertisement under the name of a Mr. Virgo. I take it that Mr. Virgo is a responsible officer in the Labor Party and possibly was the campaign director at the last election. I arranged for a copy of this advertisement to be placed in *Hansard* so that there would be a permanent record of it. It is something that should be kept on record as it is indicative of what happened. I am fortified also by the fact that the Labor Party has been talking about this problem of the wine industry for four years. The previous Government was severely criticized in another place because it did not appoint a Royal Commission immediately the problem arose. However, the Government said it would give the Prices Commissioner the authority to go ahead and discuss this matter with the winemakers and grapegrowers, and that method worked exceedingly well.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It would not have worked this year.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It was not given a chance to be proved this year as the winemakers had at this point not completed negotiations with Sir Thomas Playford, the then Premier.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes they had.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Sir Thomas Playford was not playing politics in this matter. He said, "I will have a look at it immediately after the election", and he then fixed a day for them to talk with him. That cannot be said to be unreasonable. The fact was that the winemakers wanted one or two important assurances that the Government would support them in one or two matters. I am sure that, if the former Premier had been able to negotiate with them, satisfactory prices would have been paid in most cases. Price cutting has been going on for some time in this industry. That is brought about by various winemakers either buying cheap grapes or deciding to edge somebody out of the market. Only one set of people suffers ultimately from price cutting in any industry. I refer to the people who supply the raw materials, because when people engage in price cutting it starts a rat race and the whole industry joins in. If the winemakers cannot get the price they want they will not have

money to pay to growers. The winemakers want some assurance about this price cutting. I know that Sir Thomas Playford was able to give the assurance they required. However, after the election he was never consulted in any of the discussions between the new Government and the winemakers, and his supporters were treated in exactly the same way by the present Government. I pointed that out before, so I will not labour it again. I merely want to say that it is not of our making that there is a surplus of grapes at this time. All we seek is that the Commission be given sufficient power to enable it to have a good look at the matter, without any interference.

I was surprised to hear the Chief Secretary speak about getting assurances from outside bodies. This is something that the Labor Party has learned to grow up with, taking direction from outside bodies.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Mr. Acting President (Sir Arthur Rymill), I rise to a point of order. I never said "from outside bodies", I said "from the Commissioners".

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I understood the Chief Secretary to refer to organizations, and I take it they would be the grapegrowers and some other people. He said that if, after consultation with them and the Commissioners, the Government thought it would be wise to extend the terms of reference it would do so. I would think that the support this motion had received, and the support from the number of members today, should be a sufficient indication to the Government that the elected representatives, who have consulted their constituents and who know the industry, believe that a widening of the scope of this Commission is necessary. If not, I think we ought to do what the Labor Party often suggests—roll up the carpet, lock the doors of the Legislative Council and go home for keeps. If Parliament cannot advise the Government on these matters, it is most unfortunate. I ask the Chief Secretary to have a really good look at this matter and to do what he can to see that the motion, which has been supported by so many members, is carried into effect. The Government can take advice from outside if it likes, but surely there is enough evidence here to prove that this matter is important, and that for the reasons offered it is essential that we do as has been suggested—widen the scope in order to obtain an overall picture of the industry. In accordance with usual procedure, I ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

PISTOL LICENCE ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Pistol Licence Act, 1929. Read a first time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I move:

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

The purpose of this short Bill is to increase the fee for the grant or renewal of a pistol licence from 2s. 6d. to £1 and the fee for registration as a pistol dealer from £1 to £5. Clause 3 makes an appropriate amendment to subsection (4) of section 5 of the Pistol Licence Act relating to grants and renewals of pistol licences and clause 4 amends subsection (2) of section 10 of the principal Act relating to the registration of pistol dealers. The existing fees were fixed in 1929 when the principal Act was passed. Since then the principal Act has not been amended. The increases are occasioned by the fall in value of money since 1929 and will assure to the Police Department a more adequate return for the cost of the administration of the principal Act.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT  
AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Associations Incorporation Act, 1956-1963. Read a first time.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I move:

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

This Bill amends the Associations Incorporation Act to provide that, where the name of an association is a name by which a company or foreign company could not be registered under the Companies Act or by which a business name could not be registered under the Business Names Act, the association shall not be registered by that name under the Associations Incorporation Act except with the consent of the Attorney-General. Subsection (2) of section 10 of the principal Act provides that an association shall not be registered by a name by which a company or a foreign company could not be registered under section 22 or section 353 of the Companies Act or a business name could not be registered under section 9 of the Business Names Act. The object of that subsection was to bring the policy governing the control of names of registered associations into line with the policy governing the control of names of companies and business names.

Section 22 of the Companies Act provides that, except with the consent of the Minister, a company shall not be registered by a name of a kind that the Minister has directed the Registrar not to accept for registration. Section 353 of the Companies Act and section 9 of the Business Names Act contain similar provisions in relation to names of foreign companies and business names respectively.

Pursuant to sections 22 and 353 of the Companies Act and section 9 of the Business Names Act, directives have been issued by the Minister to the Registrar of Companies and the Registrar of Business Names directing that no company, foreign company or business name should be registered without the Minister's consent if the name included certain words (for example, the word "Royal"). Thus, if a company wishes to be registered by a name that includes any of the words forbidden by the relevant directive, registration of that name could not be effected except with the Minister's consent. Unfortunately, the Associations Incorporation Act does not contain a provision whereby the name of an association that contains a word forbidden by one of the directives issued under the Companies Act or Business Names Act could be registered with the consent of the Minister.

Recently the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (South Australia) Inc. requested permission to prefix the word "Royal" to the name of the Society's Southern (Metropolitan) Branch, which is itself an incorporated association. The permission sought, however, could not be granted because of the defect in the Associations Incorporation Act to which I have referred. The amendment contained in the Bill, if approved by Parliament, would enable the request to be granted and would bring the principal Act more into line with the policy governing the control of company names and business names. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 17. Page 405.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill amends the principal Act and enables the Chief Secretary, on the recommendation of the Police Commissioner, to transfer a totalizator licence from one course to another in certain circumstances, and there are reasons why this is desirable. During the

war the Gawler racecourse was occupied for military purposes and the club was unable to race. However, it was covered by a regulation made under special war-time powers, and the club raced on city courses. In 1948 Parliament passed legislation providing that every Saturday of the year would be available for racing in the metropolitan area. At this stage, if a club could not race because of wet weather or some other unfavourable conditions on the course, there was no available Saturday to which to transfer its meeting, whereas previously there were several vacant Saturdays. I remember one occasion, which led to my introducing a Bill a few years ago in terms similar to this Bill, when owing to wet weather the South Australian Jockey Club was unable to race at Morphettville and the Port Adelaide Racing Club made its Cheltenham course available that day. The effect of this was that the Port Adelaide Racing Club used one of its licences to help another club and the other club was not able to reciprocate without transferring to a week day.

The Chief Secretary did not mention in his second reading explanation that there was a qualification to the transfer of a licence; this is described in the principal Act, and I think the wording used is "reasonable cause exists". The only reference I can see to this in the second reading explanation is the Chief Secretary's reference to it being impossible for a race meeting to be held. I should like him to assure the Council that the Bill will be interpreted according to the drafting. There has been a tendency for this point to be overlooked, so there may be a club some distance away that decides that it is to its financial advantage to move to another course. It may do this for financial advantage rather than from any reasonable cause or because the course is dangerous. In several instances stewards have said that certain courses have not been fit for racing, and in these cases the clubs have moved to other courses nearer the city. However, if the move is for a club's financial advantage, this conflicts with the expressed wishes of Parliament.

I have often heard that more mid-week races should be held. I should like the Chief Secretary to assure honourable members that this Bill means no more than that a licence can be transferred when there is a legitimate reason, such as wet weather rendering a course unfit for use or a course being commandeered. I should like to know that the Bill will be administered on that basis. As I have introduced similar legislation previously, I support the second reading.

q1

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I assure the Leader of the Opposition that this legislation will not be used just to move meetings from course to course at will. It means what it says—when a course is taken over or becomes unsafe for racing the licence can be transferred to another course. The measure relates only to five courses—Cheltenham, Morphettville, Victoria Park, Gawler and Oakbank. If a meeting is set down for a given day and adverse conditions prevail, it will be possible to move that meeting to another course. Permission will be given for the licence to be transferred to that other course. It just makes everything above board. After all, the decision rests with the Chief Secretary of the day, and so long as I am Chief Secretary that will be the interpretation. I know that it will be the interpretation by the Police Commissioner, and I do not think there is any possible chance of meetings being switched from one course to another.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from June 17. Page 405.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): This short Bill is confined to the paying of subscriptions to the Physiotherapists Board by the respective sections of the profession. It raises the amounts prescribed in the principal Act. I take it the Government is satisfied that the funds are required for the administration of the board's work. The Bill provides a larger subscription for the practising as distinct from the non-practising physiotherapist who desires to remain on the register of physiotherapists. Possibly, this will apply to female physiotherapists who marry and wish to retain their professional status in case they want to resume practising later. The measure concerns only the members of the profession itself and the request for it has come to the Government from the board. If it is happy, I do not desire to raise any objection to the Bill, which I support.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.24 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 27, at 2.15 p.m.