

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, October 24, 1972

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: About 2½ years ago I received a deputation from the Tatiara Fire Fighting Association, accompanied by representatives from the Tatiara council, to discuss with me the alterations they believed were necessary to the organization of country fire services in South Australia. A working party was appointed to investigate all matters concerning country fire services and, I believe, other fire services in South Australia. I have received a letter from the Tatiara Fire Fighting Association which, among other things, asks:

Due to our interest in this matter we would appreciate your help in obtaining information before a Bill is passed by Parliament as a result of the working party's report.

Will the Minister make the report available to Parliament so that interested people, such as the Tatiara Fire Fighting Association, can be aware of the recommendations of the working party?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This question has been asked on several occasions. As I have explained previously, the matter has been in the throes of discussion between Mr. Fred Kerr and the Treasury. I am awaiting Mr. Kerr's final recommendation before I proceed further. I am most anxious to have this report released. No Bill will be introduced into Parliament prior to the report being made public, and I hope that the report will be available in the foreseeable future.

ABATTOIRS

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: There is at present considerable criticism of the Abattoirs Board and of nearly everyone associated with the meat trade because of the inability of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board works at Gepps Cross to handle all the stock,

particularly lambs, that producers are endeavouring to market. Each year we encounter this peak marketing problem. When drought conditions exist, as at present, the position is aggravated by the excess lambs as well as the sheep that perhaps could be held back on properties until the lamb flush is over. Gepps Cross abattoir, being a service works, is required to kill all stock submitted to it. At present, there are restrictions on the number of lambs permitted to be offered through its sale yards. Exporters do not operate in these restricted yardings, because they cannot obtain killing priorities over lambs purchased for local requirements. However, many lambs are being purchased for operators in other States under the guise of the local trade and, after being slaughtered at Gepps Cross, these are freighted to destinations in other States. Also, because of the limitation on yardings at the Gepps Cross abattoir, operators in the meat trade are going out to properties and buying privately at a discount, again often under the guise of purchasing for the local trade.

This also hampers the operations of exporters at a time when no difficulty is being experienced in selling third-grade lambs, which, because of drought, constitute 75 per cent of the export kill to markets that we have not previously supplied. Will the Minister of Agriculture tell the Council what measures can be taken to overcome the present difficulty at the abattoir of getting stock killed for export and, indeed, of coping with the kill generally at the abattoir?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot answer all the questions asked by the honourable member in his questionnaire. However, representations were made to me recently (I think yesterday morning) along the lines referred to by the honourable member. I point out that the problem of glut periods has been with us in South Australia for many years, and every attempt has always been made at Gepps Cross to cope with it, even to the extent of working overtime on Saturdays and Sundays for many months of the year. However, as the honourable member no doubt realizes, this is a difficult problem to solve. I am examining the situation and will inform the honourable member exactly what transpires when the situation is finalized.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK: My question is closely related to that asked by the Hon. Mr. Hart, but there is one aspect quite apart

from the matters covered in his question. It refers to lambs and their acceptance at the abattoir. I have been approached by a producer who states that, while lambs on occasion are not received from producers, private buyers can buy the lambs from the producer on the property, and apparently allocation for killing at the abattoir is made available to those private buyers. During this period, producers on many occasions miss the opportunity of trading lambs that are in prime condition. Will the Minister, when investigating the matters referred to by the Hon. Mr. Hart, also investigate this point so that it can be clarified and, if possible, corrected?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think the Hon. Mr. Hart covered this matter in his question, as I can remember referring to it. However, I will examine the matter and, if it necessitates a separate reply, I shall be only too happy to obtain one.

WOOL

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Stockowners Association of South Australia has for many years attempted wherever possible to promote the use of wool, and one of the avenues considered was the use of woollen blankets in departmental hospitals. I understand that the Minister agreed to institute a study and to set up a committee of inquiry to investigate the relative merits of using cotton and woollen blankets in hospitals. Has the Minister received a report from Mr. Spencer, the Manager of the Hospitals Department's Laundry and Linen Services, at Dudley Park, and, if not, will he say when he expects to receive it and when the Stockowners Association can expect to receive a report from him?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have heard nothing regarding the report of the working committee since it was appointed. I do not therefore know when that report will be available. However, I will inquire and bring down a reply as soon as practicable.

PARK LANDS PARKING

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary received from the Minister of Local Government a reply to the question I asked recently regarding parking arrangements in the park lands for the forthcoming Carols by Candlelight function?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My colleague, the Minister of Local Government, reports:

The Adelaide City Council has advised me that it has received a request from the Carols by Candlelight organizing committee to use Rymill Park for the function Carols by Candlelight this year. In the course of discussion about this matter, the question of car parking was raised. I am currently examining the whole question with the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and the Carols by Candlelight organizers.

BOLIVAR EFFLUENT

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of a fortnight ago about the soil tests being conducted with the aim of using reclaimed water from Bolivar?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am advised that an interim report is expected to be ready for submission to me by the end of this month, and that it will deal with (1) results of field trials, (2) a survey of use of saline bore water in the area, (3) observations made on commercial areas at present being irrigated with effluent, and (4) a reconnaissance soil survey of the district. Meanwhile, a laboratory examination of soils and field observations is continuing.

ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATIONS

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am afraid it was some time ago but I asked the Minister representing, I think, the Minister of Roads and Transport, whether the Road Traffic Act regulations had been consolidated. I think the Minister of Agriculture has this matter in hand. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague the Minister of Roads and Transport reports:

It is agreed that the consolidation of the regulations made under the Road Traffic Act is desirable. However, the Road Traffic Board has requested that the matter be deferred temporarily in order that further regulations, which are shortly to be promulgated, may be included in the consolidation. It should be noted that any consolidation must, of necessity, be only of a temporary nature because it is necessary to amend the regulations from time to time to implement the recommendations of national committees with respect to the safety requirements of vehicles and to meet the demand imposed by greater traffic volumes using the State's road network.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture, as Acting Minister of Lands, a reply to my recent question about rural reconstruction?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: There is no necessity for those applicants whose cases are currently under consideration by the Rural Reconstruction Authority to re-apply, because

of increased prices now being obtained for the sale of wool. These were the cases I was referring to when I replied to the question the honourable member asked on October 3. Assessment of the potential income from the sale of wool is subject to constant review by the authority, and current market values are taken into account in assessing income. Any applicant who has been declined assistance and who considers that his case would warrant reconsideration in the light of increased wool prices should make a written request to the authority giving full particulars of all relevant information. I would point out, however, that in the applications declined the majority of applicants would have disposed of their wool at near ruling prices at the time of assessment. As I have already said, assessments are subject to continuous review; hence, due allowance would have been made for price increases applying at the time the applications were declined.

ADELAIDE CUP

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the Adelaide Cup holiday?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Government does not intend to amend the Holidays Act to restrict the public holiday held on the third Monday in May to the metropolitan area only.

CITRUS WASTE

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I understand the Minister of Agriculture has a reply to my recent question about the processing of citrus waste for use as a foodstuff for cattle.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Director of Agriculture has informed me that earlier investigations into this matter by his department included a small-scale feasibility study at the Struan Beef Cattle Research Centre. The results gave a strong indication of the usefulness of dried citrus pulp as a foodstuff for beef cattle, although it appeared to be readily acceptable only in small quantities and when fed with hay. The tests indicated that animals converted milled oats and hay to live-weight twice as efficiently as they did with milled pulp and hay. The departmental conclusions at the time were that dried citrus pulp could be fed to advantage to cattle and that results obtained in Florida were largely substantiated here.

However, as the feed value of dried citrus pulp was only half that of oaten grain, and the cost of drying the wet pulp was an additional expense, it was difficult to see how citrus

pulp could be used economically. Officers of the Agriculture Department have kept the situation continually under review, and at present are reinvestigating the position in view of two developments, namely:

- (1) the severe drought situation in the northern Murray Mallee which makes the consideration of all potential feed-stuffs important; and
- (2) a technological development in the Florida citrus industry in which citrus pulp pellets can be formed by an extrusion process, thus eliminating the high cost of drying the pulp.

Many problems are still to be overcome, and departmental officers are adopting a cautious but hopeful attitude.

BLUE RIBBON SMALLGOODS PTY. LTD.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: An article appears in the weekend press to the effect that a company known as Blue Ribbon Smallgoods Proprietary Limited is to build an abattoir at Salisbury next year in which 200 people would be employed. The article states that approval has been given by the Salisbury council for the erection of the abattoir and that the company would concentrate on the untapped export market to Japan. Section 50 of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act provides that the board has sole rights to slaughter all stock for export within the metropolitan area and under section 70 it has sole rights to slaughter stock for local consumption. Any export works set up anywhere would need access to local markets for a percentage of its carcasses, particularly those rejected for export. Can the Minister say whether any licence has been issued, or whether an assurance has been given that a licence will be issued, to the company? Also, has the company been given to understand that it will be issued with a permit to market a percentage of its meat in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As I did not see the article to which the honourable member has referred, this matter is news to me, and I know of no licence that has been issued to this company. However, representations were made to me by an entrepreneur of Blue Ribbon Smallgoods Pty. Ltd. some time ago, during which I said that I was concerned about smallgoods, and I think that these were what the entrepreneur was referring to when he saw me. He

did not indicate to me that the company was going to export carcasses, but only manufactured smallgoods. I referred the company to the Department of Primary Industry.

LETTER BOMBS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my question of September 26 regarding letter bombs?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Premier has contacted the Director, Posts and Telegraphs, who has advised that all of the staff handling mail in the post offices in South Australia have been alerted to watch for letter bombs of the type recently received from overseas. Instructions on the procedures to be followed if a suspicious article is detected have also been distributed. To date, no such articles have been detected in this State. It is not intended to divulge the details of the special checks or the procedures in operation, because this could provide information to the originators of the articles. It must be emphasized, however, that, while the Postmaster-General's Department will take all reasonable precautions, it is important that addressees who might receive this type of mail should themselves take every care to examine their mail on receipt, before it is opened. If a suspicious article is received, it should be left unopened in a safe place and the police notified immediately.

TOURISM

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Environment and Conservation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: While visiting the South-East last week His Excellency the Governor said several times that publicity about the tourist potential of the South-East was nowadays very much less than it was when he resided in this State in the 1920's. The position today is so bad that when His Excellency attempted to buy a postcard to show the beauties of the Naracoorte district he could find only one on sale in that town. Obviously, the tourist potential of this part of the State is being grossly neglected, particularly in connection with penetrating publicity material such as photographs and postcards. I therefore draw the Minister's attention to this matter. In the files of the Tourist Bureau and other Government departments there is an immense amount of unused materials. At present the only materials being used are faded slides that are occasionally used in automatic projectors.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am not sure whether I ought to refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Environment and Conservation or the Minister of Development and Mines. Anyway, I shall try to sort it out and bring down a reply.

KARATTA PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Education to my question about the Karatta Primary School?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague states:

In normal circumstances an enrolment of six children such as exists at Karatta at the moment hardly warrants keeping the school open. However, there are special circumstances in this case, and therefore the decision to close the school is deferred for the moment. The Director of Primary Education and the Director of Administration and Finance intend to visit Kangaroo Island to investigate a number of aspects of education. While they are there they will look into the question of closing or not closing the Karatta school and will report and make a recommendation to the Minister of Education on their return. A final decision can then be made.

WEEDS

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: While I was lying on my bed of sickness recently I read that the Minister was making efforts to try to do more to control weeds in this State. His object is very laudable; I do not know whether his methods are right or not—he would know more than I do about the matter. Some years ago (I am not sure exactly how long ago) Bulletin No. 453, issued by the Agriculture Department, proved to be a most valuable book on weeds; it gave illustrations and complete descriptions of various weeds. However, the bulletin is now out of print. On inquiring from the department (admittedly, well down the line) I was informed that it was not intended to reprint it. It seems to me that all efforts to control weeds should perhaps start with the landowner himself. The way to start is to facilitate the landowner's ability to identify noxious weeds. I am a landowner and I am most interested in the problem. I think the Minister will agree that I have made some fairly good efforts in that way, but I am not familiar with all the weeds and it could well be that some rather dastardly weeds have been loose on my place and I

could not recognize them. I do not ask this question in any sort of carping way, but I know the Minister is very interested in the subject and is trying to do his best about it. Will he look at the matter to see whether he does not agree that it would be extremely virtuous to have this bulletin reprinted and issued fairly widely, and whether the cost would not be fractional in relation to that of the greater campaign he has talked about?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Before replying to the question, I must say how delighted we are to see the honourable member back with us. We have been on tenterhooks over the past few weeks in trying to find out how he was progressing, because we could not seem to get much information. However, he seems to be progressing well, and by the nature of his question I think he is back to his old form. The submission he has made is worthy of quite a deal of consideration. I am quite willing to take up with the department the desirability not necessarily of reprinting this pamphlet but of seeing whether it could be brought up to date and printed and distributed to landholders. It is a worthwhile suggestion, and I will talk to departmental officers along those lines.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Would it be possible also to have a pamphlet of a much more temporary nature, embodying the most recent recommendations for weed control? This subject changes almost weekly, and it is most difficult for anyone to keep abreast of it. What were solid recommendations embodied in a fairly comprehensive pamphlet are often woefully out of date in a short time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think I indicated this in reply to the previous question. I will see that it is brought up to date.

CHRYSLER AUSTRALIA LIMITED

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked recently regarding his Party's attitude towards the possibility of the Chrysler works at Tonsley Park being brought under State control?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The Federal Economic Planning Committee of the Australian Labor Party is a domestic policy committee of that Party. It has not reported on this matter. The honourable member is not entitled to have its report when made—especially as his Party makes its policy not openly, as does the A.L.P., but in secret and behind closed doors.

KANGAROO ISLAND DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister responsible for planning and development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I believe the proposed regulations governing the future planning and development of Kangaroo Island are being discussed between the councils on Kangaroo Island and other organizations on the island. I am not sure whether the question concerns the Minister of Environment and Conservation or the Premier, but can the Minister ascertain when the proposed regulations will be laid on the tables of both Houses?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

FEMALE AGRICULTURAL STUDENTS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: A week ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question regarding the number of female students at Roseworthy and Urrbrae agricultural institutions. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Education has furnished the following reply:

In 1972, two female students were admitted to Urrbrae Agricultural High School—one to the certificate course beginning at fourth year, and the other as a Matriculation student. It is not possible to indicate the number who will be admitted to the certificate course in 1973. Three inquiries have been made to date by girls but no enrolments have been confirmed.

I think I replied to the question concerning Roseworthy when answering the honourable member previously.

ARGENTINE ANT

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: One of the insect pests really feared in this world is the Argentine ant, from which so far we have been free in South Australia. It is, however, established in practically every other capital city in Australia, especially in Melbourne. Recently, we have heard persistent reports of a difficult and stubborn ant invasion in some of the towns of the South-East. Is the Minister aware of the danger that this ant presents to our agriculture; secondly, is a sufficient watch

being continually kept for it? This used to be the first responsibility placed on everyone close to the department in the South-East. Does this practice continue?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain a report for the honourable member and bring down a reply when it is available.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Local Government, a reply to my recent question concerning the possibility of aliens being given voting rights in local government?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The following reply has been received:

The St. Peters council has approached the Minister of Local Government seeking an amendment to the Local Government Act to enable alien ratepayers to be given the right to vote. The Government believes that a council should be representative of the people in the district and not in proportion to the property they may own or rent. The honourable member will recall that some time ago the Minister of Local Government introduced into Parliament a Bill designed to provide voting power for all adults who are citizens of this country, but for reasons best known to it the Legislative Council rejected the Bill's provisions. Nevertheless, the Government still strongly holds the view that people are of far greater importance than property. There is another point which must be taken into consideration and that concerns the matter of consistency in elections for the State and Commonwealth Parliaments. The Government takes the view that local government is one of the three tiers of government in this country and considers that the greatest degree of uniformity that it is possible to achieve should be the objective. It is extremely unlikely that either the Commonwealth or State provisions will be amended to permit aliens to vote at either Commonwealth or State elections. This being the case, the Government has declined to extend the privilege of voting at council elections to aliens, because this would be another act of inconsistency, which is to be avoided.

TRANSPORT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Acting Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question regarding making available to the Council the report by the Commonwealth Bureau of Transport Economics?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Roads and Transport states:

As a former Minister of Roads and Transport, the honourable member should know that documents received from such sources as the Bureau of Transport Economics are sent by the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport to individual State Ministers of Transport marked "confidential" and "for use

of members only and not for publication". The word "members" in this context refers to members of the Australian Transport Advisory Council. Obviously, I am unable to release to anyone reports sent to me in confidence.

RAILWAY SLEEPERS

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have noticed in the daily press in the last few days references to the desirability or otherwise of using concrete sleepers in the construction of certain railway lines in this State. I understand that one statement made by the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Nixon) has attracted a certain amount of criticism from this State's Minister of Roads and Transport. The Commonwealth Minister said that he advocated the use of concrete sleepers in the construction of the proposed railway line to Alice Springs, whereas he considered it desirable to use timber sleepers for the Crystal Brook railway line. It has been said that this is a highly political matter and that it has something to do with the seat of Forrest in Western Australia. Will the Acting Minister of Lands ascertain whether his colleague is aware that at Paringa, in South Australia, there is a thriving industry which employs many men and which has satisfactorily supplied this State with red gum sleepers for some time? Indeed, it is capable of supplying all the sleepers necessary for the proposed undertaking. Is he also aware that it would not be necessary, if not for the policy of the Railways Department, for us to buy any sleepers from Western Australia? Will the Minister investigate the matter of the hardship that will be imposed on a flourishing industry at Paringa which provides red gum sleepers?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply when it is available.

RAILWAYS ASSISTANCE

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Chief Secretary a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to my recent question regarding Commonwealth financial assistance to build an underground railway line in Adelaide?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: My colleague states that, as part of the total overall planning for Adelaide's future transport systems, the possibility of an underground railway is being considered. Necessarily this would be a

long-term project, and investigations are in the very preliminary stages at present. As a result of representations made by all State Ministers of Transport to the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport through the Australian Transport Advisory Council, each State has indicated the level of Commonwealth financial assistance considered essential for upgrading of all forms of public transport, not only railways. South Australia has included in its submissions a request for finance for any proposed underground railway. To date, the Commonwealth has turned its back on the States' requests.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS REGISTER

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question regarding a handicapped persons register?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The present morbidity statistics being collected by the Hospitals Department are based on inpatients admitted to either general or psychiatric hospitals throughout the State. As indicated in my earlier reply to the Hon. Mr. Springett on the issue of a cancer register, the information gained in this area is being extended progressively. At this stage it is not possible to extend the hospital-based system into the outpatient and community areas, although longer-term planning for computer applications in the medical field take account of these issues. Separate registers of handicapped persons are maintained by such agencies as the intellectually retarded division of the mental health services for many of the more severely intellectually handicapped, and by the Adelaide Children's Hospital for certain groups of physically-handicapped children. It is accepted that these registers are limited and do not necessarily represent many milder forms of handicap in the community.

Although the Government is interested in gaining more comprehensive information on the number and levels of handicapped people in the State, the larger number of Government and voluntary agencies involved in the care of the handicapped has caused difficulties in the establishment of a central register. However, in view of the likely improved co-ordination of hospital and community services that is expected to follow from the report of the Committee of Inquiry into Health Services, under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Bright, it is expected that a more complete register of handicapped people will become practicable.

STANDARD GAUGE PRIORITIES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Acting Minister of Lands a reply from the Minister of Roads and Transport to the question I asked on October 17 regarding priorities in relation to the standard gauge railway lines north of Adelaide?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Roads and Transport states that the reasons for the delay in standardizing the rail gauge between Adelaide and Crystal Brook are simply that the committee established, with the concurrence of the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport and the South Australian Minister of Roads and Transport, to work with the consultants on details of the scheme has not yet finished the necessary work. Until the necessary agreement is reached between the Commonwealth and this State, ratifying legislation cannot be introduced into the Parliaments and, therefore, no date of commencement can be given.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Modifications to Lock to Kimba Pipeline and Construction of Branch Mains.

OMBUDSMAN BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its effect is to provide for the appointment of an ombudsman for this State. The institution of "the ombudsman" originated in Sweden in 1809, when a new constitution provided for the office of *Justitieombudsman* or, in English, "procurator for civil affairs"; the word "ombudsman" means simply agent or attorney. The function of the official is to protect the citizen against the suspected abuse of administrative power. It was not until the middle 1950's, when Denmark appointed an ombudsman, that the concept became widely known; it has since gained general acceptance, so much so that it has been adapted to a variety of different legal systems and to all levels of government—local, state and federal.

The ombudsman concept is, therefore, not a peculiarity of any particular form of government or legal system. It is a device that does not supplant but supplements other methods of obtaining redress. The chief characteristics of the ombudsman system are that it provides

a citizen aggrieved by an administrative decision with cheap, speedy and simple machinery for the ventilation of his grievance. The ombudsman is fettered neither by the doctrine of Crown privilege nor by the more formal nature of a full judicial inquiry. He is simply the formulator of administrative equity by the power of persuasion. Modern-day public administration is so complex that it can be undertaken only with a substantial measure of delegation of power to subordinate authorities, including the power to determine issues between citizens and public authorities, without, in a number of cases, the right of access to the ordinary courts of law. This growth of executive power has resulted in the increasing impact of government on the lives of the citizens with a concomitant increased possibility of the abuse of administrative power, whether deliberate or otherwise.

It has been found that the traditional legal remedies are in some cases inadequate to cope with the abuses of power that may flow from the growth of executive power, and the ombudsman concept has, so far, proved to be one satisfactory solution. An ombudsman not only clarifies the single decision but points to a more acceptable practice for the future. It is clear that oversea experience points to the conclusion that the ombudsman system has not had the effect of robbing the member of Parliament of his constituent casework or of weakening the links between the member and his constituents. The institution, in fact, should provide both the member and his constituents with a new and effective means of redressing grievances against the Administration. The effectiveness of the ombudsman is derived largely from the fact that the Administration is, by law, required to make available the documents and other material that relate to a particular decision. Thus, to some extent the veil of secrecy in government is lifted.

The ombudsman is concerned with administration and not with policy, since he is not empowered to question the decision of a Minister. He may, however, examine the facts that relate to the decision. In this way, the doctrine of Ministerial responsibility is preserved. His functions act in aid of the Parliament in its oversight of the administrative machine.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this measure, and I draw honourable members' attention to the definition of "administrative act", which appears in subclause (1) of

this clause. This definition is, of course, the keystone of the whole measure since the jurisdiction of the ombudsman in all matters will be fixed and determined by reference to this definition. The latter part of the definition excludes, by paragraph (a), what may generally be referred to as judicial acts and, by paragraph (b), the substance of legal advice given to the Crown by its advisers. The reason for the first exclusion is, I suggest, obvious since judicial acts should be reviewed within the judicial system, and the reason for the second exclusion is to ensure that the Crown is in no worse position than is a citizen in having preserved the confidentiality of legal advice given to it by its advisers.

I also draw honourable members' attention to the definition of "council", which should be read together with the definition of "proclaimed council". The effect of these two definitions will be to enable the ambit of the measure to be extended, in time, to cover local government councils. Although it is thought desirable that local government councils should be subject to the jurisdiction of the ombudsman, it is thought that, in the early period of development of the office of ombudsman, jurisdiction over all councils may well impose too great an administrative burden. It will, accordingly, be possible to extend the measure to cover individual councils as and when the occasion arises.

Clause 4 is formal. Clause 5 excludes certain bodies from the jurisdiction of the Act. The first exclusion, in subclause (1), covers tribunals exercising judicial or quasi-judicial powers. Tribunals of this kind will be excluded by proclamation. The second exclusion, in subclause (2), relates to the Police Force. This exclusion is proposed notwithstanding that, on the face of it, there seems no reason why "administrative acts" of members of the Police Force should not be subject to investigation by the ombudsman. However, after a close examination of the situation, it was thought it would be imposing too great a burden on the ombudsman to require him to carry out an effective investigation into an administrative act of a police officer without being able to look at other acts of the officer that would not fall within the description of "administrative acts" as defined in this measure.

Clause 6 provides for the formal appointment of the ombudsman. This clause also provides for the salary and allowances of the ombudsman and that his salary and allowances shall not be reduced during his period of office.

Clause 7 prevents the ombudsman from engaging in remunerative employment outside the duties of his office without the consent of the Minister. Clause 8 provides for a person to act in the office of ombudsman during any absence of the incumbent. Clause 9 enables the ombudsman to delegate his powers and functions under this measure. Clause 10 provides for the term of office of the ombudsman to expire on his reaching 65 years of age and also ensures that he may not be removed from office except with the approval of Parliament. This "insulation" of the position of the ombudsman is, of course, most important in a measure of this nature. However, in one set of circumstances the ombudsman may be removed from office without the intervention of Parliament, and those circumstances are set out at subclause (4) (g). I do not think it is necessary for me to enlarge on the circumstances in which it may be appropriate for the Governor to exercise those powers. It is sufficient, I think, to say that they would be extremely rare.

Clause 11 provides that the office of the ombudsman shall be an office outside the Public Service, and subclause (2) makes appropriate provision for the preservation of the existing and accruing rights to leave, etc., of any person who was, before his appointment as ombudsman, in the Public Service. Clause 12 provides for the staff of the ombudsman and is intended to ensure maximum flexibility in the appointment of staff. As will be seen by this clause, officers may be employed under and subject to the Public Service Act or outside the Public Service, as the circumstances of the particular case dictate.

Clause 13 sets out the powers of the ombudsman to make an investigation into an "administrative act" and subclause (2) is in aid of these powers. The clause is, I consider, self-explanatory. Subclause (3) of this clause precludes an investigation by the ombudsman in cases where another remedy is available to the aggrieved person, but a proviso to this subclause will permit the ombudsman to investigate the matter if in all the circumstances he feels that the "other remedy" was not reasonably available to the person aggrieved. Subclause (4) of this clause permits the ombudsman to carry out investigations notwithstanding that, in the terms of any Act, the act or decision to be investigated was expressed to be final and without appeal.

Clause 14 may appear a little complicated. However, it is intended to provide the ombudsman with jurisdiction to investigate a course of conduct that occurred before the commence-

ment of the Act or, in the case of a proclaimed council, a course of conduct of that council which occurred before the council became a proclaimed council. This power of investigation into matters that occurred before the commencement of this measure is limited to investigations of complaints received within the first 12 months of the coming into operation of this measure.

Clause 15 sets out in some detail the classes of person who may make complaints to the ombudsman. Generally, the complainant must have some direct interest in the matter of complaint, although at subclause (3) provision is made for members of Parliament to act on behalf of persons in bringing matters to the attention of the ombudsman. Clause 16 sets a time limit within which complaints must be made, although this time limit may be waived by the ombudsman if he thinks it appropriate. Effective investigation usually requires that the matters to be investigated shall not have occurred too far distant in the past.

Clause 17 (1) prevents the ombudsman from investigating a complaint made by the employee of a department, authority or proclaimed council in relation to a matter concerning his employment as such. There are two reasons for this exclusion: first, the ombudsman is not really equipped to make and give effect to a decision on what is essentially an industrial matter, and secondly, matters of this nature generally fall for determination by bodies and tribunals specially provided for the purpose. However, the existence of this subclause will not prevent the ombudsman's examining and reporting on such industrial matters where such an examination and report is necessary in the exercise of his general jurisdiction. Subclause (2) gives the ombudsman a discretion to refuse to investigate complaints in the circumstances set out in that subclause. Subclause (3) requires the ombudsman to inform the complainant where he is precluded from carrying out or otherwise does not carry out an investigation.

Clause 18 provides for the procedure to be adopted in investigations and is intended to ensure that the department or authority or proclaimed council whose acts are the subject of the investigation will be given an opportunity to be heard. The ombudsman may, in terms of this section, carry out his investigations in any way that seems appropriate to him in the circumstances. Clause 19 vests in the ombudsman the powers of a Royal Commission. Powers of this nature would seem essential if he is to perform his functions

effectively. Clause 20 is intended to ensure that the ombudsman will not be inhibited in his investigations by any statutory obligations as to secrecy or by the exercise by the Crown of its right, in law, not to make certain disclosures.

Clause 21 makes one exception only to the principle expressed in clause 20, in that it preserves the secrecy of proceedings in Cabinet. This exception is justified if the doctrine of the collective responsibility of Cabinet is still to be given effect to. Clause 22 imposes on the ombudsman and his staff the duty of keeping confidential any information that comes to their hands in the course of their duties. Clause 23 gives the ombudsman, or a person authorized by him, absolute rights to enter any premises of a department, authority or proclaimed council for the purposes of any investigation under the Act. Clause 24 prohibits obstruction of the ombudsman or other authorized persons, and a substantial penalty is provided for persons who offend against this clause.

Clause 25 spells out in some detail the powers of the ombudsman in an investigation that gives rise to matters of an adverse comment. In brief, this clause enjoins the ombudsman to endeavour to rectify the matter by reports to the department, authority or proclaimed council involved. If the matter cannot be rectified in this manner the ombudsman has the right to inform the responsible Minister and, if this is not effective, to inform Parliament of the matter. Clause 26 arms the ombudsman with further powers to give appropriate publicity to his reports or recommendations. Clause 27 casts on the ombudsman the duty of informing the complainant of the results of his investigations.

Clause 28 makes appropriate provision for the ombudsman to have his own jurisdiction tested by the Supreme Court. Clause 29 provides for an annual report to Parliament. Clause 30 affords the ombudsman and his staff appropriate protection in the exercise of their powers and functions under this Act. Clause 31 provides for offences against this Act to be disposed of summarily. The schedule to the Bill sets out the list of departments of the Public Service that will be subject to the jurisdiction of the ombudsman and, in fact, it is a list of all existing departments of the Public Service.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOWER RIVER BROUGHTON IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time. It makes metric conversions to the Lower River Broughton Irrigation Trust Act, 1938-1940. It also makes several decimal conversions and reduces the age at which a ratepayer may vote in elections or polls held by the trust. It may be sufficient to consider the provisions in detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 to 5 effect simple decimal currency conversions. Clause 6 substitutes "hectare" for "acre" where it appears: no change in principle is involved in this amendment. Clauses 7 to 9 effect simple decimal conversions.

Clause 10 amends section 115 of the principal Act, which deals with voting at elections and polls. The age at which a ratepayer may vote is lowered from 21 years to 18 years. A similar amendment was made to the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act by the Age of Majority (Reduction) Act, 1970-1971. This amendment, therefore, gives effect to clear Government policy in the matter. Section 115 also provides, in subsection (3), that a person who is ill, or who is more than 20 miles from a polling booth at election time, may vote by proxy. This is altered to 30 km, which is equal to 18.641 miles, so that the privilege of voting by proxy is thus slightly extended.

Clauses 11 to 14 make simple metric conversion amendments to various provisions of the principal Act that impose fines. Clauses 15 and 16 amend the second and fourth schedules to the principal Act by substituting decimal currency symbols for old currency symbols in the forms prescribed therein.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN AND EXPORT ABATTOIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 2226.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support the second reading of this Bill with some reluctance, because I am never anxious to buy a pig in a poke. I wish to quote the Minister's comment this afternoon about Mr. Fred Kerr's report; I trust that I am quoting the Minister word for word. He said:

There will not, of course, be a Bill introduced until this report is made available.

Yet this important Bill has been brought before the Council, although we do not know exactly how much of it is in accordance with Mr. Gray's report or Mr. McCall's report. Further, we do not know how much of it is plain Labor Party policy, although I hazard a guess that one or two matters in the Bill would probably come within that category. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

For some time now the Government has been engaged in the planning of a substantial reorganization and rationalization of the meat industry of this State.

I do not suppose any honourable member would argue very much with that statement. The Minister continued:

The benefits that will be obtained from such a rationalization are—(a) improvements in the quality and wholesomeness of meat offered for sale for human consumption.

That statement seems to imply that the quality and wholesomeness of meat offered for sale at present leave something to be desired. I am sure that, if that implication is present, it is not justified, because the board has done its best to bring the quality of the meat offered for sale up to a very high standard indeed. In dealing with the benefits that will be obtained from rationalization, the Minister continued:

(b) the creation of soundly-based commercially-viable abattoirs effectively serving the needs of all sections of the community.

That is a commendable object, but I wonder just how far this Bill will enable progress to be made toward achieving it. Actually, I cannot see very much in the Bill that will lead to that desirable result. Clause 8 removes from office the Chairman and members of the present board and replaces them with a Chairman and five new members of a corporation that will be appointed by His Excellency the Governor on the advice of the Government. I wonder just what this will do toward achieving the desirable objects that the Minister has referred to. I do not believe that the blame for the problems that have beset the abattoir can be laid at the feet of the present board members; certainly not all of the blame can be laid at their feet, because I believe the present board has some people who are very experienced in the management of a complex authority. We can scarcely expect the Gepps Cross abattoir to pay if we use it not merely to process desirable meat but also, in a season like this, to process large quantities that have to be got rid of. So, it is very difficult for a Government-sponsored institution to make a profit under these conditions.

By and large, the board, within the limits of its authority, has done a good job, and I

should like to pay a tribute to the board members. The Hon. Mr. Story and the Hon. Mr. Whyte referred to the work done by the present Chairman, Mr. George Joseph, to improve the set-up at the abattoir; I would not quarrel with the comments made by those honourable members. I also mention the Deputy Chairman, Mr. R. W. Correll, who has been a tower of strength for several years. I was sorry to hear of the resignation last year of Mr. Darcy Cowell; he made a valuable contribution over many years. Although that resignation was a heroic gesture, I doubt whether it achieved very much. I have no doubt that Mr. Cowell's successor, Mr. Eldred Riggs, has made a worthwhile contribution, although he has held office for only a short time. I query whether the replacement of the board by a corporation will do very much toward achieving the objects of the Bill. I shall be interested to learn a little more about the corporation and its composition when the Minister replies to this debate. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Clause 44 is an amendment of substantial and far-reaching importance.

I do not disagree with that. The Minister continued:

In effect, it removes from the principal Act all the board's old borrowing powers together with the inhibiting controls on its expenditure and replaces them with: (a) a power to borrow from the Treasurer (and with his consent, from any other person) for any purposes; and (b) a right for the Treasurer to guarantee the repayment of outside borrowings by the corporation.

I do not quarrel with that provision. It may be a move in the right direction, because it may enable the new corporation to achieve more than the old board achieved; we must remember that the old board's charter had limiting factors. However, clause 44 will tend to bring the corporation more closely under the influence of the Treasury and, therefore, of the Government. The tendency for Labor Governments to bring corporations under closer control is not necessarily good. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Clause 28 repeals section 27 of the principal Act, which gave the board power to promote a Bill before Parliament.

A similar type of provision was in the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, which was dealt with by this Council last session. The Minister continued:

A provision of this nature is clearly inappropriate in relation to the reconstituted corporation.

That may be so, but such a provision also reduces very considerably the independence of the operating authority of the abattoir. I query whether that is a wise move. The Minister said also that it was the first step in the overall reorganization of the meat industry. I would be the last to deny that there is room for considerable improvement and I would support the Minister in anything he could do to make such an improvement. However, I believe that we, as members of the Parliament of this State, should know considerably more about the reports received and the steps the Government intends to take to reorganize the meat industry. I do not like buying a pig in a poke; therefore, I will support, with reluctance, the second reading of this Bill in order to get it into the Committee stage.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I support the Bill, and I shall look with interest at the amendments foreshadowed. Quite clearly, some are relevant to the attitude taken to the whole matter of the abattoir and its scaling down to a businesslike operation, particularly regarding the proposed number on the board. This is a long overdue response to the needs of the people in the metropolitan area as well as the producers who use this facility in the preparation of their product for sale in the metropolitan area.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister referred to improvements in the quality and wholesomeness of meat offered for sale for human consumption and the creation of a soundly based, commercially viable abattoir effectively serving the needs of all sections of the community. To me, the second part of that statement is the more important. Quite clearly, the abattoir in the past has not been commercially viable in the true sense of the word. Changes could have been made in many areas to lead to a cheaper product on the market, and also a greater return to producers.

Many of the charges and overcharges go straight back to the producer in the form of deductions prior to the sale of stock. The abattoir has had many problems regarding the types of activities it is required to carry out on behalf of butchers. The most important of these in the metropolitan area has been the delivery of meat to butchers. Many matters could have been looked at in this regard. I have been given information regarding the delivery of meat, which is delivered at a flat rate of .65c a lb., and one

instance has been quoted of four hoggets and one pig being delivered to Christies Beach, and the same truck delivering one wether to Gawler. As it is a union requirement that two men shall be on each truck, two men carried out this task for the day. Quite clearly, that is a completely uneconomic operation and one that should have been done under a much more economic system. Overtime is charged, and I have heard that there is a tendency to spin out the journey to make sure that the truck arrives back after hours. This is a natural tendency for people involved within an industry; if they can get overtime, good on them, but, if the abattoir were operated by private enterprise or on a commercially viable basis, quite clearly this aspect would have been investigated and changes made.

If deliveries were not included in the killing price the butchers would pick up their meat, or a contractor would do it for less, as is done in other States. I understand this has been looked into, and it is an important point. The delivery of small quantities of meat is not a commercial operation, and should never be allowed. There is no upper or lower limit to the numbers that can be killed for any one butcher, and as a result the smallest butcher could ring up and ask for five sheep to be killed and pay the same price as the butcher who required 500 killed. All the offal and skins must be kept separate. This represents a colossal problem within the works. It is necessary to segregate according to ownership, to brand sheep separately, to keep skins separate, while some offal is bulked and some are kept separately. The Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board has 500 separate clients, whereas the Homebush abattoir in Sydney has a much smaller number, although it is serving a larger city. Segregation costs at Gepps Cross are estimated at \$250,000 a year, and even that figure could be out of date; the cost could be greater. Throughput cannot be planned because of the variation in numbers available for killing, but the abattoir must have potential throughput, as it is a service works. I am quite certain a much more commercially viable system could be adopted.

It has been alleged that certain meat companies in Adelaide take advantage of the fixed price a pound to ensure that they have stock killed at the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board works at weekends, while killing at their own works during the week. This matter should be investigated to see that the abattoir is not being used for this purpose.

It has been alleged, too, that Adelaide has more butcher shops a head of population than any other capital in Australia. I have not been able to check these figures, but that appears to be a known fact. It is estimated, too, that the mark-up on lamb is higher on average over the year than in any other State. That is caused by the small turnover for each shop, which automatically requires increased margins. Quite clearly, all these things relate back to the abattoir and to the need for a rationalization within the works and within the meat industry generally in Adelaide.

I understand that no women are employed at the Gepps Cross works. Certain facilities essential for female labour have been provided at great expense at the abattoir, but, because of obstruction, no women have been appointed to the staff. Perhaps we should say a word or two on behalf of women, indicating that in other abattoirs women are highly regarded, especially in the packing side of the operation, where they are much more efficient (or so I have been told) than male labour at certain points in the preparation of the meat. Discussions have taken place as to whether the yards should be leased to combined agents or farmer organizations to cut costs. One of the problems at the moment is that two sets of people are involved in handling the stock inside the yard. Until the fall of the hammer, the stock is handled by stock agents' representatives. Subsequently, it passes to employees of the abattoir. In the case of a large market, no day labour may be used, under union regulations, leading to a considerable amount of overtime being paid. This, in turn, is passed back to the owners through increased yard fees. Producers do not enjoy this, because they are paid in the long run at the decreased price. However, this relates to the board as well.

The board has been a Father Christmas organization to meat marketers in the metropolitan area, particularly the smaller ones. I trust that we will see a rationalization of killing charges and costs of meat delivery. At the moment, this is done on an all-inclusive fee which covers paddocking for stock free of charge, transfer from sale yard to abattoir, killing and chilling, holding 24 hours, and delivery anywhere between Gawler and Christies Beach. I hope that the new board will give attention to this problem. More important, we in this State, where we have such vast distances between the areas in which stock is produced and where it is killed, need to have regional abattoirs in strategic locations.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Do you mean export works?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I do. I believe that regional abattoirs will in the long run be the answer to many of our problems. I hope that we will not see any further growth in the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board works at Gepps Cross until growth occurs in the areas in which stock is produced. It has been stated that the Government is encouraging the setting up of such establishments, but clearly a long battle occurred to obtain the necessary licence to enable construction of the proposed abattoir at Naracoorte to proceed. The Government must encourage the people who are willing to establish regional abattoirs.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: They have my full co-operation.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I am pleased to hear that.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I think you know that.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: No. I do not.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I have told you that several times.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I believe that regional abattoirs will lead to greater returns to producers, as the cartage of stock over long distances must result in a deterioration of the stock, particularly when it is landed at the abattoirs here and must remain in the yards for up to seven days before being slaughtered, which occurs here at this time of the year. Although it may be said that the producer has received his money, nevertheless, the next time an agent purchases stock he must reduce his price to cover the loss that occurred in that period. This is far too lengthy a period in many cases. If a regional abattoir was situated at a strategic location, better contact could be maintained between the producer and the abattoir, and there could possibly be a greater rationalization in the supply of stock to smaller abattoirs.

I support the Bill and hope that it will achieve all the Minister expects of it. I will watch with interest the further legislation that the Minister has foreshadowed, hoping that it will encourage other people, particularly those in private enterprise, to establish more regional export abattoirs. I trust that the Minister will not increase the size of the present abattoir at Gepps Cross, and I support the suggestion made by the Hon. Mr. Whyte of the abattoir's perhaps becoming a clearing station for stock coming from other abattoirs throughout the State, and also his suggestion

regarding the establishment of a centre to which carcasses can be supplied and from which they can be diverted to the city market. I hope that this Bill will be only the beginning and that legislation will be introduced that will cover many of the problems not dealt with in the present Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank honourable members for their contribution to the debate. I am afraid, however, that some of them got carried away, and got completely off the point regarding what the Bill does; some spoke in general terms. References have also been made to various organizations and persons who have over the years been appointed to bring down reports on the Gepps Cross works. However, I am not interested in those, because those inquiries were instituted prior to my assuming office; indeed, the reports in relation to them could have been released by any Government that saw fit to set them up. However, those Governments did not see fit to do so, and it is not for me now to say whether they should be released. I have in the last 12 months received representations from grower organizations to reconstitute the Abattoirs Board at Gepps Cross. It did not take a consultant to tell me or my Government exactly what steps should be taken.

This is the first and prime move to reorganize South Australia's meat industry. This is a simple Bill, which changes the constitution and name of the authority at Gepps Cross. It does little else than that, except that it gives the new corporation certain powers that the old board did not have. In the interests of the meat industry, this is the first major problem to be tackled; hence, the introduction of the Bill. It did not take a consultant to tell me this, as the people in the meat industry generally and producers have been clamouring for this for some time. I think some honourable members even referred to this aspect in the second reading debate. I sincerely hope that in Committee honourable members will give the Bill proper consideration and that we can, in the interests of this State's meat industry, get this new corporation into effect as soon as possible.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1—"Short titles."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "South Australian Meat Corporation" and insert "Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Trust".

I have listened with much interest to the Minister in his reply to the second reading debate. He said it did not need a consultant to tell him or the Government that change was needed in relation to the Gepps Cross works. Despite the Minister's saying that, much money has been spent on obtaining the views of the consultant, who has furnished a report. I presume that that report followed closely the reports which have been submitted to former Governments, including the triennial reports made by the Chairman of the Public Service Board. I refer, for instance, to the report carried out by Mr. R. Jose, and the conclusive McCall report. When the Minister said that very little was done by other Governments, he should remember that the other Governments did not have much time in which to take action: they were busy trying to hold the meat industry together.

I congratulate the Minister on taking this positive step forward; I am pleased that this has happened. However, it is not correct for the Minister to say that the Bill changes very little except the name of the authority at Gepps Cross and one or two other minor matters, as the regulation-making powers that existed under the Act have been removed. If one examines closely these powers, one sees that they are really the core of the Act. It is fair for one to say that in the first part of the preamble to the regulations the board plays a secondary part to that of management. All that has been cut away. The amount of money spent on advertising each year on Municipal Tramways Trust buses is considerable. For advertising certain brands of wine, bananas or apples, or whatever it may be, these buses are excellent because they are mobile and pass thousands and thousands of people each day; they are therefore a wonderful advertising medium.

Why should we miss an opportunity of advertising similarly on these trucks plying between Gawler and Christies Beach? If we could have the letters "M.E.A.T." on them, that would mean something to the industry. That is why I suggest that the name of the new body be changed, that it be called not the South Australian Meat Corporation but the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Trust—M.E.A.T., which should meet with the approbation of the Government and other people. More importantly, this Bill does not deal with the whole of South Australia in respect of a meat authority: this is only the first leaf in a big book that, I hope, will be written by this

Government setting out the conditions under which meat is controlled, sold and licensed for sale, and how inspections shall be carried out. We should not miss the chance to advertise in this way.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I cannot accept the amendment. The new name for the board at Gepps Cross was discussed for many weeks. Strangely enough, the word "trust" did arise in those discussions. I concede the significance of the honourable member's motive—that we could have a gimmick like "M.E.A.T." on the sides of the trucks carrying meat and that that would be a good advertising stunt. That may be all right, but the Government is not interested in gimmicks: it wants to get down to the operation of the abattoir and do the job it set out to do. It has accepted that "South Australian Meat Corporation" is a fitting title for the new board. The honourable member wants to go further than this amendment, because he wants also to reduce the size of the board, by a later amendment.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Do not get confused about the two amendments.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: We must consider the two amendments together, because they reflect the honourable member's whole idea. The Government has gone to much trouble in looking at the whole situation. It would be different if it was going to appoint a permanent, full-time board, trust, or whatever one may like to call it, for the abattoir at Gepps Cross, but the Government decided not to do it that way. It has decided that these people shall be not full-time but part-time; they will hold their meetings regularly.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Will they be on an hourly rate of pay?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: No. In the Government's view, the name is insignificant at this stage. All sorts of different names could be suggested as gimmicks, some of which would appeal to people who do not like "M.E.A.T.". The Government has decided on the name; it has been bandied about in Government circles and elsewhere and everyone to whom I have spoken (including some prominent agriculturists in South Australia), even as late as last night, has indicated that the name is appropriate. Therefore, I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister's argument is not convincing. Why do we need to change the name at all? We are trying to make these meat works viable but the first thing we do is alter the name. By doing that,

we immediately involve the authority in increased costs, because all the vehicles and signs will need to be repainted, and the licences involved will have to be changed. All the signs throughout the property owned by the authority will need to be altered. So, immediately, the new authority is involved in unnecessary additional expenditure. However, if, as the Minister says, it is necessary to alter the name, why not make an appropriate alteration—one of some economic value to the authority, as suggested by the Hon. Mr. Story? His suggestion is a means of promoting meat. Surely the Minister, as a primary producer, is interested in the promotion of meat. I know he has the interests of the industry at heart, so surely he is interested in promoting it. Here is a chance of doing so at no cost to the Government other than the cost of repainting the vehicles, which will occur anyway under this Bill.

The Minister said something about the permanence of the board. The Electricity Trust is not a permanent authority; it acts only similarly to the way in which the proposed authority will act. We understand another Bill is to be introduced, as has been suggested by the Minister, to amend the parent Act, but it is about this measure that honourable members are concerned because they do not know to what extent a further amending Bill will expand the operations of the authority. For instance, is it intended that it shall become a trading authority? If it is, "corporation" may be an appropriate name. I have read that members of the present Government (not necessarily Ministers but at least back-benchers) have implied that the board should be a trading authority.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: There is provision under the present Act for the board to do that if it wants to.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Within limitations, but we are concerned that these limitations may disappear.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That may be a good thing.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It might be a good thing if the authority became a trading authority. I can well imagine how easy it would be for it to set up as a wholesale meat distributor. It would be able to distribute meat direct from its present works; it would not need any other distribution centre; and it would have a decided advantage over any other wholesale meat establishment, which must have deliveries from the abattoirs for its own outlets. The new body could become

a wholesale meat authority without any trouble and at a decided advantage over other wholesalers, because they would not be able to compete economically with it.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That would be an example of Socialism.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It would be putting the Labor Party's policy into effect. Can the Minister assure the Committee that it is not intended in future that the board become a wholesale meat authority?

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I think I can give that undertaking. I don't think that's possible.

The Hon. L. R. HART: If the name must be altered, the name suggested by the Hon. Mr. Story is the most appropriate, because it would promote the product with which the authority is dealing.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Are the terms "corporation" and "trust" interchangeable? If they are different, can they be changed?

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The reason advanced by the Hon. Mr. Story is more convincing than that advanced by the Minister. If the Minister has any reason, other than that he has been assured that the name is a good name, I shall be willing to listen to him, but I think the promotional value of the name suggested by the Hon. Mr. Story surely outweighs the opinions of the few people to whom the Minister has spoken.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I appreciate that, after deep consideration, the Minister and the Government selected a name, and it is their initial right to bring to Parliament what they believe to be the best name for the new body. However, I am disappointed in the way the Minister has responded to the Hon. Mr. Story's suggestion, which has considerable imagination and follows the modern approach.

The Hon. Mr. Story came up with the "in" thing which, admittedly, is something of a gimmick. We have a promotional opportunity so that the letters forming the word "meat" will be shown all over the sides of all the trucks of the abattoir and all other places where publicity and advertising is presented. It would undoubtedly be a promotion of considerable value that would cause consumers to be more interested in meat, and what could be better than that?

If a publicity campaign were launched by this new body, it might lead to a greater consumption of meat, but this would cost considerable money, whereas here we have a natural promotional piece of advertising or

publicity that would be there for the life of the organization. The suggestion has considerable merit.

Regarding the meaning of "corporation" compared to "trust", I do not know what answer the Minister will have. We have the Housing Trust and the Electricity Trust, which are successful organizations, and people are accustomed to "trust" forming part of the name of an organization of this kind. My main interest is that we develop the publicity of the word "meat", representing the name of this body. Such free publicity would cause people to become more interested in the consumption of meat, and this would benefit the producer and those concerned with the marketing and selling of meat.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I think honourable members have missed the point completely: the Gepps Cross abattoir is a service abattoir, and the name Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board is not significant. The abattoir caters for export, but it is not really a metropolitan and export abattoir as one complex. Export is a secondary consideration, because the abattoir provides meat mainly for the metropolitan area. When a new body is set up, I believe it is entitled to have a clean sweep and start afresh. If we called this body the metropolitan and export abattoirs trust or board, it would not do justice to the new body. That is why we decided to call it the South Australian Meat Corporation. I believe that "corporation" is appropriate, even though it has no gimmick in it. It is not this body's prerogative to advertise meat: all it must do is kill meat. Many organizations throughout the State are promoting the sale of not only red meat but also chicken meat. The new corporation should have the opportunity of starting off afresh. I therefore ask honourable members not to accept the amendment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister has not yet advanced any argument that has caused me to change my mind. The Minister has said that he wants to give the new authority a clean start, but I point out that nothing dirty has happened in the past.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: No-one has suggested that anything dirty has happened.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister denigrated the board.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Don't be ridiculous! Let us talk sensibly about this matter.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister said that he wanted a clean sweep.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: There is nothing wrong with that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: If two groups of people had had a little more strength, the abattoir would have functioned very well over the years. I have proved to the Minister by figures that the abattoir can function at a handsome profit; it happened in 1967 and 1968. The abattoir is called the metropolitan and export abattoir because, until the Noarlunga abattoir came into operation, it played a tremendously important part in connection with exports of prime lamb from this State. It was only when the Government of the day and the producers of the day were held to ransom through a very long strike that it was decided that more opportunity should be given for the operation of facilities other than the then existing facility. That is why the Noarlunga abattoir was given a licence. The Minister says that the export part of the business is no longer in existence, and I believe that that is one of the great faults of the present set-up. I hope that the new corporation ensures that the abattoir gets back into a considerable export trade, because the opportunities are there. I hope that the abattoir will start to work on a 24-hour basis, if necessary. I do not favour a basis of so many beasts a day, after which the workers can go home. The abattoir is capable of carrying two shifts, and another gang can clean down and get the abattoir ready. The only successful canneries are those that work with a double shift and also employ people to clean down; those people receive a much lower rate of pay than that of the skilled people.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That would apply to any export abattoir in Australia, in that case.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. The trouble with primary industry today is that it is highly over-capitalized, because people are frightened that someone will be put out of work. It is better to have one abattoir in mothballs for two or three years while another abattoir is at full capacity than to have each of two abattoirs working at half capacity.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Does the same point apply to canneries?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes; that may have to happen regarding some canneries in this country. The word "corporation" is new in this context, but it is used extensively in America. I presume that the Chairman would be the Vice-President and that the corporation would be run on American lines. We may just

as well call it a meat authority, the term used in Victoria. If this were done, the initials "S.A.M.A." would be on the delivery trucks. However, I prefer the initials "M.E.A.T."

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The Minister has not yet replied to the Hon. Mr. Springett's request, because he has not had time to check. However, I have had time, and I find that "corporation", as the Hon. Mr. Story said, merely means a company. There are some other meanings—a body or society authorized by law to act as one individual, a company (as in the United States of America), and part of a body. The word "trust" is not so clearly defined. I can see no valid reason for not being able to interchange the words.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (11)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, H. K. Kemp, E. K. Russack, V. G. Springett, and C. R. Story (teller).

Noes (6)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey (teller), M. B. Cameron, F. J. Potter, A. J. Shard, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I take it the Minister is not pleased, but I think it would be wise for him to report progress so that the Bill can be completely reprinted, as should have been done, with all the amendments, to bring it into line with the Act in the first place. A complete reprint would save the Committee a tremendous amount of time, because the words "Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Trust" will have to be inserted throughout. I do not think the Minister would want the Committee to chase those words right through the Bill on so many occasions. I suggest that the Minister report progress and discuss this matter with the Parliamentary Counsel, and he will be happy, I am sure, when he has had a good look at it.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I am absolutely disgusted with the attitude of honourable members who, even at this early stage, defy what the Government has set out to do in establishing an organization to carry out the duties relating to the Gepps Cross abattoir. After the Government has gone to the lengths to which it has gone to bring down this Bill, for members in this Chamber to have the audacity

to vote to have the name altered is, to my way of thinking, absolutely despicable, to say the least. They are showing their authority over the Government—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister must not reflect on the decision of the Committee or on honourable members.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I accept your ruling, Sir. I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

Clauses 2 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Continuance of corporation."

The CHAIRMAN: A drafting correction is necessary. In new subsection (5) the words "Amendment Act" should be inserted after "Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act". That correction will be made at the table.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—"Composition of corporation."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I move:

In new section 10 (2) to strike out "five" and insert "two".

Before the Committee reported progress, I suggested to the Minister that it would be very much easier if the Bill were reprinted. The Minister seemed obsessed with going on with this measure. The effect of the amendment I have now moved will be that, instead of a chairman and five members, making a total of six, there will be a chairman (a permanent chairman, in my opinion, although it is up to the Minister to decide) and two members. The amendment is self-explanatory; I wish to cut down the size of the board, which will be called a trust—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is what you think.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not mind what the Minister thinks. I am trying to be as tolerant and as placid as I can about this. A board of six would lead us into the same situation as we have suffered for a long period. I suggest a permanent head of the abattoir with two skilled men to assist him in the administration. An advisory committee could be set up. If the Minister wishes, he could have 20 people on the advisory committee, representing skins and hides, stockowners, stock salesmen, and everyone else now clamouring for a job in the 11 on the board. If we have five, one or two of the five must be specifically categorized, and that will not help the abattoir to get back on its feet. I am not standing over the Minister—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: Then what are you doing?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You are making it your Bill, and not the Government's Bill.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Minister has made that assertion a couple of times today. It does not disturb me. I have been stood over by Ministers previously. I am making a clear and proper suggestion to the Committee. The Minister is assuming that the Committee will support me, but it may not do so. I am not playing politics, but I am terribly interested in trying to make the abattoir pay.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Altering the name makes it pay?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This amendment, if carried, will make it pay better than it would otherwise. If the Minister has any better explanation to offer than when he was defeated on the first clause, we would listen to him. I would not push the Minister in any way if he has some good reason, but up until now all he has been able to say is that it is on advice. I cannot see how he will find a better situation with five people, in addition to the chairman. With five he will be pushed into a corner. With two (apart from the chairman) he has a chance of getting the best brains as head of the corporation or trust. He can have the choosing of all the three, but if he has six members there will be two outside bodies pushing him into a corner. In his heart of hearts, the Minister knows who they will be. Each group will want a representative, and the moment either gets a representative the Minister is sunk. If the representatives do not carry messages back to their principals they will be sacked and the Minister will not gain anything.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister and his colleague, the Chief Secretary, seem to be terribly sensitive to any suggestion as to how the Bill could be improved. There are people in this Chamber who have the industry at heart to as great an extent as the Minister, if not to a greater extent. The Committee is simply trying to suggest to the Minister how improvements can be achieved. However, we are working under disabilities because we have not before us the report of the consultants. We do not know what was contained in that report. During the second reading debate, I expressed doubt that the consultant had recommended a board of six. I believe there is every possibility that the recommendations are along the lines now suggested by the Hon. Mr. Story. I said further that the enlarged board is there for only one purpose, to accommodate union representation. The Minister said that we are trying to avoid sectional interests. If that

were to be achieved, what justification could there be for a union representative on the board? I said that if we were faced with a situation of having to have a union representative on the board, we should not have a person associated with the unions involved in the operation of the works. At Homebush, in New South Wales, the union representative on the board is not representative of any union involved in the operation of the works. Such a representative is under a moral obligation to report back to his superiors the findings and discussions of the board. There is a great deal of merit in the amendment before the Committee. If the Minister is opposed to it, let him inform the Committee of Mr. Gray's recommendations on this matter. What were the recommendations of the previous investigation made by Mr. McCall?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Why not ask the Hon. Mr. Story? He got the report from Mr. McCall. Why didn't you ask him when he got it a couple of years ago? You are complaining now and blaming me for something I had nothing to do with.

The Hon. L. R. HART: The Minister is so terribly sensitive.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Of course I am sensitive. I hate to be called something I am not. I did not ask for the McCall report.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I know you did not ask for it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. L. R. HART: I assume the Minister has read the McCall report and that he has heard the verbal report of Mr. Gray. Let him tell the Committee that both men recommended a board of six. If the Minister is willing to tell the Council this, I shall be happy to consider further the Hon. Mr. Story's amendments, which I consider to be justified, especially as another Bill is to be introduced later. Will the Minister explain why it is necessary to have six members on this corporation? At present, there is justification for requiring a body of only three members. I therefore support the Hon. Mr. Story's amendments.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: This clause is probably the key to the whole Bill, as it will decide whether or not the abattoir will in future become more efficient and viable. This depends entirely on personnel who will be appointed to the new corporation. I understand that the Chairman of the Western Australian body must be an accountant; clearly, a person with managerial ability should be appointed. Did the Minister have this in

mind when considering appointments to the new corporation? If people who are without the necessary experience to deal with financial problems, which are probably the most difficult are appointed, the new corporation will amount to nothing and will merely represent a continuation of the present system.

I see some merit in the Hon. Mr. Story's amendment to keep down the number of members on the corporation. However, I do not believe this will have the drastic effect desired. The number of members on the new corporation should be kept as low as possible because, as the Hon. Mr. Hart said, we could arrive at a situation in which, as a result of pressure exerted on the Minister or the Government, there was sectional representation.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot accept the amendment. I wish that the Hon. Mr. Hart would do his homework a little better than he does because, the more he talks about the meat industry in this State, the more I am convinced he knows little about it. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Cameron that the head of the new corporation should have some accounting experience and, indeed, that he should probably be a qualified accountant. In discussions with the Government it was decided that the best way to tackle this problem would be to appoint a board, the members of which had business experience, managerial ability and interests in the meat industry. We also considered the employment of a three-man board such as that at Homebush, the members of which are all permanent employees. We must also obtain a man to fill this position in a full-time capacity; those at Homebush are not working on a full-time basis. This matter was bandied around for some time, and I assure honourable members that this is the basis on which the Government finally decided. If honourable members do not like the provision, they can, with the numbers they have in this Council, throw it out. However, considering that this would be in the best interests of the meat industry generally and of the Gepps Cross abattoir, the Government had the Bill drawn in this way.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: Can the Minister say why there is to be a corporation comprising part-time members instead of full-time members? Is there something detrimental about having full-time members, or is there an argument in favour of having part-time members?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: There are many arguments for and against. If we can obtain the right type of people to run the abattoir on

a permanent basis, it could be the answer to our problem. However, having examined the meat industry in South Australia generally and the way in which the Gepps Cross abattoir has been constituted in the past, the Government decided that it could operate efficiently in future with the members of the corporation acting in a part-time capacity.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: One of the success stories of boards in this State is the Metropolitan Milk Board, which has done an extremely good job in licensing, fixing prices, enforcing health hygiene regulations and bringing requirements regarding milk in this State up to date. This has happened because it has an efficient, permanent Chairman. There is no need for any member of this body, other than its Chairman, to be permanent: the two other officers can be employed temporarily, the same as they are on the Milk Board. In saying that the new corporation should comprise only three members, I am not tying the Minister's hands: I am merely saying that the corporation should comprise a Chairman and two other members. I reiterate that the more people there are on the corporation the more opportunity there will be for sectional interference. That has been the problem at the Gepps Cross abattoir almost since its inception. If the Minister reflected on what happened to him on two occasions during the period he has been Minister, he could trace back to the source of many of the problems existing at Gepps Cross.

If we were considering something that involved the whole of this State's meat industry (we are not doing so: we are considering the running of the Gepps Cross abattoir only), I would see some merit in widening the scope of the new corporation, because expert advice on a wide spectrum would be needed. Here, we need managerial skill at the top.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That is what we are doing.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We are setting up a corporation of five members with a chairman to blunder along—

The Hon. T. M. Casey: I have already explained that they will have managerial experience.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: —in the same way as has happened in the past, without having full information regarding what is happening day by day, because a part-time man cannot obtain a sufficient grasp of management. He must be present all the time and have his finger right in the middle of the pie: he must be the pivot point for the rest of the operation. If we are to have a part-time chairman with five

other members, why should we not have nine members? There is no difference. We want a dynamic top three, with one very dynamic person in the middle. Pay him \$20,000 a year and we shall get something for our money. Do not let him be interfered with by sectional interests in the community.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I was surprised at the emotion displayed by the Minister of Agriculture and the Chief Secretary on the previous amendment. I find it hard to understand why the Government appears to be so sensitive about the idea of calling the body "Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Trust". I see merit in that, from the points of view of advertising and of recognition by the public. What impresses me is that this must be a managerial board capable of solving the problems that have beset the Gepps Cross abattoir for so long. The Minister well knows the problems to which I refer. The argument is about a six-man board and a three-man board. If we want efficiency and strong management, the smaller the board the better. The idea put forward by the Hon. Mr. Story of having one permanent Chairman (upon whom the ultimate responsibility devolves) and two out-riders appears to be an eminently sensible way of organizing the management of the abattoir. Honourable members in this Chamber have a right to express their views. I discount completely any idea that honourable members are dictating to the Government what it should do.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is what the amendment does. In effect, it is telling the Government, "You will do this, or else."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is not so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is a fact. You look at the Bill as it leaves this Chamber; that is what the amendment does.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is not quite so.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You tell me different.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Any honourable member who has listened to the arguments of the Hon. Mr. Story, the Minister and any other honourable member who has spoken must come down on the side of the amendment if he uses his judgment soundly.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: These amendments were put down on file before the Minister was heard. They were already cooked up.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is amazing that the Hon. Mr. Banfield should say that the amendments were cooked up. They were

not on file, so he would not know what was to be moved. This is a reasonable amendment, which I ask the Government to consider in the hope that another place, when it gets the amended Bill, will approach it realistically.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It might reinsert the old provision.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This Committee is trying to improve the operation of the abattoir.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I never cease to be amazed at some of the arguments that the Opposition tries to put forward when it wants to buck the Government. I agree there are times when small boards operate more efficiently than big boards, but there are many boards of directors, both in South Australia and throughout the Commonwealth, of which honourable members know. Are there only three members on those boards? The position is that the Government has decided to put a certain number of people on this board at Gepps Cross which, in the opinion of honourable members opposite, is too large. Why don't you tell some of these companies operating in South Australia that they have too many people on their boards? Why not say to them, "You are not running your business properly; you should do this and you should do that?" The Government has decided, after much deliberation, on a board of management of five people plus a chairman, as I explained in my second reading explanation. These people all have the expertise to do the job at Gepps Cross. We settled on the figure of five and a chairman, but this amendment will change it completely. The Hon. Mr. Story now wants a permanent, full-time chairman, who should, he suggests, be paid \$20,000 a year. We do not intend to do that, and that is where we differ. I do not see why we should be criticized for establishing a five-man board of management plus a chairman if we compare that board with some of the boards in Adelaide that have more than five members. The Government cannot be criticized here. Members opposite are entitled to their opinion that three members is better than six, but the Government's view is that six members with expertise will do the job. That is how we have presented it in the Bill. I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Once again, the Minister is somewhat confused. He is talking about a board of directors: we are talking about a board of management, a managerial board. It is within the power of the shareholders of any company to say how many

directors they want. If we flip through the list of various boards of big companies in this State, we find they set out to get on their boards people who suit their particular type of business. That is their prerogative. In this case, the shareholders happen to be the members of Parliament and we are looking at this matter because we must protect the public. If the Government is allowed to run wild, this measure will go through without the members of Parliament debating it at length. In that case, what is the use of paying people like me a salary? That is wrong. What I want to prise out of the Minister is this: will he put into categories for me the six people he has in mind for his board, or will he name them? He says the Government has given much thought to these people who will run the abattoir.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: They are all experts.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Will the Minister tell me simply how many lawyers, how many accountants, how many people representing sheepowners, how many people representing beef producers and how many people representing the unions will be on the board—or would he rather name the people so that we can work out their categories? The Minister has said that the Government has given much thought to this matter. I want to see for myself how much thought the Government has given and, unless the Minister can tell me categorically what those six people are supposed to be experts at, I will not believe that the Government has given sufficient thought.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: How can the honourable member expect me to give him the names of the people on the board when the Bill has not even been passed?

The Hon. C. R. Story: Then give me the categories.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The amendment provides for a full-time Chairman, but can the honourable member say who the Chairman will be? Will it be Mr. McCall?

The Hon. C. R. Story: No—someone better than him.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Mr. McCall was mentioned the other day.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I didn't mention his name in the debate.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: We cannot decide who the Chairman will be until the board has been appointed. I have spoken to many interested people who have had considerable managerial experience; for example, accountants and business men who are the managing

directors of their own firms. These are the kind of people we will have on the board—people who want to manage the abattoirs to the best of their ability. If the honourable member is not satisfied with my reply, I do not know how I can please him.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Well, I cannot be satisfied. Is the Minister being consistent in the way in which he approaches these industry matters? In the case of the Citrus Organization Committee, we are not allowed to have anyone on the committee who has a vested interest in citrus. Do I understand that the Minister will continue to be consistent so that there will not be anyone who has any affiliation with meat? That would automatically disqualify any person who has any association with meat from being a member. Why will he not give me the categories, say whether the Chairman should be an accountant or a lawyer, and whether there should be stock salesmen and union representation? The Minister is dodging the issue and, until he comes clean, we must sit here.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: It may put the honourable member at rest if I tell him that the people I have consulted on this matter come under the following categories: accounting and finance, engineering, law, industrialist, Public Service, and industrial relations. These people are keen to see that the abattoir is put on a correct footing, as is provided for in the Bill. Surely that should satisfy the honourable member.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (7)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, E. K. Russack, and C. R. Story (teller).

Noes (9)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, T. M. Casey (teller), M. B. Cameron, R. A. Geddes, C. M. Hill, F. J. Potter, A. J. Shard, V. G. Springett, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause passed.

Clause 9—"Term of office."

The Hon. C. R. STORY: "Corporation" appears in this clause, whereas the Committee has substituted "trust" previously. I have twice asked the Minister to get a clean print of the Bill so that honourable members will not be floundering around for the rest of the week. If this were done, it would save the Committee and the Minister much heartburn.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You can move your amendments if you want to.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: "Corporation" appears in several of the clauses that have been passed. If "trust" has been carried previously, there is no alternative but to recommit the Bill.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): The Government is not willing to accept "trust". It is the Government's intention to recommit the Bill and reconsider "trust".

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 2231.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said:

It is of fundamental importance to the welfare of this State that good industrial relations be maintained between employer and employee, and the Government considers that this can best be achieved by the maintenance of a system of conciliation and arbitration. It is suggested that one of the reasons why our system of conciliation and arbitration has at times failed to live up to its expectations is that, in the past, too much reliance has been placed on arbitration and too little on conciliation.

We know that this thesis is dearly loved by the Labor Party, but I sincerely doubt its truth. Too frequently, attempts to reach conciliation have occupied an extraordinary amount of time, newspaper space, argument, irrational behaviour by one or both parties to the dispute, considerable loss to the public, and frequently near bankruptcy to the owners of the business involved, such as the Kangaroo Island farmers. Conciliation in the form we are contemplating here is to the taste of the bully or the pressure group. As honourable members know, interminable argument so often gives to the undeserving advantages which they would not have received in the cold light of rational judgment.

One of the faults of the present conciliation and arbitration system is that it is cumbersome and it takes so long to grind its way through its numerous steps to reach a satisfactory conclusion to the dispute. Meanwhile, as I have said, the public suffers, the workmen lose their pay, lawyers and union officials thrive, and business men fear for their survival. I believe that it is a fundamental truth that well-defined laws, strictly and quickly applied, make for more disciplined behaviour by all parties and for the least disruption of our social welfare. Therefore, I am strongly in favour of judicial arbitration, easily obtained and quickly applied.

I now refer to clause 29 (1) (c), under which power is to be given to the commission to introduce matters such as preference in employment for unionists, insisting, in fact, not just upon preference when other things are equal but on outright preference irrespective of circumstances. I point out first that Australians generally have always stood out against compulsory unionism. We in Australia have a wide range of unions, most of which function effectively and in the interests of employees. In virtually every industry or craft there already exist sufficiently effective unions for the welfare of our people.

Compulsory unionism is little more than a method of forcing a compulsory levy upon every employee in order to swell union funds at a cost to private citizens who would otherwise exercise their freedom of choice and their right as citizens to live in Australia without being bound by rules made by any semi-political organization and pressure groups outside of their control with whom they do not wish to be associated. Furthermore, this part of the Bill envisages the compulsion of an employer to employ unionists, but it does not envisage giving to employees an inalienable right to belong to any union of their choice.

We find here the peculiar situation proposed in which a man might not be allowed to work unless he was a unionist without any law or rule being envisaged to prevent the unions denying a man the right to be a unionist. One cannot make universal requirements for workmen unless one balances that by giving them universal rights. Before unions can be given special rights of employment for their members, Parliament must pass laws as to the rights of the public and employees in respect of unions, their laws, rules of management, and ballots. It is not simply the right of free selection by the employers in question: it is the right of the freedom of choice by individual employees. It is a matter even, as honourable members will have discovered, of religious doctrine in some spheres—that the individual shall not be coerced.

I find it impossible to support any Bill that leaves the door open to the introduction of compulsory unionism under the Trades Hall concept of what compulsory unionism means, whether the introduction should be by regulation or by order of the court. Moreover, sub-clause (d) of clause 29 (1) is too wide in its implications. What it proposes is the possibility of too much inquisition by union employees into matters within the sphere of the rights of private employers.

I turn now to clause 37, which gives the Governor power to declare by proclamation living wages of various types in the State, subject only to the Minister's agreement and the President's recommendation—in other words, the right to fix the State's living wage in various categories without any preliminary requirement of the court, commission or arbitration hearing of the rights or wrongs of the proposal, or any court ruling; or, looked at from a different angle, the Government, together with its Minister, or the Government, based on its own opinion and subject only to the opinion of the President whom it has itself appointed, may arbitrarily fix the basis of the State's wage structure, an action against which there would appear to be no right of appeal, and the general operation of which would be undesirable and, in my opinion, improper.

Clause 78 makes pleasant reading, in that the Government has provided for the commission to award equal pay to men and women for work of a similar nature and value. This, of course, has my approval and will be acclaimed by the women of South Australia.

Clause 83 is apparently supposed to refer to the possibility of the commission's making special rules in relation to what is generally conveyed by the term "mechanization". It provides as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act the commission or a committee may, upon an appropriate application to it, insert in an award, whether by variation of an existing award or in a new award, provisions relating to the following matters:

- (a) the obligations, duties and responsibilities of any employer upon the introduction or proposed introduction of mechanization or other technological changes in the industry in relation to which he is an employer;

The person who drew up this Bill seems to have imagined that mechanization is something that happens suddenly and at a point in time or with a major change in an industry or factory. The truth is, of course, that mechanization is normally a creeping thing which comes in step by step with a new machine here, a new control there, or a simplification somewhere else. There is no specific time when it arrives: there is no industry that is without some change in respect of mechanization.

Therefore, if clause 83 means anything, it means that, subject to the commission's decision, the hamstringing requirement of this

provision may perhaps be applied to all industries. Therefore, on the grounds that the concept under which it was drafted seems to be a complete misunderstanding of the situation, and that this concept would produce an infinity of borderline cases, interminable arguments and general dissatisfaction, I believe that, considering the power of the commission under other headings, clause 83 should be deleted completely.

I turn now to clause 145. I am horrified that a responsible Government could contemplate the introduction of a provision like this into what purports to be a Bill for the future welfare of the people of this State. The clause proposes among other things that where an association or a member of an association performs an act "in contemplation or furtherance of an industrial dispute", it or he shall not be subject to the normal process of law, irrespective of what damage its or his action may do to the welfare of some other party, save only in the case of personal or property injury.

There are laws of the land that must be obeyed in all circumstances and by all members of the community. There are rights for recovery of damages that are, or at least should be, open equally to all members of the community. I am appalled to discover that men who claim to be responsible legislators could contemplate a Bill of this type which, if it became law, could only incite the irresponsible to the furtherance of mob action and disregard of law and order. I am appalled that they can accept as normal the rights of some to damage the livelihood of others, while being cleared of all legal responsibility themselves. It goes really without saying that it is quite impossible for any responsible and honourable legislator to accept such a position.

Clauses 148, 149 and 150 refer to illegal strikes. Clause 148, which defines "illegal strikes", appears to be in some degree rational. Clause 149 prescribes the penalty that may be imposed on those people taking part in or aiding or abetting illegal strikes. Clause 150 then proceeds to define the circumstances in which the penalty may be imposed. To begin with, proceedings may be taken in those matters only by leave of the court, but clause 150 then proceeds to provide a series of circumstances that must be fulfilled before the matter of penalty can be considered. This would suggest that penalties will rarely, if ever, be applicable.

In view of the great number of shortcomings and injustices revealed in this Bill since the

debate began, I would hope that the Government would withdraw it and send it back to its advisers to review its contents and produce something more sensibly in accord with twentieth century thinking on social problems.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION COUNCIL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 18. Page 2168.)

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON (Southern): I do not wish to speak at any length on this Bill. I have examined the report produced by the committee set up by the previous Government. It is a comprehensive and long report which (as any honourable member who has studied it realizes) it has been impossible to consider fully in the time available since it was produced. It is a report that is a blueprint for the future; also, it indicates some changes that will be made for the present.

Clearly running through the report is the thought that probably one of the greatest things detrimental to our present environment is the motor car. Our greatest pollutant at the moment is probably the motor car. It is costing the community huge amounts of money not only in pollution but in lives lost. Pollution is the most important thing covered by this Bill, which sets up a council that will be able to act in relation to environmental control, including the effects of the motor vehicle on the community at large. The council to be set up will perhaps be a little too overloaded with members of the Public Service. It is necessary for people independent of Government in all ways to be involved in such a council. I should have liked to see it composed entirely of people outside the Public Service, except perhaps for the Chairman. However, that is a matter that will be raised during the Committee stage.

We have in Australia a community that so far has not acted detrimentally to the environment to an irreversible degree. However, we need to take action now before people behave detrimentally to our environment in greater measure. I live in a community in the southern part of the State where already a lake has been ruined (at least for the time being) by the actions of this Parliament and of people in industry. Action is now being taken in respect of that lake but it is unfortunate that it was not taken earlier, for it would have prevented the pollution that has already occurred. I refer, of course, to Lake Bonney.

However, some action has been taken to restore it; so far the action is not sufficient, but at least it has been taken. Lake Bonney is not the only area in the southern part of the State that has suffered from lack of control of the environment. There is also the Coorong.

There is great need for an investigation of that stretch of water to see just what is happening and what can be done to control it, and at certain times of the year to bring it to a level acceptable not only to the local community but also to the travelling public. It is a beautiful stretch of water, but in the summer it is difficult to take travellers along that part of the coast, which is an important part of our tourist attractions. It is important that we look at it carefully to see whether any action can be taken either to remedy anything detrimental that has happened to the Coorong or to improve it and bring it to an acceptable state at all times of the year.

The drainage works carried out in the South-East have been detrimental to the Coorong; the waters that flow into it from the southern end are no longer fresh. I believe that the opening of the barrage at Goolwa has a drastic effect on the Coorong and on the amount of fresh sea water that flows into it. Certainly no fish can enter because, if the waters going over the barrage at Goolwa are too great, the fish cannot enter the Coorong against the pressure of those waters; and that detrimentally affects the fishing industry on the Coorong.

That is a matter in respect of which only the Government can act. Already an investigation is being made of, and a report prepared on, Lake Bonney. I hope the investigation will be extended to include the Coorong as soon as possible before that body of water is further affected detrimentally. The Bill is wide and no doubt legislation will flow from this environmental council in the future. It will play an important part in the legislation of this State because clearly we are growing as a community and, as we grow, we tend to destroy our environment. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from October 19. Page 2233.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I support the second reading of this Bill. As the Chief Secretary said, it was part of our policy speech when we went to the

people at the last election, so we have a clear mandate for this Bill. I am amazed at what the Hon. Mr. Potter said in his speech on this Bill:

I never cease to be amazed when this Government seeks to carry out its promises which were given in a policy speech, because when it embarks on this kind of exercise it does not do things by halves.

I cannot understand why the honourable member should be amazed because this Government carried out its promises. He is a member of a Party which made many promises before election but which made no attempt to put them into practice. I can understand to a degree why he is against putting such promises into practice and for the failure of his Government to do so. Our record is very good: between 1965 and 1968 we put into practice 98 per cent of the promises we made in 1965, before we were elected; the other 2 per cent were defeated by the Opposition. Our record is equally as good this time: we have put into practice 95 per cent of the promises we made at the last election. I cannot understand why the Hon. Mr. Potter should be amazed that we seek to carry out our promises. He should not be amazed at a Labor Government carrying out its promises, unlike some other Governments that do not carry out some of their promises.

I was also amazed when the Hon. Mr. Potter spoke against the principle of long service leave for a part-time worker who works less than 20 hours a week. He said he did not think that such a person should receive long service leave. He said:

Although I am in favour of long service leave, I consider it ridiculous to approach the matter in this way.

What is the difference between the principle of a full-time worker and a part-time worker who does only 20 hours, and a worker who might do only 10 hours work a week? A person who works regularly for eight hours or 10 hours a week should be entitled to pro rata long service leave. Because an employee who works only 10 hours a week may become entitled to long service leave after seven years, it does not mean that he must get 13 weeks leave, as though he worked 40 hours a week. He gets it pro rata.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: I never said he didn't.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Hon. Mr. Potter said there was a difference between a man who gives good service on a 40-hour basis and one who gives good service on a

five-hour basis. He gets paid the same proportion for the time he works. If a person works for a housewife for 10 or 15 years, starting every morning at 6 o'clock, and working three or four hours, she is entitled to long service leave the same as everyone else. I am glad to see that the Bill removes the provision in the Act whereby pro rata leave will be granted after seven years without making it necessary for at least five years to be served as an adult. A lad who commences work at 17 years of age gives good service to his employer, and from the date of his commencement of work he should be credited with long service leave. I am glad to see that the Government has taken action in that respect. The Hon. Mr. Potter also said:

Indeed, there is further retrospectivity in the Act allowing claims to be brought within three years. This means that anyone who has been employed on a part-time basis and whose contract of employment ceased up to three years ago can return to the employer and say, "I want long service leave. Three years ago, I completed seven years service with you, and I am now entitled to long service leave under the terms of this Bill." This is a ridiculous situation.

I think the claim made by the Hon. Mr. Potter was ridiculous. Clause 5 (8) provides:

In the case of a worker who commenced service with an employer before the first day of January, 1972 and, after the commencement of the Long Service Leave Act Amendment Act, 1972, completes a period of not less than ten years' service with the employer or whose service having commenced as aforesaid is terminated after the commencement of that Act and after the worker has completed at least seven years' service . . .

Surely this means that a person in those circumstances has no claim for retrospectivity until the Act has been proclaimed.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: My remarks were about part-time employees. I wasn't talking about anyone else.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member did not say that.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Most of my speech dealt with part-time employees.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It does not matter whether they are part-time employees: the fact remains that, if they cease work before the 1972 Act is proclaimed, they have no claim for long service leave.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: That's debatable.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is why we have lawyers, and thank goodness we have judges to adjudicate, because lawyers can always put up a good story.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They haven't found the one-armed one yet.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, but there are plenty of two-armed bandits about. Although it might be debatable, the Bill was not drawn up with that intention. The Hon. Mr. Potter appears to differ from a number of people who have had legal training.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: I'm steadily convincing a few people.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No. The honourable member is not convincing us. We knew we were right in our own minds, because we went to lawyers and obtained good legal advice.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: What's your story?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I, together with many lawyers, disagree with the argument of the Hon. Mr. Potter, who said that, regarding retrospectivity for those part-time employees who cease work prior to the proclamation of the Act, they are not entitled to a claim under this legislation. Such a person may have a claim under the present Act, but it does not bring him under the provisions of this Bill. The Government's intention is contained in the Bill. The only other matter is the cost involved. The Hon. Mr. Potter did not give any figures, but he said he believed that the cost would be exorbitant. It is estimated that the increase in entitlement under the Bill will be about one-third of 1 per cent, and that is not very much.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: One-third of 1 per cent of what?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will tell the honourable member how it has been arrived at. There are about 408,000 wage and salary earners in South Australia, of whom 110,000 are employed by the Commonwealth Government and the State Government, to which the Long Service Leave Act does not apply. About 298,000 are employed in private industry. I believe that 26 Commonwealth awards applying in South Australia contain long service leave provisions; such awards cover the vehicle industry, the metal trades, graphic arts, etc.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: You are talking about full-time employees. How many will you add to that work force in connection with part-time employees?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They are still employees, whether they are part-time or full-time. Let us take the case of someone who over a 10-year period works for an employer for only one hour a week. At the end of the 10-year period that employee becomes entitled to an extra 13 hours pay.

If his rate of pay is \$2 an hour, he would receive \$26 after 10 years service. Surely the honourable member will not tell me that a person who employs a housekeeper for an hour a week is not able to meet that commitment, which is at the rate of \$2.6 a year, or less than 10c a week. Does the honourable member agree with that?

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Yes—

The PRESIDENT: I suggest that the Hon. Mr. Banfield address the Chair, rather than conduct a dialogue with one honourable member.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I appreciate that, Mr. President, and I hope you will appreciate the argument I am advancing.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member looks this way, I shall be able to appreciate what he is talking about.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Is the sum that I have referred to astronomical? Of course it is not. So, I think the Hon. Mr. Potter was drawing a red herring across the trail when he suggested that the cost would be astronomical. All in all, I believe that this Bill is pretty good. For many years the public servants of this State have had long service leave after 10 years service. So, why should other workers in this State be treated differently in this respect? Public servants do not give any better service than an ordinary employee gives to his employer. There is no reason why the ordinary employee should not be brought into line. I therefore support the Bill.

The Hon. E. K. RUSSACK secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN ADELAIDE ROAD WIDENING PLAN BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 2235.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): Last Thursday, when I sought leave to conclude my remarks, I dwelt for some time on clause 6, which is the only clause about which I have any serious questions. I said that it was proper for the Local Government Association to be consulted about this clause, because in many ways it affected local government generally. When I talked with the Secretary of the Local Government Association, he referred me to another officer, with whom I have had consultations this morning. As a result, I have spoken to the Parliamentary Counsel and an amendment is being prepared that will improve the Bill. Last Thursday I said that I regretted that the proposal had not come to the Council as an amendment to the Highways Act, and I asked that the Minister explain that point. The balance of the Bill has my support.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ARBITRATION)

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.53 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 25, at 2.15 p.m.