LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 8 August 1978

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The PRESIDENT: I remind the Council that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive the President and honourable members at 2.30 this afternoon for the presentation of the Address in Reply. I therefore ask all honourable members to accompany me now to Government House.

[Sitting suspended from 2.17 to 2.59 p.m.]

The PRESIDENT: I have to inform the Council that, accompanied by the mover, seconder and other honourable members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Opening Speech adopted by this Council, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

> I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the second session of the Forty-Third Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

QUESTIONS

ALFALFA APHID

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Agriculture about alfalfa aphid in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think it fair to say there has been a lack of success in the biological control of alfalfa aphid, even though I believe every possible endeavour has been made to find a way of using this type of control. Secondly, I believe that certain varieties of lucerne (two in particular, I think) have been introduced to South Australia that have a resistance to alfalfa aphid. What we require in this State fairly quickly are improved varieties of lucerne which are capable of resisting alfalfa aphid attacks and which can stand being grazed. I understand these varieties are available, particularly from the United States.

First, has the Minister taken any action to ensure that the quarantine requirements are relaxed to allow the urgent introduction into South Australia from overseas of varieties of lucerne that are capable of resisting alfalfa aphid? Secondly, does the Minister agree that, if we are to resuscitate a $20 000 000 industry in our lucerne growing areas of the State, it is necessary to be able to propagate sufficient seed this year to ensure resowing of vast areas of lucerne-growing country in South Australia?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The first thing I should like to say is that I do not believe that the biological control programme has failed in South Australia. We have put a considerable amount of effort into the propagation and distribution of the trioxys wasp, which is parasitic on the spotted alfalfa aphid, and we are currently in the process of distributing a further wasp that will parasitise that aphid. Last year, the only area which had a sufficient period of parasite release to be able to give an idea of how successful the programme can be was the Virginia area, and we were extremely pleased with the rate of parasitisation of the spotted alfalfa aphid and with the degree of control. Towards the end of the summer at Virginia the levels of spotted alfalfa aphid were very low, and the growth of lucerne without spraying was good, so I do not agree with the honourable member that the biological control programme has failed. We cannot yet say whether it will be completely successful: that can be judged only during this coming growing season. However, I think that the indications are that it will have a very significant effect on reducing aphid numbers in this State.

So far we have allowed the introduction of considerable quantities of seed that is resistant to both the spotted alfalfa aphid and the blue green aphid, the varieties that fulfil this characteristic being C.U.F. 101, introduced last year, and W.L. 514, which will be introduced this season.

We do not see the need to relax our quarantine regulations unduly for other varieties that do not have a proven record of resistance to both these aphids. We are willing to take a more lenient view with these two varieties, and any other varieties that can be shown to have such dual resistance. We do not believe it is worth putting the lucerne industry at risk for the introduction of other varieties that do not have the proven resistance to both of the aphids.

The other problem that we find is that most of the resistant varieties are being bred in the United States, where the grazing of lucerne is not common and where the lucernes are normally used only for hay production. We are not confident that in South Australian conditions, especially in the Upper South-East, they will survive under grazing.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Has enough been imported to allow for propagation and resowing this year?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: We cannot in any circumstances allow that, because the risks are too great. The decisions before us are to introduce some hundreds of pounds (not thousands of pounds), which is a considerable risk, because there are about 30 to 35 other diseases that can be introduced in large quantities of seed, or we can introduce small quantities, the normal method of introducing lucerne seed. The normal method is to introduce a small quantity of seed, grow it for the first year in a quarantine glass house, and then release it. We have with C.U.F. 101 and W.L. 514, allowed some hundreds of pounds into the State for sowing of a larger acreage for eventual seed production. To allow the introduction of tonnes of seed would be a risk certainly not worth taking.

The relaxation of the quarantine is only to the extent that we can allow some hundreds of pounds to be imported for seed production. As I stated earlier, that risk has to be measured against the other diseases that can be introduced. In that context interstate some diseases with C.U.F. 101, which has been introduced from the United States, have already been found, and these diseases never existed in Australia before; they were introduced with that seed. A real risk is involved; it is not something being put up to make things difficult. In South Australia we have had an excellent track record of co-operation with the seed industry regarding the introduction of new varieties, and we will continue to co-operate. However, we are not willing to put the whole industry at risk from new diseases as well as the considerable pests we have at present. We are not prepared to do that for varieties that have not the proven resistance against the aphids that are causing the present problem.

DRUGS

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief statement prior to addressing a question to the Minister of Health concerning drugs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: When I was recently in the United States I had the good fortune to spend some time with Jim Kenney, Management and Treatment Supervisor, Drug Services Programme, Portland, Oregon. Mr. Kenney has a Masters degree in Counselling Services from Washington, D.C., and was involved in the programme with Dr. DuPont in Washington through the late 1960's and the early 1970's, at the time of what was known as the heroin epidemic, when the number of addicts soared spectacularly and alarmingly.

To give honourable members some idea of the magnitude of the problem, between 1969 and 1972 when he was in Washington, some 15 000 addicts were treated in the programme. Since then, Mr. Kenney has been involved in the treatment of many more thousands of people. Also, to give some idea of the magnitude of the problem in the United States and in Europe, I was told quite reliably that in Portland, which is a relatively small city with a population of 380 000, a low estimate of the number of heroin addicts was 3 000, and a high estimate was 5 000, which is 1 per cent of the total population, or about 4 per cent of the most susceptible proportion of the population.

These figures are reasonably favourable when compared to the position in Washington, D.C., where the low estimate of addicts was 40 000, and the high estimate 60 000, in a population of 3 000 000. So that almost 2 per cent of the total population in Washington, D.C., or about 8 per cent of the population in the age group generally considered to be most susceptible or at risk, is estimated to be heroin addicts. In Sweden, there are 35 000 estimated addicts, which is about ½ per cent of the population, or approximately 2 per cent of the susceptible age group.

It was very interesting to talk to Jim Kenney, who has probably had as much experience in this field as almost anyone in the world. He postulates a causal relationship between cannabis and heroin use, but for vastly different reasons from those usually postulated. During the time he was in the Washington programme he was seeing people addicted to heroin, who had been the "flower children" of the 1960's. They had been told by their elders, and so-called betters, that the use of cannabis and the use of some of the milder hallucinogens was wrong in all circumstances, and that they had all sorts of dire and harmful effects, just as they had been told throughout their lifetime that they should not touch a hot radiator because it would burn their hand, and so on.

The PRESIDENT: I am finding the honourable member's explanation extremely interesting, but I would like him to get to the point.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I am coming to the point, Sir. The fact is that throughout their lives they had been told that if they did these things certain consequences would follow. They were told that if they did smoke pot—use cannabis—certain dire consequences would follow, and, in fact, for the first time in their lives, those consequences did not follow. Consequently, they were disinclined to believe the drug education programmes when they were told there of the dire consequences of heroin.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That also applies to tobacco.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: To some extent, but I hardly think it is an appropriate analogy. The other interesting statistic is the very close relationship between heroin addiction and crimes against property—theft and armed robbery.

Can the Minister say, first, whether any statistics are available for crimes (violent or otherwise) against property, related to heroin addiction in South Australia? Secondly, are the Health and Education Departments satisfied with the emphasis of their current drug education programme, and its accuracy? Thirdly, has the Government considered bringing witnesses, with the vast experience of people such as Jim Kenney, to South Australia to give evidence to or assist the Royal Commission into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I appreciate the honourable member's concern in relation to this matter. I will try to get answers to his questions and bring them back to the Council.

FISHING LICENCES

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Fisheries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Information has been given to me to the effect that 259 fishermen were written to on 31 May 1978 and told that they did not qualify for the reissue of fishing licences, both A and B class, but mainly B class. They were invited to show cause why their licences should be renewed in accordance with an interpretation of section 30 of the relevant Act. I understand, too, that about 30 of these people have been relicensed because they clearly did not fall into that category of scrutiny. I have been informed that, of the balance, about 22 people, mainly from Port Augusta, have been told that they can continue fishing until their cases are heard and determined. It is understood in the fishing industry that this process will take some months. At the same time, the others concerned are denied the right to fish in the interim period. Can the Minister say whether what I have said is correct and, if it is, can he say why he has instructed his department or his fisheries inspectors to allow certain persons to continue fishing and selling their catch while applications for B class licences are under review? What are the names and addresses and second occupations of that group? If my information is correct, did the Minister receive any representations or requests from the local House of Assembly member whose electoral district includes Port Augusta to give special privileges to that group of about 22 people who are continuing to carry out those activities?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The honourable member seems to have picked up a number of unsubstantiated rumours. The only correct information in his question is that 259 "show cause" notices were sent out. I cannot state the exact number of licences that have been reissued to date, but it is considerably more than 30. The Licensing Branch of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department has been taking those that are obviously cases for reissue, and it has been reissuing those. The ones that are obviously cases where there should not be any reissue have not been reissued. The ones that are pending have not been decided, and those people have been allowed to continue fishing until their cases are decided. Some of them are in Port Augusta, and others are in other fishing ports. There is certainly no truth in the honourable member's accusation that somehow Port Augusta people, through representations by the local House of Assembly member, are receiving any different consideration from that received by people in any other fishing port or any other part of South Australia. In relation to some of the

"show cause" notices, the information given is incomplete or there has not been an opportunity yet for departmental officers to assess those cases completely. Those people are in the pending category, and they have been allowed to continue fishing until their cases have been decided.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Did I understand the Minister to say in his reply that all those who were previously B class licensees, who have received "show cause" notices, and who have not yet had their licences reissued are permitted to carry on their activities? Or, is only one group of that number so permitted?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: No; I did not say that. If the honourable member had listened, he would have heard me say that some applications for licences have been refused. Those applicants are certainly not allowed to continue fishing. There are three groups. Some licences have been reissued; some have been refused; and some are pending. Applicants in the pending category are permitted to continue fishing until a decision has been made on their cases.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Are all of those in the pending category being given the opportunity to continue their activities?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The situation is quite plain. People in the pending category, whether they be in Port Augusta or in any other place, have been given the same opportunities.

SPORTS LOTTERY

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport about sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I understand that all members of Parliament have received a letter from Mr. W. V. Reid, the President of the Confederation of Australian Sport, seeking their support for a national lottery for Australian sporting purposes. I also understand that the Government has been approached in this regard. Does the Government favour supporting the concept of a national lottery for sporting purposes and, if it does, will it operate a lottery singly within South Australia or in conjunction with a national lottery in other States?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: This matter has come to my attention. I understand that the Premier has received a letter in the same vein. Until I have discussions with the Premier, the matter is in limbo. I hope shortly to find out what the situation is. When something definite is decided I will inform the honourable member.

RURAL WORKERS

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about rural workers?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Minister of Labour and Industry has advised me that information received from the National Training Branch of the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations indicates that the Federal scheme that the honourable member referred to is obviously the Special Youth Employment Training Programme (SYETP) under which a farmer can employ a farmhand and receive a subsidy of $67 a week for six months whilst being trained. A condition of payment of the subsidy is that the farmhand must be paid the award rate. If a country employment office receives a complaint that a farmhand is not being paid the award rate, the local employment officer will interview the farmer and advise him that if the award rate is not paid subsidy will be withdrawn and past payments recovered. The National Training Branch could not recall any specific complaints being made by farmhands claiming they were not receiving the award rate. No complaints of this nature have been made to the Department of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I thank the Minister for his reply, and I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a further question on this matter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Of course, it is difficult for a complaint to be made against a farmer where the employee has been grossly imposed upon by that farmer. The farmer may have abused the employee's trust in the whole scheme. It is difficult to complain if the youth so abused is not willing to co-operate. Consequently, I wish to ask a further question.

Even in the case where there are complaints, is there any likelihood of such an employer being prosecuted in the event of a complaint being sustained against a farmer employing such a youth within the terms of the Special Youth Employment Training Programme? Secondly, to what extent, after six months training has been given by such employers, are the youths regarded within the pastoral industry as being competent to be employed in that industry? What knowledge is there of shearing or any other pursuits in that industry?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will get a reply for the honourable member.

ANGLE VALE ROAD

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On 13 July I asked a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport, about the portion of Angle Vale Road between the Gawler by-pass and Heaslip Road. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: My colleague states that, in 1970, the sealed portion of Gawler-Two Wells Main Road 409 was taken over for maintenance by the Highways Department following construction and sealing with departmental funds. The road is in the District Council of Light's area and is outside the Adelaide statistical boundary. Such roads are maintained by the Highways Department due to the difficulty experienced by rural councils in being able to allocate the necessary resources to adequately maintain the road to the standard to which it was constructed (the District Council of Light's rate revenue in 1977-78 was $273 907).

On the other hand, Heaslip Road (Angle Vale to Bolivar Main Road 410) is in the District Council of Munno Para's area and is within the Adelaide statistical boundary. Munno Para's rate revenue in 1977-78 was $1 300 000, which is higher than a number of other metropolitan councils and it is considered that maintenance of Heaslip Road is not beyond the resources of Munno Para. In addition, within the Adelaide statistical boundary, the Highways Department would not expect to maintain roads with traffic volumes of less than 10 000 vehicles a day, some three to four times the volume carried by Heaslip Road. The Highways Department has carried out traffic counts on Heaslip Road and is aware of the proportion of heavy vehicles using this road. No good purpose can thus be seen in carrying out further traffic counts. There is no justification for the Highways Department to assume responsibility for the maintenance of Heaslip Road at the present time. The limited availability of funds also precludes the Highways Department from assisting metropolitan councils in meeting their maintenance obligations on roads for which they are responsible. The Highways Department wholly

financed the reconstruction of Heaslip Road to its present standard and the provision of funds for further reconstruction of this road will depend on the priority of the work and the level of funds available.

CHEESE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that cheese producers in the South-East are very concerned about their future under the proposed selective underwriting scheme for the dairy industry? Can the Minister say whether at the Agricultural Council meeting yesterday in Sydney he was able to obtain any information that might reassure cheese manufacturers in this State?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Cheese manufacturers in this State have been very concerned about the selective underwriting proposals because, as they have been publicised so far, it seemed that, since there was no restraint on cheese production, many manufacturers throughout Australia might enter into cheese manufacturing and thereby create a surplus; they would not be entering into the manufacture of cheese for commercial reasons but rather they would do so to be in a position to get a good underwriting quota if it proved necessary later. I took up this matter with the Federal Minister for Primary Industry, during the short period that he was at the Agricultural Council meeting yesterday.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Does he go to them?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: He was not able to come in the afternoon; there was a Cabinet meeting.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What was that about?

The Hon. B. A CHATTERTON: I think the results of that meeting have been publicised in the press.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Is that when they sacked the Leader of the Government in the Senate?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I think it must have been that. The Minister assured me that, if in the future it was necessary to introduce quotas on cheese manufacturing, the traditional producers would be safeguarded and the base period to be used for any calculation of quotas would be the base period before the selective underwriting scheme was introduced. I think that assurance will be of great benefit to the industry, and I hope that it will be more widely publicised so that the present uncertainty in the industry about the selective underwriting proposals will disappear, because there is uncertainty at the moment. Many people are unsure how the scheme actually will work, and there are other things that are causing uncertainty. The sooner this information is made available to the industry, the sooner people will know exactly where they stand.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before directing a question to the Minister of Health concerning the constitution of hospital board management.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: When this Council debated the establishment of the Health Commission, one of the greatest and strongest planks that the Government submitted for this change in hospital and health administration was that the new hospital boards were to be so constituted as to provide independence and autonomy to the local boards in the various areas of the State in which hospitals are situated. An article in the Whyalla newspaper of 28 July expressed strong criticism from the local council of what it claimed to be the Minister's change of policy in regard to the constitution of these boards. In a footnote within that article, that newspaper states:

> In the original draft constitution for the hospital—

that refers to the hospital at Whyalla—

> there was a clause providing that five general community repesentatives should be elected to the board at an annual general meeting. Those eligible to attend and vote at the annual meeting would have been all normally-qualified electors living in the hospital district. This would have given ordinary people the opportunity to stand for election to the board. However, this clause has been deleted from the proposed constitution, and the clause giving the Minister power to appoint the five community representatives replaces it. Similar clauses in draft constitutions for other hospitals in the State have also been amended to give the Minister power to make the board appointments.

Eleven persons were to be appointed to the board of management of Whyalla Hospital. Under this new arrangement, the Minister was to appoint five of those 11, and the other six were to be representative of the following groups within the city: the city council, the Community Health Services Committee; the Combined Unions Council; the Chamber of Commerce, the medical staff society; and the non-medical staff. It is apparent from that list that at least one supporter of the Minister would come from those representatives—the Combined Unions Council representative. This would ensure the Minister's control of the hospital board. The protests that were mentioned at the council meeting were reported in the newspaper. One councillor, who was, incidentally, supported by the mayor, is reported to have said:

> We see too much of Ministers having too much power. I see no reason why the Minister should be permitted to appoint five members of the board. Surely the local people are better able to select and elect the people they want on the board.

Has the Minister changed his policy so that the autonomy and the independence promised will no longer rest with the boards? What is his explanation about this affair, applying not only to Whyalla but also to other hospital boards of management in the State? Has he any further explanation about those arrangements?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There has been no change in policy so far as the Government is concerned. It has been pointed out previously that the suitability and competence of people selected for boards were the criteria used in the appointment of board members, and members would be selected so that representation on boards would be as wide as possible. True, the local council in Whyalla has put on a turn because it is not having a say as to who will be appointed.

However, in discussions with various people in Whyalla, the consensus was that the people of Whyalla did not want local government to have the sole say as to who would be appointed to the board. I assure the honourable member that, when the board is finally established, he will be satisfied with the calibre, competence and suitability of board members. He will have no reason to complain about the personnel.

Does the honourable member believe I should bow to the dictates of local government there? I will not do that. There should be on the board people from education, and business and there should be representatives of employer and employee organisations. If we can obtain such a wide spectrum of knowledge and experience among board members, the board and the hospital will be much better served.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask a supplementary question concerning the reply that the Minister has just given and

the explanation that I gave to my question. Will the Minister say whether in his opinion these boards will have the autonomy and independence that were promised, or whether he agrees that under the new arrangements he, as Minister, will have control of such boards?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will not have control of any boards.

CONVENTION CENTRE

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport concerning a convention centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: There has been recent press publicity about a site in Adelaide for a convention centre. It has been suggested that such a centre could be established at the railway station, using the facilities of the festival centre as well, as was the case with the conference of travel agents held in Adelaide last week. The reason behind the suggestion is that the convention centre would be well situated, being near the centre of the city and near the centre of transport. Can the Minister say whether this recently publicised suggestion has been considered?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: As the honourable member knows, a feasibility study has been carried out on a site in Adelaide for, I think, a sports complex as well as a convention centre. That report has not yet come to fruition, although I understand that it is in the final stages of preparation. Until it is forthcoming, I cannot comment on the suggestion. Doubtless, many people have given evidence to the committee that was established, and doubtless that evidence will be considered in the report that comes forward.

SUPERANNUATION POLICIES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question concerning superannuation policies?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: A large number of Superannuation Fund trust deeds has been submitted to the Succession Duties Office in recent years to enable a decision to be made on whether benefits payable on the death of a deceased member form part of the estate of that deceased person for the purposes of the Succession Duties Act. There are many different types of superannuation fund scheme and considerable variations in the rules of the various funds. The practice of the Succession Duties Office in respect of payments made by these funds following the death of a member varies according to the particular circumstances of the case concerned.

The superannuation fund in the case referred to in the *South Eastern Times* is one of the more popular types of fund. Officers of the Succession Duties Office examined the Western Australian Supreme Court decision in that case and came to the conclusion that it would be applicable to similar cases in South Australia.

The Commissioner is required by the Succession Duties Act to assess duty in accordance with the Act and does so in the light of decisions handed down by the courts from time to time. The Act contains provisions for objection and appeal which enable any assessment issued to be examined by a legal authority. I believe this is the appropriate procedure to adopt in cases where there is a dispute about the legality of the Commissioner's assessment.

It should be noted that no succession duty is payable on property, including the proceeds of superannuation policies, passing to the surviving spouse in respect of deaths occurring on or after 1 July 1976.

Discussions have taken place with solicitors handling estates likely to be involved. An objection has been lodged in one case and is under consideration at present in accordance with section 61a (3) of the Succession Duties Act. The Law Society is aware of the interpretation that the Succession Duties Office has placed on the Western Australian decision and has been in contact with the Treasurer on that subject.

When legal opinion is received in connection with the current objection, the Government will consider the matter further in the light of that opinion.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (on notice):

1. In the past 12 months has there been a report sought from consultants or other persons in relation to the domestic staff, cleaning staff, and/or other staff of the Royal Adelaide Hospital?
2. If such report has been sought and received:
   (a) who prepared the report;
   (b) when was it received;
   (c) to which staff did it relate;
   (d) what were the recommendations of that report and what savings, if any, were estimated to be achieved if the recommendations are implemented;
   (e) have the recommendations, or any of them, been implemented;
   (f) if any of the recommendations have been implemented, which recommendations; and
   (g) if any of the recommendations have not been implemented, why not?
3. If a report has been sought but not yet received, when is it expected that it will be received?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The answer to the honourable member's question is not available. I ask that his question be placed on the Notice Paper for Tuesday 15 August.

PRESIDENT'S VOTING

The PRESIDENT: I should like to make a personal statement. I have perused the *Hansard* report of the speech made by the Minister of Health in the Address in Reply debate last Thursday, and I am disturbed that, in commenting on the voting by members on questions before the Council, he seemed to me to imply that the Chair, when called on to exercise a casting vote, exercised that vote purely on Party lines.

As a private member, I think I had a good reputation for crossing the floor and I did not always follow closely on Party lines but, as the occupant of the Chair in this Council, I assure the honourable Minister that, except where I have had a strong personal opinion, I have tried to exercise my casting vote in such a way to ensure that all avenues of debate on the question before the Chair have been exhausted. For this reason I think that the remarks by the honourable Minister tend to ascribe to the Chair motives in voting which are not correct.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I thank you for your explanation, Mr. President. However, I think that if you re-read *Hansard,* you will find that I observed that frequently (and this was in reply to the claim by members opposite that members on this side toed the Party line) members opposite also seemed to be of the one opinion and just happened to vote that way. In addition, I indicated that there were numerous times when you, Sir, gave your casting vote accordingly. That was no reflection on the Chair. You, Sir, are entitled to give your casting vote whichever way you like. On the other hand, I believe that any honourable member has the right to observe what takes place.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: He has not got a casting vote.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Well, he used his vote. I think I said that I had observed from time to time that you, Mr. President, had come down on the same side as Liberal Party members. You were entitled to do that. There was no reflection intended. If it was not a casting vote and you were exercising your right as a member of Parliament, I feel justified in pointing out how members in this place have voted. It was purely an observation in reply to matters raised by members opposite.

The PRESIDENT: I accept the honourable Minister's explanation. I point out, without taking the matter to further debate, which I have no desire to do, that at all times I will try to see that debate is continued to the fullest.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 3 August. Page 294.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I had intended at one stage to seek a further adjournment on this matter. However, I am prepared to speak at this stage and hope that the debate will be adjourned. I have not yet analysed the Bill thoroughly. I am prepared to support it at the second reading, although I may say more in Committee.

The Bill makes minor amendments to the principle established in the principal Act in, I think, December 1976, when the last amending Bill went through the Council. The principle adopted in 1976 was to enable persons found intoxicated in a public place to be taken home or to be taken to sobering-up centres, and consequent upon that principle was the abolition of the offence of public drunkenness.

Under the provisions of the principle established, only premises specifically established for the purpose of sobering-up centres could be declared sobering-up centres. This Bill amends that provision. It allows the use of other premises, perhaps such as existing police stations and voluntary agency premises, to be used as sobering-up centres. In principle, I have no objection to that change, although I reserve my right to examine the Bill, and I may speak in Committee. I see no objection to the principle, which is an expansion of the principle established in 1976, although I understand that that Act has not yet been put into operation. When the Bill is passed, the Government may apply that legislation. I support the Bill.

The Hon. C. M. HILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOIL CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 1 August. Page 158.)

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: For some quite inexplicable reasons, there are still farmers, and even members of local government, who get a mental blockage when the need for soil conservation is mentioned. For some years I was a member of the West Broughton Soil Conservation Board, and learnt at first hand the sort of resistance some farmers had to soil conservation on their own properties when the suggestion was put to them, by either officers of the Agriculture Department or members of the Soil Conservation Board, that their farm was possibly in urgent need of some form of soil conservation. They used to, and apparently still do, put up all manner of argument and resistance to the need for contour banks, pasture improvement, change in crop rotation, stabilising of sandy soil, or stock rates. They have always had another argument to put forward.

I understand that there are still people who refuse to have anything to do with the practice of soil conservation. One interesting piece of work that has occurred in recent years is the control by the construction of contour banks on the headwaters of the Pissant Creek, which flows into Gladstone, and which used to cause serious flooding after big rains.

Over the past few years, thanks to money from the Federal Government, class 3 land (land with a certain degree of slope) has been contour banked and the headwaters of this creek have now been controlled. It is hoped that flooding of Gladstone will not happen in future. It has been an interesting exercise. Anyone who has travelled the Main North Road with any consistency in past years would have noticed that there was always topsoil over the road at certain places after heavy rain, but this year has been one of the exceptional winter heavy rain years and to date there has been no evidence of soil erosion or soil movement in this particular paddock.

I recall also the case of a young farmer in the district who had refused to have anything to do with soil erosion or soil conservation work. When the department approached him and suggested filling in all the banks and erosion gutters that had prevented the driving of a motor vehicle across his paddock, he agreed and now he boasts of what a wonderful job they have done. He is able to put this particular paddock into crop, whereas it was uncroppable, because of erosion, for about 10 or 15 years. In all, more than 7 000 hectares of class 3 land was contoured under this scheme; 75 per cent of the cost was borne by the Government, and the total cost was $32 000.

This has been an excellent public relations exercise, together with a good commonsense understanding by most property owners in the district, but some still refused to participate, even when it was suggested by the board and by the Agriculture Department that 100 per cent of their costs would be paid for.

In the past it was often necessary for the West Broughton Soil Conservation Board to construct soil conservation measures at the Government's expense as an example to the neighbouring landholders, to show the value and the need for this type of conservation. This is no longer necessary because of better education of the farmer, and the number of requests for the Agriculture Department at Jamestown to do the necessary survey work for landholders is increasing yearly. Last year 18 000 hectares was surveyed and contour banked, and already the department has over 8 000 hectares awaiting survey work this year.

There are five soil conservation districts: first, the Eastern Eyre Peninsula district, which takes in the Kimba council area, the Franklin Harbor council area, and other areas; secondly, the West Broughton district, which takes in country from north of Jamestown to the coast; thirdly, the central Yorke Peninsula district; fourthly, the Murray Mallee district; and fifthly, the Murray Plains district. In connection with these amendments to the principal Act, I hope the Minister will make some changes not only through additional soil conservation districts—

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation. If honourable members wish to discuss a matter with another honourable member, they should sit close to that honourable member, so that *Hansard* can hear the member who has the call.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Obviously, some honourable members, as well as some farmers, are reluctant to hear about soil conservation. Because some soil conservation districts are far too big, I hope the Minister will be able to subdivide them. I refer particularly to the West Broughton district, which takes in land from north of Jamestown to the coastal plains. The coastal regions are sandy plain country, and the responsible board has to be acquainted with a wide variety of work. It is responsible for water erosion of heavy soils, for contour banks, and also for the sand erosion and wind erosion on the coastal plains. I hope the coastal plains will be taken from the West Broughton district and included in a new district stretching from Port Pirie or Port Germein in the north as far as Mallala, where there are similar land characteristics.

I agree with the concept that the old method of forming soil conservation districts was cumbersome, under which three-fifths of the occupiers of a district had to agree before a proposal for forming a soil conservation district could be implemented. The proposed amendment allows the Minister and the relevant councils, or the Minister and the landholders who vote, to decide on the formation of future soil conservation districts. I query the reason for the following definition in clause 3:

> "Council" means a municipal council or a district council within the meaning of the Local Government Act, 1934-1978, and includes a body corporate that is by virtue of any Act vested with the powers of a municipal or district council:;

What is the purpose of having "includes a body corporate" in the definition? I hope the Minister will give me a considered reply in due course. Will this mean that the Aboriginal Lands Trust could be included within the meaning of the Act? Also, will this mean that the Northern Areas Land Trust or the Monarto Development Commission could come within the meaning of the Act? If the Northern Areas Land Trust could be brought in, one would have to think again about the type of erosion occurring in the Upper Flinders Range outside local government areas.

My other point is a realisation that under clauses 14 and 15, if a freehold landowner has an order imposed on him requiring him to preserve the vegetation on his property, these amendments allow the Minister to instruct the Registrar-General to note the order on the title of the land, so that the order is imposed not only on the existing owner but also on any future owner of that freehold land. I have no argument about that as it stands, but why does this type of order apply only to freehold land? There are many occupiers of Crown lease land, but no mention is made that a perpetuation of an order should apply to owners of Crown leases. Judging by the large number of Crown leaseholders who are complaining (and rightly so) about the ridiculous $5 administration fee that the Lands Department has imposed, there would be many Crown lease landholders who have country that has soil erosion problems. They should certainly be eligible to have their title noted in the same way as a freehold title is noted.

The fines provided for in this Bill are ridiculous. The principal Act has been operating since 1939, and its principles and those of soil conservation boards have been applied to teach the farming community about soil conservation, soil erosion, wind erosion, and water erosion. The farmer has been taught by example. In the rare instances when these provisions of the Act have had to be applied, it has been done as a last resort. Fines are being increased from $100 to $500 and from $200 to $1 000. These increases are unnecessary in this type of legislation.

The Minister can say that costs have increased five times and, therefore, the fines should be increased five times. However, this is not necessary in this type of legislation, because once a farmer is fined for failing to abide by soil conservation measures, it is the last time we will get work from him. This is one time when the Government should pay greater recognition to the purposes of the principal Act. I support the second reading.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (AGRICULTURE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 August. Page 158.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I rise to speak to this Bill, to which I have no particular objection because it is largely a formal Bill which seeks to correct matters of currency and bring legislation up to date. The Minister said that the Bill removed obsolete references to the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture from various Acts. I do not want to be hard to get on with: I could take issue with him on the word "obsolete", but I will not do so now. The Minister also said that Part II amended the Agricultural Chemicals Act; it removes the definition of "Minister". The result of this amendment is that references to the Minister in the principal Act will be interpreted in accordance with the definition contained in the Acts Interpretation Act. From memory, in that Act the Minister is defined as the Minister for the time being vested with the responsibility for that Act or such Minister as may be authorised to act in his absence. They may not be the exact words, but they constitute the general purport of the provision. This Bill seeks to do this in each of the Acts that it is designed to amend.

If we examine the Bill, we see that there are similar amendments in each case. Having already dealt with the Agricultural Chemicals Act, the Bill makes similar amendments to the Artificial Breeding Act, the Fruit Fly Act, and the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act, where there is also a correction of terminology referring to the "Returning Officer for the State"; that is struck out and the present term "Electoral Commissioner" is included. That brings the matter up to date. Also, there is a correction in regard to the use of the present currency. Similar amendments, of the type to which I first referred, are made to the Red Scale Control Act, the San Jose Scale Control Act, and the Stock Medicines Act.

However, if we look at the Swine Compensation Act, we find a slightly different amendment, when reference is made to the Swine Compensation Fund or that portion of it which is used for pig industry research. This amendment seeks to delete the passage "undertaken at any Pig Industry Research Unit, conducted by the Department of

Agriculture" and insert in lieu therof "relating to the pig industry undertaken at the direction of the Minister". That is not a nation-rocking amendment but it widens the area of control a little, and, as the Minister has said, the provision is recast more generally. Even though it is a small amendment, I have checked with the pig industry about it. I telephoned the Secretaries of both the commercial and the stud pig breeders associations and at that time, as far as they were aware, they had no indication that this amendment was to be included. Had the matter come on for debate last Thursday, I was going to seek leave of the Council to conclude my remarks to give those people time to make quite sure that they were happy with the amendment.

The debate was adjourned until today, and I have had information from Mr. Sutton in regard to this matter. He says those involved are quite satisfied with the change in the legislation, and they have since been in contact with the Minister about it and have also thanked me for bringing it to their notice. I draw attention to the fact that, although it is a small amendment, possibly these people should have been consulted and assured that there was no need to be concerned about it. However, I have had the assurance of the pig industry people that they are happy with the amendment, which relates the control of the spending of a portion of that fund a little more directly to the Minister in contrast with the previous wording of the Act. I support the second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

SEEDS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 August. Page 242.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): The Bill before us repeals the existing Agricultural Seeds Act because it has been recognised for some time that the old Act was largely an unworkable piece of legislation. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

> It [the Bill] is designed to ensure that transactions involving the sale of seed will take place on a fair and informed basis.

The production of seed has developed into a large and specialised industry in South Australia, and it is true to say that legislation has not kept pace with the development of the industry. I pay a tribute to those people in this State who over the years have made a great contribution to the development of this industry. What the Minister said next in his second reading explanation is also true, that the lack of adequate legislation has permitted a certain volume of trade in substandard seed.

I am not a slavish advocate of uniform legislation between States, yet I believe that in the seed industry in particular we should attempt to keep our legislation as close as possible to the existing legislation in other States. Therefore, we should be mindful of the legislation existing in the other States, particularly in New South Wales and Victoria. About 50 per cent of our seed production is exported either overseas or to other States. That factor alone means that we should be careful in appraising any legislation dealing with the production and sale of seeds in South Australia.

On the other hand, there is an important import trade of seeds coming into South Australia from other States and overseas. I suggest that we do not want to see a large retesting procedure for seeds coming into the State if that procedure can be satisfactorily avoided. Therefore, my first strong advocacy in relation to this Bill would be that we should not seek controls that place any inhibition on this industry, by going beyond the provisions of the existing legislation in other States.

I will now deal with the Bill clause by clause, though not necessarily in numerical order. What I have already said I should like to relate first to clause 7, which can be said to be the "truth in labelling" clause. The labelling provisions for seed in this State should follow the accepted principles that have existed so far in this State and also the accepted principles that operate in the other States. To me, clause 7 appears to be excessively wide in its application. It appears that under this clause a label will need to be fixed to every package of seeds sold in South Australia, irrespective of how large or small that parcel is.

If my interpretation is accurate, I believe the clause is much too wide in its application. If I am wrong, I hope the Minister will correct me. I draw the Minister's attention to one or two examples of practical consequences in relation to clause 7. I refer to the case of a seed merchant who is asked by a client for a 10 kilogram mixture of *phalaris tuberosa*, 10 kg of Palestine Strawberry Clover, and 50 kg of New Zealand Hawkes Bay rye grass to be premixed and forwarded to him. Looking at clause 7, I refer to the problems that the seed merchant would encounter in providing labelling for that package.

Also, what are the problems involved in bulk deliveries of seed, wheat, barley, oats, oil seed, legumes, field peas, etc.? Those problems become excessive in relation to clause 7, which deals with labelling of seed packages. Will the Minister consider the difficulties associated with horticultural seeds, floricultural seeds or vegetable seeds in relation to this provision?

To make matters even more confusing (and I know that the Hon. Mr. Blevins would be interested in this question, having made a very powerful speech on this matter when he first entered this Council, when he then offered spirited opposition to such clauses), subclause (6) contains a reverse onus and a defence provision.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: The Minister has persuaded me as to the error of my thoughts.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is the first time that the Hon. Mr. Blevins has admitted to making an error in this Council; today is a red letter day. I believe that this provision is double-edged. Not only does it contain a defence, but also the defence must satisfy two criteria. Subclause (6) provides:

> It shall be a defence to a charge under subsection (5) of this section if the defendant proves that—
>
> *(a)* the circumstances of the sale were such that he could not reasonably have expected that the seeds would be used for the purpose of the germination or propagation of plants;
>
> and
>
> *(b)* the seeds have not in fact been used for that purpose.

If we consider this as a defence clause for a person who has sold seed as bird seed, he has to prove two things before his defence is valid. The Hon. Mr. Blevins referred some time ago to a person having to prove one thing, saying that that was contrary to British justice. The honourable member would be doubly vocal if a person had to prove two things. Indeed, I will be looking forward to hearing some comment on that provision.

Clause 7 is excessively wide and will cause a tremendous amount of difficulty in the industry. Further, as at this stage we cannot say whether or not the Bill applies to wheat or barley, the only assumption we can make is that it will apply to everything, and that is the only way that this Council can look at this legislation now.

Regarding the onus of proof, I agree that on some occasions there is a need to provide a defence clause, but I doubt whether we can justify having a dual provision, or two points that must be proved before the defence can be shown to be valid. If a person sells seed for purposes other than the propagation of plants, there should be an exemption for that person and his trade. I believe there is no need to go so far as to say that any person selling seed must fall into the category of clause 7.

Clause 4 defines "seeds" as "any seeds of a species declared by regulation to be a species of seeds to which this Act applies". In other words, once the regulations state that a certain seed comes within the ambit of the Act, the Act applies to that seed irrespective of the use to which it is put. I suggest to the Minister that, if this legislation is to operate at all, seeds be defined as seeds that are bought for sowing or harvesting, or sowing and harvesting. There is little point in over-regulating an industry where seed is being taken out of a parcel of seed by cleaning, and what is cleaned out goes to either human or animal consumption, or to the birdseed trade. That would seem to be an over-regulation of the industry to a point that I believe is unreasonable.

Clause 7 goes much too far in its expression. I agree that seeds offered for sale should be tested in most cases, although not in all cases. On this question I believe that the present standards are reasonable. However, there are some difficulties if one is to apply standards to certain seeds. First, I refer to the difficulties regarding the application of germination standards to flower seeds as there is no international standard.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: That is the important difference; that is truth in labelling rather than the setting of standards.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will go back to that matter for the benefit of the Minister. Perhaps he can tell me what clause 7 (2) really means. Subclause (2) provides:

> Where the seeds are contained in a parcel, the statement must be imprinted on, or attached to, the parcel, and, in any other case, it must be given to the purchaser before delivery of the seeds to him in pursuance of sale.

Subclause (3) provides:

> The statement must contain the following information:
>
> *(a)* the species of plant from which the seeds have been obtained;
>
> *(b)* the proportion (expressed as a percentage) of the seeds that might reasonably be expected to germinate;
>
> *(c)* where the seeds are contained in a parcel, the mass of the contents of the parcel;
>
> *(d)* the proportion by mass (expressed as a percentage) of extraneous matter admixed with the seeds;
>
> *(e)* any treatment to which the seeds have been subjected; and
>
> *(f)* any other prescribed information.

Germination will be attached, but in some cases it may be misleading.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: My point was that there is not a prescribed germination, but the germination found has to be shown. It is a different principle.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That may be so. However, regarding the international flower standard, there is some difficulty.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: That is the point I am making. There may be low germination, but it does not matter under this legislation, so long as—

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: To the consumer, such a condition would be most misleading, if he found that certain flower seeds being sold had the germination marked on them as very low. This might be quite normal; in no way can that particular germination be taken above that figure. In some cases it is most misleading if that is contained on the packet. Nevertheless, I do not think that is an important question in regard to this overall point; I raise that in passing.

Clause 8 seems to me to grant to inspecting officers extremely wide powers. It provides:

> (1) An authorized officer may—
>
> *(a)* enter any place in which seeds are kept for sale; and
>
> *(b)* on tender of the ordinary market price take a sample of seeds for analysis.

In the existing regulations, under the principal Act at the present time, more stringent instructions relate to the inspector. I believe that the powers and duties of an inspecting officer in the legislation need to be more clearly defined. In many warehouses where cleaning, dressing and packaging of seeds take place, there will always be seeds that are not for sale. One of the problems the department sees is that, in many of these warehouses, it believes seeds are going out that are not up to a certain standard. When inspectors go in to check them they find the seeds are not for sale; they are cleaned out and going somewhere else. I do not know whether that takes place. If we are to have an inspector being able to go in and do what he likes, there will be a tremendous increase in cost in that cleaning establishment. The instructions to the inspecting officer are not clearly defined in the Act.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: What do you suggest?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: All I am saying is that the existing instructions in the present Act are far more stringent and spelt out more clearly than in clause 8 in this Bill. In regard to inspecting officers, we should not rely on regulations, but should spell out in the legislation exactly what their powers are in relation to these particular matters.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: The problem is the second grade seed screenings which we know are being sold and which are definitely substandard, containing weeds and other extraneous matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: There are ways of doing this without going into this particular system. There could be a licensing of warehouses where, unless they reached a certain standard, their licence was withdrawn. Regarding the establishments I am talking about, under clause 7 the required label of a bag, a pallet of bags, or a bulk bin, will often show a lot of useless detail and will be an almost impossible provision to comply with in a warehouse cleaning type of establishment. There must be a more satisfactory means of control than that envisaged in this legislation.

Clause 6 also appears to be somewhat deficient. I refer the Minister to the existing provisions in section 19 of the principal Act. In this provision the Minister may order the destruction of a parcel of seeds. Clause 6 provides:

> (1) Where the Minister is satisfied that—
>
> *(a)* any seeds are noxious seeds, or contain an admixture of noxious seeds; or
>
> *(b)* are infected or contaminated by a noxious organism,
>
> he may by instrument in writing order the destruction of the seeds in a manner specified in the order.
>
> (2) If a person to whom an order is addressed under this section fails to comply forthwith with the order he shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars.

Under the existing legislation, I think in section 19, the Minister, when noxious weeds appear in a sample, has available a range of things he can do, including the ordering of a recleaning process. I wonder whether the Minister, under this particular clause, has that power or

not. I suggest that once again the legislation should spell out more clearly what the Minister can do. One could well have a parcel of seeds worth $50 000 that could be ordered to be destroyed by the Minister, when all that is required is a recleaning to remove the noxious seeds. I realise that the clause refers to noxious organisms. This goes to another question, that of diseases in other things. In particular, lupin seed is subject to certain diseases.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: And rye grass.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. But here in the existing legislation there is a power for the Minister to order a recleaning, and that can be done. In that recleaning, the noxious seeds can be totally removed. I am suggesting that those provisions should be rewritten into this legislation. Also a decision could be made here by an inspector and a decision could then be agreed to by the Minister, and there is no appeal against that particular decision. I fully appreciate that there may be cases where the Minister would need to act very hastily in regard to the destruction of seeds when certain organisms may be present. That may well be the case but, in regard to noxious seeds, I believe there is no real hurry to destroy that particular parcel of seeds.

I suggest to the Minister that the powers here once again are very wide. I believe there is a need to have at least some method of appeal against the decision of the Minister in regard to the destruction of seeds. Perhaps the Minister has other options. I do not know but, if he does have, I believe they should be spelt out in the legislation. I do not want to be difficult with this Bill. When I started looking at it I was satisfied that a new Bill was required in South Australia, but the more I have looked at this Bill, the more concerned I have become.

As I have said the old Act is virtually unworkable. This Bill is workable, but its workability will depend entirely upon the regulations that the Minister may or may not make. I cannot, from reading this Bill, know what the Minister has in mind. Presently we could have regulations which could take this Bill to its ultimate end and which I believe would be a disaster in South Australia if all the regulatory powers were used.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Which particular powers?

The Hon. R. C DeGARIS: I started with the "truth in labelling" provision, clause 7. I come to the point of farmer to farmer sales, which I believe the Bill can catch. Will the Minister regulate, say, wheat? I do not know whether the Minister intends to include seed wheat or not. Will he include oil seeds and legume crops? I do not know. All I can do is look at the Bill in terms of what the Minister may do in regard to regulation. I believe if he regulates for all seeds that are sold irrespective of the use to which they will be put, we will have a piece of legislation that is so damaging to the industry in South Australia that the Minister will know all about it in the rural sector.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: I would not disagree with that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Sure, but what hope has Parliament of knowing what the Minister is going to do, and what hope has Parliament of knowing what a Minister may do in future? Tomorrow the present Minister of Agriculture might not be there.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Parliament can disallow the regulations.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Agreed, but then they come back on again.

The Hon. C. M Hill: As they did the other week.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Exactly, that is the point I am trying to make with this piece of legislation. It is a very difficult piece of legislation. When I first started I was quite happy with it, but the more I looked at it the more concerned I became because so much material in the old Act had been pruned out.

We are relying now on the Minister to bring down regulations that will be virtually the guts of the Bill. Actually, the regulations should spell out the fine print: they should not be the real intestines of the Bill. I therefore view this Bill with concern. I do not want to be difficult about it, but I believe at this stage that the best course is for the Bill to be referred to a Select Committee to allow all the evidence to come in and to allow Parliament to decide whether these things should be done by regulation or whether greater control measures should be written into the Bill itself. It would be unsatisfactory to pass this Bill in its present form. I know that the Minister has introduced it with the best of motives: I am not questioning his motives in any way.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: The industry has had plenty of opportunity to comment. A green paper and a white paper were released. Submissions were received from all interested parties.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I realise that, but does the industry know what is in this Bill?

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Yes, it does.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I would say that the industry is unaware of many of the ramifications to which I have referred; that is why I say that referring the Bill to a Select Committee is probably the best course. It would allow people in the industry who are greatly concerned about this type of legislation to give evidence before the Select Committee.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: The Bill has been circulated to interested parties in the seed industry and in producer organisations. Amendments will probably be moved in the Committee stage.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not doubt that the Minister has worked hand in glove with members of the industry, but I know that many people in the industry are as concerned as I am with the fact that this Bill is virtually an open cheque in connection with regulations; that is the point that concerns me and many people in the seed industry in South Australia. I would suggest that, without holding up the passage of this Bill, the Minister should consider referring it to a Select Committee, which could be very quick in its work, because only a limited number of organisations would wish to give evidence.

I am certain that, in redrafting the Bill, we could arrive at a very satisfactory piece of legislation that would be supported by all sections of the industry: those who sell seeds for sowing and also those who sell seeds for other purposes. I am not happy with the Bill as it is. Much work needs to be done on it so that greater detail is included. I am prepared to support the second reading, but I believe that the Bill should be referred to a Select Committee.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.39 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday 15 August at 2.15 p.m.