

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 21, 1971

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Aged Citizens Clubs (Subsidies) Act Amendment,
Citrus Industry Organization Act Amendment,
Housing Improvement Act Amendment,
Industries Development Act Amendment,
Second-hand Dealers Act Amendment,
South Australian Housing Trust Act Amendment.

QUESTIONS**UNIONISM**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry report to the House on his discussion with the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society about its hostile attitude and intentions towards Aresco Trak-Chief Proprietary Limited? On Tuesday, I asked the Minister a question about this matter, informing him that the society was advising people not to work at Aresco and that it intended to boycott the company as soon as a new crane bay building was completed. Although I did not tell the Minister this on that occasion as I had no opportunity to do so, the society is looking for and recommending other jobs for its members to discourage them from going to Aresco. In the course of his reply, the Minister said that he would take up the matter in the interests of industrial peace, as I had asked him to do, to make sure, I hope, that this company—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —would not be victimized in this way by a trade union.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member will realize that these people are employed under a Commonwealth award. Possibly because of this neither the company nor the union has approached me. Furthermore, the honourable member said that the union had been advising its members not to apply for work at this plant. I suppose

it is the right of any union to tell its members where better conditions prevail, and I presume that that is exactly what this union is doing.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the boycott?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he intends to do anything about the situation that has arisen between the Boilermakers and Blacksmiths Society and Aresco?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have pointed out to the honourable member that this matter is covered by a Commonwealth award and, if there are any breaches of that award, I imagine that the matter will be taken up by the appropriate Commonwealth Commissioner.

Mr. Millhouse: So the answer is "No", is it?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I think I have given the honourable member the reply.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you say straight out?

The SPEAKER: Order!

SPEED LIMITS

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider increasing the speed limits as regards stock transport and other heavy motor vehicles? Truck transport operators in my district have approached me about these speed limits with regard to the operation of the points demerit scheme. The speed limit for heavy trucks is 35 m.p.h. As the Minister knows, these vehicles are equipped with brakes to make it safe for them to be driven at speeds of up to 60 m.p.h. Also, they can be safely handled at that speed. The need to get stock and goods from one place to another as quickly as possible means that this limit should be increased. Although the points demerit system is necessary, the Minister knows that Mr. Nyland, Mr. Aylmore and Mr. Burgess, who appeared before the Select Committee that inquired into the points demerit scheme, pointed out that the scheme would inflict hardship on certain transport operators in my district and in other districts.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This question has been raised before on numerous occasions. From a quick glance at *Hansard*, I have seen a reply that I gave on August 4, at page 544, as follows:

The Government has said that it is reviewing the speed limits applicable to heavy vehicles, but this review will take place only having regard to the braking requirements of those

vehicles. It would be quite irresponsible to increase the speed limit without having additional safeguards regarding braking. If we did that we would have more tragic accidents involving these vehicles than we have had. I have previously made several statements to that effect.

I do not think I can add anything further to what I have already told the House on numerous occasions: that is, that we will be introducing road traffic legislation, but it will not be isolated to the question of speed limits. The matters of axle loads and, more particularly, braking requirements are involved. It is also not accurate to say that the speed limit is 35 m.p.h. It is variable, depending on the weight of the vehicle.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Some are as low as 20 m.p.h.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would not care to comment on that, other than to say that I do not think they are. However, I think I have given this information also previously in the House, but if the honourable member wants it I shall be willing to get it for him.

MEDALLIONS

Mr. HOPGOOD: My question is to the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, who I understand has vouchsafed the reply to a question I asked recently about medallions. Has the Attorney that reply?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague has vouchsafed a reply, stating that the issue of medallions being worn by people as a substitute for carrying cards, in cases where potential donors of organs such as kidneys have signified their intention to have such organs used for transplant surgery, has been discussed by the Director-General of Medical Services with the appropriate hospital authorities and with the St. John Ambulance Service. It is to be observed that the current situation in regard to the use of cards by persons willing to offer organs for transplanting has, on its own, no legal validity at the present time. It is still necessary for hospital personnel, in the case of potential donors for transplantation procedures, to gain permission of available relatives before any organ can be removed. Nevertheless, the donor card has served a useful purpose in presenting concrete evidence, to hospital staff and the relatives, of the formal intention of the person who may be involved in what may ultimately prove a fatal accident or disease with associated unconsciousness. It is also true that such a donor card carried in a person's wallet or handbag at the time is

less obvious than a medallion or bracelet. In view of the Medic Alert programme jointly introduced by Rotary and the St. John Ambulance Council on October 1, 1971, involving a specially designed medallion worn in the form of a bracelet or neck chain, inquiries were made whether such a medallion used by Medic Alert could also indicate whether a person had signified the intention of becoming a potential donor of organs for transplant procedures. It is appreciated that Medic Alert was primarily designed for people suffering from various physical disorders such as special allergies, diabetes, etc., but as a master record of the total medical problems of members is kept at the St. John transport headquarters so that the departments of hospitals, doctors, and those involved in the treatment of sick and injured (particularly the unconscious) could have this information readily available 24 hours a day, it is believed that there would be considerable merit in providing additional data under this scheme relevant to potential transplantation operations. It has been arranged that a suitable inscription on the Medic Alert medallions will be considered for potential donors of organs when the medical record form designed for Medic Alert is next reviewed. This additional information gained from the medallion in a coded form would be a supplement rather than a replacement of the existing donor card system.

DARTMOUTH DAM

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Works give me information about the recent meeting of the River Murray Commission regarding the Dartmouth dam and state the commission's decision, as well as his Government's views, on the proposal for a hydro-electric scheme that I understand is to be installed for use by Victoria and probably will be paid for by that State?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the Premier replied to the Leader of the Opposition yesterday about the outcome of the meeting in connection with building the Dartmouth dam. He said that the commission had endorsed the new estimate of cost by the Snowy Mountains Authority for building the Dartmouth dam, and that New South Wales was to initiate an approach to the Commonwealth Government on the financial aspects concerning the \$1,300,000 above the 10 per cent difference allowed in the original agreement. I have received no report from Mr. Beaney on the outcome of the discussions about the proposed hydro-electric scheme to be built on the dam,

but I believe there will be some modification to the construction of the dam if this scheme is to be incorporated. However, discussions that I had before Mr. Beaney went to the conference were on the basis that we would not object to the hydro-electric scheme being included in the construction of the dam. In fact, the Victorian Government would pay for the total cost of this scheme. As I understand the position, it would mean also that the rate paid to the River Murray Commission (and I am not certain how this applies, and whether it would be an amount paid to the commission in respect of the use of water) would be sufficient to maintain the dam at no cost to the commission. In other words it would be an advantage to include the hydro-electric scheme in the dam, when it is built. I know the matter was to be discussed, but I will ask Mr. Beaney what has been the outcome of any discussions on this matter.

MODBURY WATER SUPPLY

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of October 19 about the finding of tiny red worms, which have been identified as the larval stages of the chironomid midge, in the public water supply at Modbury?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The terminal storage tank, which was the source of red worms found in the Modbury water supply, will be roofed at a cost of \$300,000 to prevent any recurrence of the midge larval infestation. Because of the normal supply demand, the work will have to be done in two stages, during the winters of 1972 and 1973, as the tank can only be taken out of service during the winter months. Since shutting off supply to the metropolitan area from this tank on October 13, the tank has been heavily chlorinated to kill any larval in the water, and it is intended to reclean the tank before placing it back into service. The draining of 30,000,000 gall. of water from the tank into Dry Creek to allow the cleaning to take place began this morning.

SCHOOL LIBRARIANS

Mr. EVANS: Is the Minister of Education aware of the concern among teachers and ex-teachers attending the school librarian course at the Adelaide Teachers College, that a quota system to be introduced next year will adversely affect many people? I believe that this is a three-year course in three units of A, B, and C, and that student teachers, practising teachers, and ex-teachers are now enrolled for this course. These persons have now been told that next year

a quota system will be introduced and that all of them will not be allowed to continue. Those to be excluded will be ex-teachers, who are willing to go back into the profession at the completion of the course, and the practising teachers. The only ones to be allowed to continue will be the student teachers. Also, concern has been expressed that next year there will be new enrolments for unit A of the course. The opinion has been expressed to me that the group should be allowed to continue as it is and that there should be no new enrolments next year. The group of students to be excluded will have nowhere else to go to complete the course, because no other lectures are available. Will the Minister say whether the information I have given is correct, and will he obtain a full report on this matter?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As I am not aware of this situation, I will obtain the necessary information for the honourable member. Limits are placed on the number of first-year enrolments for any teacher-training course, and that restriction has applied for a long time. The only aspect of the situation as described by the honourable member, if true, that could be new is that students who have been admitted to the first-year course will not be permitted to proceed to the second-year course, and perhaps that is the rumour or complaint that has been drawn to the honourable member's attention. However, I have not heard about it.

CAMBRAI SCHOOL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education consider introducing a fourth-year class at the Cambrai Area School? I have received a petition signed by 174 parents and friends of the school and I believe that one of the Karmel report's general recommendations is the introduction of fourth-year classes at area schools. Cambrai is the centre of a large area on the Murray Plains. Transport and boarding arrangements have to be made for many of the students after they complete their third year. I have sent the petition to the Minister and I hope that he will consider it favourably.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will investigate this matter. However, no doubt the honourable member appreciates that it is late in the day for a decision of this kind to be taken. For example, the decision to provide new fifth-year classes next year was taken about five or six weeks ago; so it may not be possible to act on any recommendation on this

matter at this stage. I point out that students who will be attending a fourth-year class next year, if no fourth-year class is available at Cambrai, will all be eligible, under the rural scholarships that are being introduced, for a scholarship. The scheme will provide some assistance in that area and there will be additional assistance to students that was not previously available. However, I will investigate this matter and bring down a report as soon as possible.

STATE LIBRARY

Mr. CLARK: Can the Minister of Education say in what circumstances students with textbooks are permitted to use the State Library? Concern has been expressed to me that confusion may be caused because there might not be adequate knowledge of the regulations under which the library operates. As a result, there could be circumstances in which the legitimate use of the library might be curtailed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The State Library operates under certain regulations, one of which provides that any person who wishes to take his own textbooks into the library may do so only with the State Librarian's permission. I understand that a notice placed on the door to the library states that any student who wishes to use its facilities, and at the same time to use textbooks that he or she has brought into the library, should seek the Senior Librarian's permission. There will be no difficulty in respect of students entering the library with their own notebooks. The difficulty arises in providing sufficient accommodation for legitimate library users when many students are using the library only as a study area and not using any of the books available in the library. The position that applies at the State Library in South Australia is identical to the position applying at public libraries in Brisbane, Sydney, Melbourne and Perth.

POP MUSIC

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to my recent question on the effects of pop music?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that officers of the Public Health Department are aware of the need to inform young people of the permanent damage which can result from prolonged exposure to loud noise of any kind, including pop music, and action is being taken to incorporate information on this subject in current and proposed general health education programmes in schools and teachers colleges, and in talks to mothers clubs and various other organizations.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. CRIMES: Can the Premier say when the House will rise for the Christmas recess and when it is intended to resume in the new year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I expect that the House will adjourn on November 25 and resume on February 29 next year.

POLICE FORCE

Mr. VENNING: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary what is the policy of the Government regarding the enforcement of law and order in country areas? In September last, the resident police officer was transferred from Wilmington. Before that time, several other country towns had been deprived of police protection by having the resident police officer transferred. Yesterday I received a letter from the Jamestown District Council expressing its concern about a decision to reduce the strength of the Police Force at Jamestown. It is requested by many organizations in the Rocky River District that this Government should not neglect the needs of the people in yet another country area.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I gave an answer to the House a few days ago from the Chief Secretary explaining that it was not the policy of the Police Department to close police stations simply because they were small, but I will now refer the specific question of the honourable member for further reply.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. HARRISON: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation any information about the cause of the nauseating smell that blanketed areas in Albert Park and adjoining districts last evening? I have received many complaints from people who felt sick and uncomfortable because of the smell.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I was approached by many residents of the Seaton Park, Kidman Park and Fulham Gardens areas, who complained about the smell that was evident throughout these areas. Some people had become physically ill as a result of this smell. I immediately contacted the Public Health Department and asked whether it could ascertain the cause of this smell. It was indicated that the smell seemed similar to the smell added to natural gas so that people can be warned of any leakage of that gas. When I arrived home last evening, the smell was evident, even as far away as West Beach. Inquiries made have not revealed the source of the smell and, even though it is similar to the

smell of the material added to natural gas, inquiries have revealed that certainly it has nothing to do with activities of the Gas Company. The suggestion was made that Imperial Chemical Industries was responsible for the presence of this material in the air but, again, inquiries have revealed that this is not the case, because that organization does not use any material that could have caused this problem. The Public Health Department is examining all uses of this material to try to establish the source of the pollution complained about. I shall be pleased to inform the honourable member what the department's inquiries reveal, as soon as a report is made available.

EGGS

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the current situation in respect of the orderly Commonwealth marketing of eggs is in any way changed by the announcement that Queensland is prepared to move into this field? On August 4, the Minister reported that at that time Tasmania and Victoria were remaining outside any orderly marketing arrangement. As a recent press report states that Queensland is moving further into the field of orderly egg marketing, I ask whether South Australian egg producers may expect any improvement of their situation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member for Heysen asked an identical question on Tuesday and I have a reply to that question. I think that reply will cover the question asked by the member for Light.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister now give me that reply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture agrees that effective control of egg production could not be achieved unless all the mainland States co-operated. However, in view of the obvious support already clearly indicated by growers in Victoria for a scheme of production control and the desire of growers generally in the other States for such an arrangement, he does not consider that a referendum in South Australia on this question would serve any useful purpose. The South Australian Government has made it clear that it is willing, and indeed anxious, to co-operate with other States and the Commonwealth Government in enacting legislation to regulate egg production. In fact, my colleague has maintained close liaison with the New South Wales and Queensland Ministers of Agriculture whose respective Cabinets have agreed to production

controls in the industry and, following the announcement of the Victorian decision, he telegraphed the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry seeking an urgent meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council to discuss the situation. The situation in Western Australia is somewhat different from the position in other States, because of the comparative isolation of that State from the rest of Australia and, although a system of state control in Western Australia might be practical, it is doubtful whether similar schemes would be effective in the other mainland States, unless every State co-operates.

RURAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. GUNN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on October 7 about a review of the terms under which rural assistance is provided for farmers and about varying the agreement with the Commonwealth Government so that more people might benefit?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Lands reports that he is keeping the operations of the rural assistance scheme under constant review. He believes that it is too early yet to make firm proposals to the Commonwealth Government for changes in the agreement but will do so immediately this is shown to be desirable. He believes that the scheme is being efficiently operated in this State and has no knowledge of the alleged statements of any member of the committee; nor does he have any reason to believe that any member of the committee would have made such a statement. The views expressed by the honourable member's constituent are not in accordance with the facts.

PORT LINCOLN TRANSPORT

Mr. CARNIE: In the event of the Government's purchasing the *M.V. Troubridge*, bearing in mind that negotiations are proceeding, I ask the Minister of Roads and Transport whether the Government has considered resuming the service to Port Lincoln.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government has considered that matter.

Mr. CARNIE: Although the Minister has fully answered the question, in view of his statement that consideration has been given to resuming the *Troubridge* service to Port Lincoln if the Government purchases the vessel I now ask him whether the service will be resumed if the Government does buy the vessel.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The former Government established a committee that looked at the question of transport to Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula. That committee reported to the former Government prior to its defeat, but, to be quite fair, as I always try to be, I point out that the report was brought down only a few days before polling day. That committee recommended against sea transport to Port Lincoln on the basis that the whole of Eyre Peninsula was adequately served by road transport.

MORPHETTVILLE PARK SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question regarding a new staff room at the Morphettville Park Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have another reply for the member for Glenelg, notice of which I gave him yesterday but for which, for some strange reason, he did not ask yesterday. The reply he asks for today is as follows:

A site inspection has been carried out by Public Buildings Department officers and a detailed report and estimate is being prepared. It is expected that work will commence early in 1972, subject to the availability of funds at the time.

Mr. MATHWIN: As the Minister said quite correctly yesterday (and I apologize to him for making him carry the answer down on two days), I did not realize that I was obliged to ask for a reply on the same day as he said it was available. Will he now give a reply to my question about the re-sealing of the paved areas at the Morphettville Park Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am sure the honourable member will appreciate it was a problem to carry the reply down on another day because, like all my replies, it is a very weighty one! Following receipt of the report of the consulting civil engineers regarding this matter, funds have been approved. The consultants have now been asked to submit a quotation for the preparation of designs, drawings and specifications for tender call purposes. It is expected that tenders can be called in about two months' time.

BOAT RAMPS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Marine have immediately implemented a survey into the condition of boat ramps on metropolitan beaches and into the requirements of small boat owners using St. Vincent Gulf? I understand that last summer eight boat ramps were in operation on the metropolitan foreshore but,

because of winter storms, three boat ramps are now out of action, leaving five in reasonable condition. I understand that in this State there are about 20,000 power boat owners, all of whom depend on using simple beach-launching facilities. A conservative estimate of the value of their boats is about \$30,000,000, so that this represents a multi-million dollar industry in South Australia. Also, I believe that the Minister is aware that a \$8,000,000 boat haven is being built at St. Kilda, Victoria, where mooring and launching charges will repay the cost of that haven within 10 years. In view of these facts, will the Minister recommend that a survey be conducted into the condition of boat ramps and facilities for power boat owners in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, as there is sufficient knowledge in the department already, without the need for the survey suggested by the honourable member. As Minister of Marine, I am fully aware (and I know that the department is fully aware) of the lack of this facility in this State, especially in the metropolitan area. The previous Government spent a considerable sum to improve the facility at Garden Island, but there is a limit to what the Government can spend on this type of facility, as I think the honourable member will appreciate. He referred to the boat haven at St. Kilda. According to my information, what he has said is largely correct, but I wish he had pointed out the size of the fee charged in order to recoup the capital cost of that project within 10 years. Many boat owners in South Australia could not afford to pay nearly as much as is being charged at St. Kilda. I have had discussions with several people about developing boat havens. As the honourable member knows, the decision on Hallett Cove has now denied small boat owners the provisions that were contemplated there, but many other factors were involved in that decision. From discussions I have had with other organizations about establishing a large boat haven, it appears to me that private enterprise is not interested in such development as a result of the economics involved.

Mr. Nankivell: Private enterprise was interested at Hallett Cove.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have just referred to that and, for obvious reasons, it will not go ahead. Had we looked into the economics of that project, I doubt whether the company would have been able to complete it, because it did not have an accurate estimate

of costs. The rough estimate I had given me was for a sum of more than \$2,000,000. The department is fully aware of the need for these facilities: it is desirable that they be developed where possible. However, there is a limitation on the Government in this respect. I should be perfectly happy to co-operate with private enterprise if it were prepared to develop this sort of facility. At this stage I cannot say what the future holds, but we will pursue the matter with all possible vigour.

CHILD-CARE CENTRES

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Social Welfare say what progress has been made by the Commonwealth Government in implementing the child-care centres for working mothers which Mr. Gorton, as Prime Minister, promised during the 1970 Senate election campaign?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have not had any communication from the Commonwealth Government on this matter nor, as far as I know, has the Social Welfare Department. I have no knowledge at all whether the Commonwealth Government is proceeding with this project.

ADVERTISING SIGNS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question about the removal by the Railways Department of signs from roadsides?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The two groups of signs referred to by the honourable member lie within the District Council of Mobilong. The first group at the eastern end of Murray Bridge is visible within the 35 miles an hour speed limit zone. As a matter of policy, the Control of Advertisements Act is not being applied to signs visible within these zones pending the development of a more comprehensive code for the control of advertisements within urban and township areas. Regarding the second group of three signs at the Monarto South crossing, one of the signs was erected under a contract that expired on August 6, 1969, and has been removed. A double-sided sign is under contracts expiring on August 31, 1971, and March 31, 1972. In the first case the contractor has been requested to remove the sign. The Commissioner has given an assurance that advertising panels outside the 35 miles an hour speed zones will be removed as their respective site leases expire.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of September 14 in which I asked for an up-to-date report on the substantial cracks in the school administration block at the Modbury High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization is still investigating this matter, and that there are several problems still to be solved before a final report can be prepared and permanent remedies suggested. From studies undertaken, he considers it probable that, in spite of efforts already undertaken to drain water and prevent seepage, the building's vertical movement could continue for some time to come. In the circumstances, he considers it inadvisable to fill the cracks in the walls at present. However, he considers the building to be safe, and not to constitute a danger to its occupants.

PERFORMING ARTS CENTRE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier give me some information about the performing arts centre? As I understand the concept of this centre, the roadworks that will be necessary to give access to the site are likely to terminate near the Morphet Street bridge. Representations have been made to me by a certain person, who is employed by the South Australian Railways, about the provision of new facilities to enable functions of this department to be carried out. Dissatisfaction has been expressed at the offer that has been made of the old Legislative Council building. I should like to know what is the cost involved in the offer that has been made by the Government, and who will pay. Moreover, it has been suggested that some rowing clubhouses (not only the railways clubhouse but also the clubhouses of other clubs) may have to be moved. Will the Premier say what the Government intends to do in this regard?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the decision to site the performing arts centre on the Torrens River bank (a decision that flowed from the decision of the Government of which the honourable member was a member), it was clear that some activities of the Railways Institute would have to be located elsewhere. In fact, that happened with the renting of Waval's building to provide for some of the activities of the institute. A feasibility study was undertaken into the general planning and development of the Torrens bank to the completion of

all the facilities of a performing arts centre, a working committee being established in order to see what had to be moved. It was agreed that all the buildings north of the present railway line would have to be provided for elsewhere and that eventually, though not for some time, this would include the rowing club buildings. It is possible for us to locate the rowing club building elsewhere on the banks of the Torrens River.

Mr. Coumbe: Including the railways club?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, sufficiently close to be able to cater for the needs of the rowing club, but that is not an immediate measure in prospect. The immediate provisions we will have to make are to replace the other areas of the institute there, plus the tarpaulin shop and the laundry. Of course, the bakery has been disposed of otherwise and we will have to provide for that also. A working committee has been engaged for some time in examining alternative accommodation for all these activities. Our objective is to provide permanent accommodation for all these activities, including the Railways Institute, but in order to provide a permanent home for the institute (which had not previously been decided on) we must decide where it can best be located and what can be done for it in the meantime. The working committee's proposal, after examining the floor areas that would be required for the Railways Institute, both temporarily and permanently, was that part of the institute's activities could be accommodated in the old Legislative Council building until 1974, by which time we expect to be able to provide permanent accommodation for the institute in the main Railways building, together with alterations that will provide additional floor accommodation in that building. It is desirable that we be able to locate the Railways Institute in the building, because this, after all, would be near the central home of the Railways. It is an area where most railway officers have their activities and it is the most convenient area in which they could be located. However, it will take us some time to move the Motor Vehicles Department from there and to make the alterations necessary to provide a permanent home for that department, so in the meantime we must find temporary accommodation. The temporary accommodation proposed is, I believe, temporary accommodation that can cope with all the activities of the Railways Institute. I have seen some published statements by an officer of the institute, and I can only say that the institute has been consulted by the working

committee in making the committee's proposals. I believe that the strictures that have been made about the proposed accommodation for the Railways Institute are ill based and that we shall be successfully able to cope with the whole of the activities of the institute. I point out to the honourable member that the working committee established to see how the performing arts centre is to fit into railways development includes the President of the institute, so the institute has always been consulted about the moves. The institute can be assured that, when the time comes (and it will be some years hence) that the rowing club must be moved, provision will be made for the rowing club on the Torrens bank, in a situation that will give ready access to the clubhouse and adequate convenience to club members.

SPEAKER'S RULINGS

Mr. HALL: I ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. On September 30, I asked you to arrange for the Standing Orders Committee, of which you are Chairman, to discuss interpretations and rulings given by you. In reply, you said you would be pleased to refer the matter to the Standing Orders Committee. I now ask you what was the result of this reference to the committee.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Orders Committee met this morning. The matter that the Leader had referred to us was dealt with and the committee considered that it was not its function to inquire into the suggestion as the Leader had asked in his question.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, on what grounds you say that the Standing Orders Committee decided that it was not the committee's prerogative.

The SPEAKER: The Standing Orders provide that matters must be dealt with at the time they arise in Parliament, and if honourable members wanted to have a post-mortem outside they would be in breach of the Standing Orders in doing so. They must also consider other Standing Orders. The member for Alexandra was present at the meeting and he knows the general feeling.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: When you get the call. Has he got special privilege? I don't want to stop him, but he just jumped up.

The SPEAKER: The Leader asked a question and, following that, the member for Alexandra rose, and that honourable member has had the call. I think that, in courtesy to other

members who invariably complain to me that certain members on the other side are getting preference, if the honourable member wants to make an explanation that could be done later. It is not right that one member should continually get the call because he jumps up. I do not think this is in the spirit or is the intention of the Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Have I leave, or not?

The SPEAKER: When I get around to it, I will give the honourable member the call, and then he can seek leave.

Later:

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Standing Orders Committee of the House comprises yourself, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General, the member for Playford, the member for Mitcham, and me. I understood you to say just now that the committee considered the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition was not a matter on which it should have any influence, or words to that effect. I do not recall your exact words, but I understood you to say something like that. Also, I understood you to say that the committee had decided that this matter was none of its business, so to speak. I wish to explain that at the meeting this morning an apology was received from the member for Playford who could not attend, but the other members were present. In my understanding, no decision was made on this matter. I certainly held the opinion that the committee should interest itself in the matter referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. The member for Mitcham had a somewhat similar view, but he could not remain for the whole of the meeting. The Attorney-General did not stay for the whole of the meeting, either. The meeting carried no formal motion and, in fact, made no decision. I want to make clear that I think this is a matter that the Standing Orders Committee should interest itself in, because I think it is becoming increasingly important that this question should be decided, and that the matter referred to by the Leader should be discussed by this committee.

Later:

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

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that, during Question Time, in reply to a question asked of you by the Leader of the Opposition regarding suggestions which he had put to you earlier by way of question to be considered by the Standing Orders Committee, you said that the committee had met this morning and dealt with the matter and had decided that it was not appropriate for the suggestions to receive further consideration. I understand that that sums up what you said. I desire to make clear that, unfortunately, I had to leave the meeting early, but I hope that I expressed my opinion that these were matters of very grave importance to the conduct of this House and, therefore, to all members and to the public of South Australia, and that I believed they should be considered. Unfortunately, when I left the meeting, the member for Playford was not present and only three members remained. I personally hope that you will call the Standing Orders Committee together so that there will be a full meeting and a full discussion on the various matters that have been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition and other members for discussion.

LITTLE PARA RESERVOIR

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works say whether any decision has been made to construct the Little Para reservoir? When I asked the Minister a similar question on August 4, he replied that a firm decision would be made by mid-October. I hardly need point out that the indecision in this matter is causing hardship and that some people are being refused a water service.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No decision has been taken.

GROCERY PRICES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier, as Minister in charge of prices, a reply to my question of October 6 regarding grocery prices?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Prices Commissioner has reported that, although prices of grocery lines have increased this year, the increases do not appear to be excessive when related to (a) price increases of other commodities and (b) cost increases incurred by manufacturers and distributors. The food group of the consumer price index for South Australia for the year to June, 1971, rose by 2.7 per cent, whilst the increase for all commodities in the index for this State was 4.9 per cent. During the same period average weekly earnings in South Australia rose by 11.8 per cent. Supermarkets, grocery chains,

and other resellers provide a wide range of prices and products, and strong competition among them helps to ensure that price increases are kept to a minimum. The average super-market would carry up to 5,000 different lines in stock. Some months ago, the larger super-market organizations were written to, requesting that margins on groceries be closely watched, and that they be adjusted where possible with a view to limiting price increases. Individual complaints from consumers are always examined and, in any case where increases are considered to be unwarranted, adjustments are sought. The majority of grocery manufacturers are in other States. The grocery industry is highly competitive and there is little evidence of excessive profits being made either by manufacturers or retailers. However, the position will be kept under review.

DEEP SEA PORT

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Marine say, having received the report on the second deep sea port for South Australia, what would determine his decision to make this report public or not to make it public? From time to time I have asked questions about progress on this report. The Minister has been good enough in and about the House to tell me what the position has been, and the other day he said that the report was being printed and that he expected to receive it soon. One is greatly interested to know what the Ministers decision will be and what factors will determine whether he makes the report public or whether he does not. One remembers the previous report that was prepared but not made public, and people in my district consider that this action was detrimental to the whole project.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting, and I call on the Minister of Marine.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand that the honourable member wants to know what factors will influence my decision about whether I table the document or whether I will treat it as a report submitted to me. I think the reply to his question is that it will be my judgment and the judgment of Cabinet that decide whether it is in the best interests of the Government and of the people to table the report. I previously told the honourable member that when I received the report the first thing I would do would be to read it and, naturally, I would submit it to Cabinet: members of Cabinet have some knowledge of this matter, too. Following that, and with the assistance of my colleagues, I will decide

(and it will be a matter for my judgment) whether the report is to be made public. Better still, I may tell the honourable member now that at 10.15 a.m. today I received the report, but I have not yet read it.

HEALTH COMMITTEE

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to the question I asked on September 22 during the debate on the Estimates about the Committee of Enquiry into Health Services in South Australia?

The Hon. L. I. KING: My colleague states that the Committee of Enquiry into Health Services in South Australia has met on eight occasions, for a total of 17 days. The committee meets for two or three days at about monthly intervals. The cost of salaries, meeting fees and expenses, and oversea and interstate visits of inspection represent most of the total expenditure. It is expected that the report will be completed by the end of 1972. The committee has received over 200 written submissions.

DEPARTMENTAL INSPECTIONS

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether inspections of departments under his jurisdiction are being considered, similar to the visit last Friday to the Highways Department, as this visit created much interest amongst members who made the inspection?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It has been suggested that similar visits be arranged, perhaps to the Railways Department or the Head Office of the Highways Department at Walkerville, to inspect planning and works that are being carried out. I should be interested to hear the opinion of members on this matter, and perhaps Opposition members could convey their desires through the Opposition Whip, indicating whether they would be interested in attending if such visits were arranged.

LOXTON SCHOOL HALL

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that the Loxton High School Council and the Loxton District Council are interested in a joint venture to erect a school hall or gymnasium. Can the Minister of Education indicate the policy of his department towards such a joint venture involving a school committee or council, the local council, and his department in constructing a gymnasium or a school hall that may be used jointly for school and local

activities, and how the financial responsibilities for such a project will be apportioned? Also, what would be the terms of the arrangement between the parties concerned for the use of such a hall?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not sure whether I have sufficient time to reply to the honourable member this afternoon, but I will do my best. I have sent to the Chairman of the Loxton District Council details of a joint arrangement that involved the Education Department, a local council, and a high school council at another place. The basis of the arrangement is that the department is willing to contemplate this kind of situation in which 50 per cent of the net cost is shared by the high school council and the local council.

Mr. Nankivell: Is there any limit?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes: there is a limit in respect of the provision of the hall. That comes under the department's general policy on halls. The limit on the cost of the hall is \$124,000, so the limit on the Government's contribution to the net cost is \$62,000; over that \$62,000 contribution the department meets the supervising and design costs and any additional costs that might be associated with the site of the hall. I think the main aspects of the matter are as I have stated them to the Chairman of the Loxton District Council: the department's main concern would be to ensure that the school would have appropriate and adequate use of the hall and that neither party would vexatiously prevent the other party from using the hall in appropriate circumstances. So long as these conditions are met and the finance that must be contributed is provided, there is no reason why such a project should not go ahead. The maximum subsidy limitation on the provision of a hall depends on the enrolment at the school. The full \$62,000 subsidy of the net cost of \$124,000 would apply only to a school at which the enrolment was over a certain figure. I will ascertain more precisely what is our policy on the matter and let the honourable member know.

SINGAPORE TELEPHONE CHARGE

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, request the Postmaster-General's Department that telex to Singapore from South Australia be a one-minute minimum instead of the present three-minute minimum? I have been contacted by a business executive in my district who has an office in Singapore and who uses this service. He states that the telex system to Canada can be used in one-minute segments. As the

Premier's Department and certain business people who have offices in Singapore hope to gain markets for our products in South-East Asia, a one-minute minimum telex service would help maintain business contacts and reduce costs.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have this matter investigated.

MINING LEASES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier, as Minister of Development and Mines, say whether persons and organizations currently have the right to peg leases and subsequently mine on Government sanctuaries, reserves or national parks, either with or without the responsible Minister's approval? When inspecting a sanctuary in the Cockatoo Valley area last Sunday I noticed that a miner's peg (M.R.A. 15733), dated September 13, 1971, was associated with the property originally purchased in that area from a Mr. Dawson. On one part of this block an extractive industry, namely, the removal of sand, is under way and there is doubt in my mind that the area will be able to serve its purpose as a sanctuary or national park in the future if this undertaking is permitted to continue. Hence I ask whether such people have this right and, more particularly, whether they have received the permission of the responsible Minister or his deputy in recent months.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Sanctuaries can exist in places other than national parks: sanctuaries can be declared on private property and that private property not be exempted from the provisions of the Mining Act. I do not know the area to which the honourable member has referred, but I will inquire about it. National parks are all exempted from the provisions of the Mining Act. For instance, at Oraparinna, a newly purchased national park, certain areas are subject to mining operations, but those were excluded specifically from the park at the time of transfer. Where an area is not exempt from the provisions of the Act, the pegging of a claim is perfectly proper without any Minister's consent.

SCENIC ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ascertain what alignment the scenic road is to take immediately it leaves the main Upper Sturt road at Hawthorndene? Residents who live within the Rankey Hill section of Hawthorndene are concerned that the road may take that route. They point

out that the hill is very steep and has a bad junction at the bottom near the Hawthorndene schoolgrounds and that the area at the bottom of Footes Hill has not been subdivided to any great extent. This would be a better route for the road to take and, as the land is more or less vacant at present, it would be best to make the move as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is expressing an opinion, and that is not permitted.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be happy to get a report.

SMOKING

Mr. WELLS: As the Standing Orders Committee has met recently, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether my request for permission to smoke in the Chamber has been considered by the committee. If it has been considered, what is the committee's decision? As the member for Alexandra has given the House the names of members of the committee, we know that they are a fine body of people who could be expected to acquiesce in my request, so may I know when we can expect your permission to light up?

The SPEAKER: A full report will be brought down by the committee. Apparently, the honourable member is not nearly as patient as is the Leader, and I ask for his tolerance while he awaits the report to be given to the House.

EMERGENCY HOUSING

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, say what efforts the Housing Trust is making to provide emergency housing for large families in the metropolitan area? About 12 months ago, when I asked the Premier a similar question, he said he would obtain a report for me and explained that it was difficult to provide emergency housing for large families in the metropolitan area. I have a constituent with five children who lives at Glenelg North and who is paying \$25 a week rent; he has now been threatened by the landlord with eviction, but I have advised him not to take any notice of that. These people applied to the Housing Trust 10 years ago for rental accommodation, but they admit that they did not keep up the six-monthly contact: after all, the wife had five children during that period.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commenting. I call on the honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the moment the Housing Trust has more applications for rental accommodation than it has ever had. There are many cases where grave concern must be expressed because of the emergency hardship nature of the circumstances surrounding the application. If the case to which the honourable member refers had been a current and continuing application, there could be no doubt that, unless the report on the tenants was extremely adverse, these people would have been housed long ere this. I can only assume that there were supervening factors which meant it was not a continuing application during the period. The Housing Trust has been asked to examine proposals to provide emergency housing. It has done so, but I believe no satisfactory proposal has come forward. The only alternative which can be considered at the moment is that I should take money which is currently being used for low-cost housing and put it into emergency housing, thereby reducing the number of people who could be housed permanently. That is not a course which I am happy to take, because it simply provides an unsatisfactory short-term expedient while making the long-term answer very much less satisfactory. I have looked at any other accommodation that could conceivably be found for emergency cases and, where the Government owns housing in which emergency cases could be accommodated, it has sought to accommodate them. Numbers of people have been helped in this way. If the honourable member has a specific case, we will look at it to see whether there is some way of helping within the limited housing we have available for emergency purposes.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Premier say whether the trust still regards the houses that it has called "up-to-date temporary" to be still temporary? I was disappointed recently to hear that, because the trust had been through the type of house that I refer to as temporary (that is, a rectangular building with the kitchen and lounge in the centre and a bedroom at either end that was built at about the time of the war) and taken out the wood stoves and fires, replacing them with gas equipment, the houses were no longer regarded by the trust as temporary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I should be grateful if the honourable member would refer me to the group of houses he is talking about. For the most part, the temporary or emergency houses in the original scheme of the trust have been removed from the site and sold. True, we have some houses that could be called less

than permanent that we have obtained at times from other sources and used to cope with a certain housing need. There is no general emergency housing now being administered by the trust as a group. However, if the honourable member has a query about some houses and cites them to me, I will get a report concerning them.

FARM HOLIDAYS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of October 13 concerning farm holidays?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: At present the Tourist Bureau has listed 21 farms willing to accept holiday visitors. This information is made available to people who inquire at the bureau. Other property owners have inquired and discussed proposals with officers of the bureau. Mrs. K. P. McBride, of the Sundowner Holiday Agency, 253 Pulteney Street, Adelaide, has commenced a business aimed at promoting farm holidays. In effect, this would be an association along the lines proposed by the honourable member. The Tourist Bureau will be happy to help as much as possible the Sundowner Holiday Agency and private farmers interested in receiving visitors.

YALATA MISSION

Mr. GUNN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health what steps are being taken to provide Yalata Mission on the West Coast with adequate trained nursing services? The mission has been without a trained sister for several months and the flying doctor's wife and a fifth-year medical student have been providing some service. There have been several cases of gastro-enteritis, respiratory infections and, more recently, an outbreak of scabies has been reported. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether help can be given by the Public Health Department?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have been looking into the question of health services at Yalata Mission, and I shall be able to give a reply to the honourable member in a few days.

NORTH-EAST ROAD INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport investigate the possibility of extra street lighting being installed at the intersection of North-East Road and Golden Grove Road, Modbury, to ensure the safety of the intersection? I ask that this matter be investigated and, if necessary, negotiations be entered into with the Tea Tree Gully Council.

The route of Golden Grove Road where it meets the North-East Road at Modbury has recently been altered, and this may be the reason for the inadequate lighting at the new intersection.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall have this matter examined.

WALKERVILLE SCHOOL

Mr. COUNBE: Will the Minister of Education investigate the possibility of expediting the provision of additional playing areas for the Walkerville Primary School? I took up this matter with the Minister some time ago, and on September 7 he sent me a letter in which he referred to a docket which had been mislaid. The Minister informed me that the Public Buildings Department was looking at this work as a matter of urgency. I have been approached this week on behalf of the school. I have inspected the properties concerned and request that this matter be dealt with without delay, because this school is in a confined area in a heavily built-up suburb. Will the Minister therefore treat this as a matter of urgency and give me a reply as soon as possible?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

INFLATION

Mr. McANANEY: On Tuesday, I asked a question of the Premier but was knocked out by the bell. I therefore ask that question again today. Does the Premier agree with the statement made by the member for Spence last week that the Premier would agree with the Labor movement that moves for higher pay arose from the unstable and inflationary economic situation which the Commonwealth Government had made no effort to prevent, when the recent increases in the average weekly wage have been 36 per cent and in the average minimum wage 27 per cent, whereas the increase in prices has averaged only 15.4 per cent, being made up of increases in the cost of such items as food, 11.5 per cent; clothing, 15.8 per cent; housing, 18.5 per cent; and miscellaneous, 21 per cent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The inflationary pressures that occur in the community have been clearly exposed by a study undertaken by the Australian Council of Trade Unions and published by Mr. Willis, its advocate. In fact, the inflationary pressures in the economy largely derive from elsewhere than from wage increases. The wage increases have constantly followed price increases and, in fact, have been inadequate to keep up with

the many increases in prices and charges in various areas. I do not know that there is any point in my getting up to reply to what are, in fact, contentious statements by the honourable member, including carefully selected figures. I suppose I could give the honourable member five marks out of 10 for reading, but I do not think any purpose is to be served by using this sort of thing as a debating point during Question Time.

DOWNNEY HOUSE

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my recent question about Downey House?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary reports that Downey House will become part of the proposed Australian Mineral Sciences Centre and will not be demolished. There is no intention to discharge patients or to move them into substandard accommodation in the old mental retardation wards. The patients now in Downey House will be transferred only when new and better accommodation has been built.

WEEDS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works have more conspicuous signs erected in the Happy Valley reservoir reserve stating that trespassers will be prosecuted, and will he have included on those signs a statement to the effect that people should not pick the flowers of noxious weeds in the area, as this tends to spread these weeds right throughout the State? The flower of the weed cape tulip is quite attractive and on three recent occasions local residents have warned persons picking this flower in the area that it is a noxious weed and poisonous to stock, and that the flower should not be taken out of the area. As this matter concerns landholders, I believe that more prominent signs should be displayed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall have the matter examined.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he intends to allow African daisy to be shifted from schedule 1 to schedule 2 in the Bumside council area and, if he does, what action he will take to provide protection and compensation for areas to the east that will now be affected to an even greater extent by the neglect of this council to fulfil its function under the provisions of the Weeds Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire of my colleague.

SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say whether there is any Government policy on making grants available to schools for the purchase of library books where a Matriculation class is newly established? If there is no such policy, will he consider having grants made for this purpose? This matter has been referred to me by the council of a high school in my district, at which school a Matriculation class is to be established. It is pointed out that, in the first year of establishing such a class, considerable expense is involved in building up stocks of reference books, etc.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine the suggestion and see whether anything can be done.

HOUSING TRUST CONTRACTS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked him some days ago about Housing Trust maintenance contracts?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There have been no alterations in the past 12 months to the provisions or arrangements regarding the maintenance of Housing Trust rental properties. Day-to-day maintenance and the internal and external repainting programmes continue as usual. The trust over the past two or three years has spent considerable sums in what is known as up-grading of older houses in both the metropolitan area and country towns. This up-grading programme is quite distinct from the trust's normal maintenance operations. Following the adoption by the trust of this year's budget it became trust policy to let fewer up-grading contracts, but all contracts already let for this type of work are being fully executed. Many of the subcontractors engaged in this programme were additional to the trust's normal subcontractors.

BRIGHTON CROSSING

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether any consideration has been given to making safer the railway crossing at Jetty Road, Brighton? Following the recent terrible accident that occurred at that crossing, a letter appears in today's *News* from the father of one of the children killed at this crossing. The letter states:

I am an ex-railway employee and the father of a 15-month old child lost in the fatal Brighton level crossing accident. For the record, the lights could not be seen because of the glaring sun, until we were nearly on the line and, if there had been gates or bars my son would still be with me.

Will the Minister say whether this matter has been considered?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Providing protection at level crossings is a matter about which people become emotional from time to time. However, whilst I extend my deepest sympathy to the families of the people concerned in the recent accident, the letter that the honourable member has read to the House (I read it in the *News*) does not go the whole way. Although I can see that it is often difficult, because of the position of the sun, to see lights, I fail to see how the position of the sun makes it difficult or impossible to hear bells that are ringing at a crossing. Therefore, a double protection is already provided. Although I regret to do so, the other point I am forced to make, as the question has been asked, is that, if it is difficult to see the lights because of the position of the sun, surely it is the responsibility of motorists to take additional care. It has been suggested that boom gates should be provided at this crossing to make it even safer. Although I cannot say from memory how many of these gates have been replaced, the department continually has to replace them when motorists drive straight through them, so that even boom gates do not protect a person who does not exercise proper care. I believe that the only solution to the problem with regard to all these crossings is to provide grade separation. However, again it is a matter of priorities in relation to allocating money. I doubt very much whether the people of Brighton would be prepared to contribute the sum necessary to provide grade separation in this case. As I believe that this type of work will have to be done on a State-wide financing basis, there is a big task in front of us. I point out that in South Australia there are between 1,700 and 1,800 level crossings.

Mr. Mathwin: But some are more dangerous than others.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, I suppose the ones that are most dangerous are those where the car and the train happen to get to the crossing at the same time.

Mr. Mathwin: Some are busier than others.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg is out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Perhaps, but it is not the question whether or not they are busy that makes them dangerous: it is a question of how much care is exercised. The matter of upgrading crossings is continually being

examined. I do not know whether the honourable member has forgotten what I have previously said in this House: that we are spending this financial year a far greater sum than has ever been spent before on level crossing protection devices. If my memory is correct, I think that the sum provided this year is equal to the total of that spent in the past seven or eight years. Therefore, irrespective of this accident, continual and active consideration is being given by the Government to upgrading these crossings to the highest degree of safety that is humanly possible.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REPORT

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Local Government say when we can expect to have the report of the committee that is investigating the extension of local government to areas that are not already served, because many people at Andamooka and Coober Pedy are interested in the effect that local government could have on these areas?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The report will be made to me when the committee concludes its work.

NURSE TRAINING

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether the alteration in nurse training is expected to be associated with any marked increase in the cost of books used in that training? In any form of education, it is necessary for students to obtain books, and this applies to nurse training. A constituent of mine has told me that twice his daughter has been denied the opportunity of obtaining a taxation concession in relation to the cost of books that she has bought for her training. With the more sophisticated training about to be embarked on, the fear exists in some quarters that this may be an added burden on people entering the nursing profession.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague.

FILMS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say whether, in any circumstances, he is prepared to exercise the powers under the Places of Public Entertainment Act in relation to cinemas and films? Several days ago, a man telephoned me (he was not one of my constituents, but lived in the eastern suburbs) and complained about a film that was being shown in the city. I explained to him that I could do nothing about the matter, although

I was sympathetic, and that he would have to get in touch with the Attorney-General.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What was the film?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General will know that when I have explained the question. This person said that he had tried to get in touch with the Attorney but to that time had failed. He telephoned me again later and said that, with my encouragement and as a result of my suggestion, he had been able to speak to the Attorney and that he had complained about the film. The Attorney said that broadly his views were the same as this man's but that, as there was an agreement with the Commonwealth, he could do nothing about it. My understanding is that South Australia is one of the only States that has retained its powers by law to deal with these matters, despite the agreement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Therefore, I ask the Attorney whether in any circumstances he is prepared to exercise those powers.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The arrangements with the Commonwealth Government, as the honourable member is aware, are that the films are classified by that Government. Indeed, under the Film Classification Bill, which has been passed by this House and which is now before another place, that classification will be given statutory authority. The practice that has long been followed in this State is that films are permitted to be exhibited in the form in which they are passed by the Commonwealth Film Censor, and I gather that the film to which the honourable member refers has been through the ordinary Commonwealth Government process and has received what the Commonwealth Film Censor regards as an appropriate classification. I am not prepared to answer the question whether, in any circumstances, I would exercise a power vested in me by Statute. I do not think any Minister would be wise to commit himself absolutely in advance to an attitude of that kind. The question is necessarily hypothetical, but I do say that, in all ordinary and foreseeable circumstances, I would take the view that, where a film had received an appropriate classification from the Commonwealth Film Censor, this State should adopt the attitude that it should be exhibited here under the statutory conditions which will now apply and which are appropriate to the classification.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education consider making a special grant to be applied to the provision of material for special classes for handicapped children? I have received a letter from one of the organizations concerned with the welfare of handicapped children, stating that the new policy of making grants instead of giving subsidies could lead to neglect in this area, and that parents of handicapped children are seldom members of school councils that are charged with the responsibility to make decisions about spending these grants.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will examine this matter, but I cannot imagine that any school committee would neglect the interests and welfare of a special class or a particular class that existed at that school, where a legitimate request had been forwarded to the committee by the class teacher or the headmaster. I should think, also, that it is the basic responsibility of any headmaster, where there is a special class in a school, to see that there is adequate provision of equipment. I should be extremely surprised if there were cases where classes in this category had been discriminated against. I think the honourable member appreciates that, so far as special schools are concerned, separate formulae have been devised to provide assistance on a per capita basis to those schools and on a much more generous basis than the grants provided to ordinary schools. If there is any special school in which the honourable member is interested, I can certainly provide him with the details of the grants that will be made to the school. Regarding the position of special classes, I will certainly examine the matter that the honourable member has raised.

RIDGEHAVEN SHOPPING CENTRE

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Highways Department intends to erect a wall on the edge of the parking lot at the shopping centre owned by Mr. Fleming and situated at the corner of North-East Road and Golden Grove Road, Ridgehaven? The North-East Road has been widened and reconstructed at this point. Previously, a low tubular railing was erected on the edge of the parking lot, and it has been alleged that this was removed when the road-works were completed. This rail was erected to protect the properties opposite from damage by motor vehicles that had crossed the North-East Road. In fact, this is still occurring across what is now a six-lane highway, with

a median strip. The main reason for this damage occurring is that people do not apply the hand brake after parking their vehicles to go shopping. One resident has had his fence knocked down seven times, and motor vehicles have run on to an adjoining property on two occasions, one accident being only recently. The wall is necessary to prevent damage to the property of residents opposite the shopping centre, as well as to prevent a serious accident, as eventually a vehicle collision may occur or a pedestrian may be injured or killed if action is not taken.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This sounds like an extremely serious matter, and I shall have it investigated thoroughly.

OPAL FIELDS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of tourism, try to have some of the leading travel people from America who will visit this State in about three weeks' time visit the opal fields at Andamooka and Coober Pedy so that they will have first-hand knowledge of the tourist potential of these towns? The *Advertiser* of Tuesday, October 19, contains a report that these people will visit certain wild life reserves in South Australia and will also visit the Barossa Valley. The diggings in the opal-mining centres are unique and have wide tourist potential.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up with the Director of the Government Tourist Bureau the possibility of introducing these people to the wild life of Andamooka and Coober Pedy.

REGISTRATION OF DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Registration of Dogs Act, 1924-1968. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to overcome a serious deficiency in the provisions of the Registration of Dogs Act. The principal Act at present provides for the destruction of bitches that are found at large and on heat, for the impounding and subsequent destruction (if unclaimed) of stray dogs, and for the destruction of dogs found worrying any sheep or cattle. It does not, however, provide for the destruction of stray dogs that are found to be a danger to human life. A number of incidents have occurred in

which children have been terrorized and exposed to risk of injury by stray dogs, and the purpose of the present Bill is to provide sufficient powers to enable these situations to be adequately dealt with.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a new section 20a in the principal Act. This section provides that, where a dog is at large in any public place or in any premises not belonging to, or occupied by, the owner of the dog, and a member of the Police Force forms the opinion that the behaviour of the dog suggests that it constitutes a danger to the public, he may proceed immediately to destroy the dog or arrange for its destruction.

Mr. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (INSURANCE)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is entirely complementary to the amendment to the Motor Vehicles Act recently introduced in the House. The purpose of that amendment, as has been previously explained, is to provide that an applicant for registration will obtain both registration and third party insurance in the one "package deal". There will be no separate application to an insurance company for a policy of insurance and there will accordingly be no separate certificate of insurance. This system reacts on the Stamp Duties Act, because at present stamp duty is payable on the certificate of insurance. The present Bill accordingly introduces a legislative scheme whereby all stamp duty will in future be payable on the application for registration or the renewal of registration. One component of the amount payable on the application will be the amount at present attracted under the Act and the other component will be the amount presently payable on the certificate of insurance. The provision for payment of a separate amount on the certificate is removed. The Bill preserves the existing provisions as to the disposition of the amount collected by way of stamp duty in respect of policies of insurance. This amount is, of course, paid into the Hospitals Fund.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the

date of commencement of the new Act; it will, of course, commence concurrently with the corresponding Motor Vehicles Act amendments. Clause 3 inserts in the principal Act definitions necessary for the purposes of the new provisions. Clause 4 amends section 42b of the principal Act. This is the major operative amendment: it strikes out the provision for separate payment of duty on the certificate of insurance and provides for payment of stamp duty on an application to register in two components. One component is to be paid in respect of registration, and the other is to be paid in respect of the policy of insurance. Consequential amendments are made to subsection (3), under which the amount collected as stamp duty in respect of policies of insurance will still be credited to the Hospitals Fund at the Treasury.

Clauses 5, 6 and 7 make consequential amendments to sections 42c, 42d and 42e of the principal Act. Clause 8 amends the second schedule to the principal Act. The item at present relating to a certificate of insurance is removed and the operative portions of that item are brought under the provisions imposing duty on applications to register motor vehicles. The stamp duty payable on the application is thus divided into two separate components, one of which relates to registration and the other to the statutory third party insurance.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

JUVENILE COURTS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 10—After clause 17 insert new clause 17a as follows:

“17a. *Report*—(1) The senior judge shall on or before the thirtieth day of September in each year submit a report to the Minister upon the administration of this Act over the period of twelve months ending on the thirtieth day of June in that year.

(2) The Minister shall, within fourteen days after receipt of the report, lay the report before Parliament if Parliament is then in session, or if Parliament is not then in session, within fourteen days after the commencement of the next session of Parliament.

(3) The report shall not be altered after it has been submitted to the Minister.”

No. 2. Page 43 (clause 75)—Leave out the clause and insert new clause 75 as follows:

“75. *Publication of matter relating to juvenile proceedings*—(1) A juvenile court, or the Supreme Court sitting upon the hearing of proceedings under this Act may, by order, suppress publication or exhibition of

such details, information, films or pictures in relation to proceedings under this Act as it thinks fit.

(2) A person who publishes or exhibits any details, information, film or picture in contravention of an order under this section shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding two hundred dollars.

(3) This section does not affect the right of a court to punish for contempt.”

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The Legislative Council's amendments are identical with the amendments which were moved in this place and which were defeated, but members of another place, doubtless without consultation with their colleagues here, nevertheless seem to have concluded that identical amendments are appropriate. In debating the Bill, I gave the reasons why in my view and in the Government's view the amendments were wrong and contrary to the spirit and policy of the Bill, and I need not occupy the Committee's time by repeating those arguments. I urge, therefore, that the amendments be disagreed to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As this move by another place gives us the opportunity of second thoughts, I am disappointed that the Attorney-General is not willing, now that he has the opportunity for second thoughts, to accept the amendments. He said, with a touch of irony, that there had been no consultation between members here and those in another place, but it is open to members in both places to scrutinize amendments that have been put on file and, if they see fit, to move them. These are good amendments for the reasons I gave when the Bill was previously in Committee.

The first amendment which has been made in another place simply provides that a report shall be made to the Minister and that that report shall be laid on the table of Parliament. This is in conformity with the convention which has grown up in this place for longer than any of us can remember. It has been breached in my knowledge only once and that was this year, when the Attorney-General in a high-handed manner and for reasons that were obviously spurious refused to make public the report of the present magistrate of the Adelaide Juvenile Court because he said that this would drag the magistrate into the dust of political controversy. That was an insult to Mr. Beerworth, because he would be the best judge of

what to put in his report as he would have information available, as he is senior enough, and as he has enough common sense to know what he is doing.

The real reason was it would have embarrassed the Government if the report had been made public. This was a most reprehensible act on the part of the Attorney-General. We tried, when the Bill was before the Committee previously, to ensure that this would not happen again. Now another place has tried to do the same thing and I do hope, in the interests of the community on a matter which is of great concern to people, that we will not reject this amendment out of hand.

Under the Bill as it was presented, there is an almost total prohibition on the reporting of individual cases. I do not argue that juveniles should be in the same position as adult offenders, but that is the position. If we do not provide for a report, we will not know what is happening generally in this field and there will be an almost complete lack of knowledge and information in the community. These amendments are trying to correct that position and to ensure, so far as it is desirable in the interests of the juvenile offenders themselves who come before the court, that the community does receive information.

Why should the Government reject that? Why does it want to hide altogether what is going on in this field? Members on this side often complain that the Government is concealing information, and members on the other side try to refute that allegation and to laugh it off; but when we get a rejection of perfectly proper amendments like this, it confirms what we say: that the Government does not want information to be freely available in the community. It has shown that in the specific instance this year about which there was a great outcry from those concerned when the Attorney-General in a high-handed fashion refused to make the report available, and now he is determined to make this the rule by law, whereas hitherto it has been merely a breach of what has been a convention. I am sorry indeed and I hope that the Committee will not accept the Attorney's motion that these amendments should be rejected. I believe it is desirable in the interests of us all that they should be accepted.

Dr. TONKIN: I support completely the remarks of the member for Mitcham. I think it was obvious and apparent to most members that the legislation as it was sent to the other place was not entirely satisfactory and I

am very pleased that these amendments have been passed there. The Attorney-General said these amendments were contrary to the spirit of the Bill, but I submit they are entirely in keeping with the spirit of the Bill. We are embarking on what could be termed an experiment with this legislation. Some provisions of this Bill have been implemented in other centres in the world. As in medicine and many other spheres of learning it is only by pooling our resources and our knowledge from all over the world that we will ever be able to tell how a specific measure is progressing and whether it is satisfactory or not.

I said previously that we in South Australia could well lead the world again in the treatment of young offenders, and I believe that this is possible. Indeed, I hope it will become so. However, we must not be afraid of disclosing the results of this programme in any way. By his obvious indifference the Attorney-General has made up his mind not to accept these amendments, but we must have progress reports and these progress reports must come from the senior judge to Parliament and to the people of South Australia. They must be available for the guidance and benefit of people throughout Australia and overseas who will be watching this move with intense interest. I know of at least four overseas centres that have asked for a copy of this legislation, and they will be watching the effect of the legislation with much interest. If we do not have a report from the judge of the juvenile court, how on earth are we going to tell as a community whether we are doing the right thing?

The welfare of the child is of supreme importance, and we must safeguard it. To do so we must know how this legislation is turning out and what effect it is having. I oppose the motion, because I believe that the amendments made by another place are extremely valuable and will add to the spirit of this legislation.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I oppose the motion because I think the amendments should be agreed to. The Attorney-General said that a judicial officer should be able to report to the Minister frankly and candidly on current issues no matter how controversial. The Attorney said that he could do this only if the report was a report that did not require publication and that there were great disadvantages in having a statutory report from a judicial officer, when by reason of the provisions of the Statute that report must be published, because the judicial

officer might either refrain from making controversial comment or involve himself and the Judiciary in an area of public controversy. Any press report of proceedings in an ordinary court will bring the judicial officer concerned into the arena of public controversy if he makes controversial statements. A judge, giving his views on a case, frequently comments specifically on the person who is accused. Indeed, he often makes comments which, through press reports, he would like brought to Parliament's attention. This can be done through open press reporting, although it will not continue if these amendments are not agreed to.

If the amendments are not agreed to, Parliament will be prevented from seeing the report made to the Minister by the judge concerned under this legislation, for that report can reach Parliament only if the Minister so desires. If the Minister thinks that the report contains a criticism of his Government or thinks that it is inappropriate for Parliament's perusal, Parliament will not, in fact, see that report unless the amendments are agreed to. This matter did not really occur to Parliament previously, because reports were published annually as a matter of course, and it is only now that, I presume, the Attorney-General considers that the latest report contains a criticism of his Government; hence his decision that Parliament had better not see the report. As shown by the action taken in another place and by what Opposition members have said on the subject, Parliament cannot be expected to like this situation. The amendments (or even only one of the amendments), if agreed to, would improve the measure; otherwise, the interests of the people of the State will be adversely affected.

Mr. RODDA: I support the view that the report should be made available to Parliament. Our young people are precious, and at present they are being subjected to permissiveness and depravity, so we should not be denied the opportunity to see a report dealing specifically with young people. I deprecate the Government's action and support the amendments.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I, too, support the amendments, which I find eminently reasonable. The amendments really seek to ensure that a course of action pursued in South Australia over many years is continued and that this precedent that the Attorney-General seeks to introduce shall not prevail. The welfare of our young people is of wide public interest, and the Attorney-General has no justification

for suppressing the publication of this report. The amendments merely seek to ensure that this report, which under the newly constituted court will be even more widely sought after, is made available to Parliament.

The Hon. L. J. KING: There is little point in even making passing reference to the speeches of the member for Mitcham and the member for Bragg, because they really did not rise much above the level of abuse, with epithets such as "reprehensible" and one or two others in which the member for Mitcham chose to indulge. That sort of speech, consisting of little more than a string of epithets, is not worth replying to. However, the member for Alexandra took the trouble to advance argument instead of abuse, and that puts his speech in a different category. He pointed out that, in defending the non-publication of the Juvenile Court magistrate's report, I had said that the publishing of the report might have the effect of bringing a judicial officer into the arena of public controversy. He pointed out that, whenever a judge's remarks were published, if they were of a controversial nature that result might be produced. He suggested that this was a common occurrence. However, I point out that good judges take great trouble to ensure that what they say does not have the effect of involving the Judiciary in public controversy. Good judges are very conscious of the importance of the Judiciary's commanding the respect of all sections of the community—

Mr. Millhouse: You are implying that Mr. Beerworth is not a good magistrate.

The Hon. L. J. KING: —and take great pains to ensure that the Judiciary is not involved by any remark or conduct of theirs in the sort of controversy that could only injure its standing in the eyes of some sections of the community. True, from time to time, some judicial officers (the lesser lights, one might say) have made statements publicly which, in my view, would have been better not made. However, good judges direct their attention to the case before them, confine their observations to the matters they are deciding and, if they decide it is appropriate to draw the attention of Parliament to the state of the law, do so in careful and moderate terms designed to ensure that the Judiciary is not involved in a controversy. Therefore, there is a great distinction between the situation which arises when a judge makes observations about a case before him and that which arises when a judicial officer makes a report about matters of policy, impending changes in the law, or

matters of a political and social nature currently being debated in the community.

When the member for Mitcham interjected, he obviously misunderstood my point completely. Mr. Beerworth made his report to the Minister, and in that report he was entitled, and indeed obliged, to put such considerations to the Minister as he thought proper. It was the Minister's responsibility to decide whether that report should be made public. Had I made the report public, I, not Mr. Beerworth, would have incurred the responsibility of involving the Judiciary in the possibility of being dragged into public controversy. That was a responsibility I was not prepared to take.

I believe that the speech of the member for Alexandra was a thoughtful contribution to the debate; perhaps for the first time in the debate we heard an Opposition member actually addressing his mind seriously to the issues involved. I ask the Committee to disagree to the amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I regret that the Attorney-General reflected as he did (in spite of his lame explanation later) on Mr. Beerworth, who is not here to defend himself. On his behalf, I reject what the Attorney said about him. The Attorney implied that Mr. Beerworth was one of the lesser lights, that he did not know what he was doing and that he had exceeded his functions. I do not believe for a moment that that is right, and it ill becomes the Attorney to make such implications in this place.

The Hon. L. J. King: I did not say that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The complete answer to the remark made by the Attorney is that Mr. Beerworth prepared his report in the expectation that it would be published, as all previous reports had been published. That is the answer to the Attorney's saying that he had to take the responsibility and decide whether the material was fit to be seen by the public and members of this place.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Really, the practice of trying to put into the mouths of other people statements they have not made and then to demolish them is a form of juvenile debating which the honourable member should long have outgrown. I did not describe Mr. Beerworth as a lesser light; I did not say he did not know what were his duties, functions and responsibilities, and the honourable member knows that perfectly well. I said that Mr. Beerworth made a report to the Minister in which he was entitled to make such observations as he thought fit, knowing that it was a report to the

Minister and that it was the Minister's responsibility to decide whether or not it should be made public. I deplore the hypocrisy of pretending that a member has made critical statements about someone outside, and then pretending to defend that person. It is deplorable that the honourable member should lower himself to that level of debating.

Mr. McANANEY: There must be something in this report that should not see the light of day. If it is not published, that is a reflection on the person who has presented it. The Attorney-General is saying that this person is too outspoken—

The Hon. L. J. King: I didn't say that.

Mr. McANANEY: There must be something in it that criticizes the Government, or perhaps the Attorney considers that the magistrate had exceeded his authority and right of expression. The public is entitled to see this report.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I repeat, I hope for the last time, that what it is appropriate for a judge to put in a report to the Minister when the Minister has the responsibility of deciding whether it will be made public is a different matter from what a judge would be entitled to put in a report that would automatically be made public. I hope the honourable member can understand that distinction.

Mr. CUMBE: The significant words are "upon the administration of this Act over the period of 12 months". The amendments provide for a report on how legislation (supported by both sides) has been operating. What is there to fear or hide? Surely the Minister should be reasonable and accede to the request, because it is in the interests of justice, members of Parliament, and persons interested in welfare to do so.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments are contrary to the spirit of the Bill.

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 2312.)

Mr. FERGUSON (Goyder): I support the Bill wholeheartedly. Perhaps it is long overdue. When I secured the adjournment of the debate, I recalled the latter part of 1946, when I was invited to be a member of a committee that considered a draft Bill which had been prepared by Sir Edgar Bean and which afterwards became the basis of the original Barley

Marketing Act that came into operation in 1947. Therefore, I have had an interest in this matter since the inception of the Act. However, little did I think then that I would be standing in this Parliament in 1971 supporting these amendments.

In 1947, the original board comprised two grower members from South Australia and one from Victoria. There was a maltsters' representative from Victoria (Mr. Smith) and Mr. Shannon was the other representative from Victoria. In 1962, I think, the membership from South Australia was increased from two to three. The board will now comprise five grower representatives.

I have always been interested in the production of barley, and my earliest sowing of grain included a portion sown to barley. Perhaps if I continue to speak about production of barley you, Sir, will tell me that this Bill deals with marketing, but I consider that the production of barley is an important adjunct to its marketing. Before 1950, barley growing in South Australia was on a comparatively minor scale. In the middle 1920's production was about 3,000,000 bushels and 10 years later it had increased to about 5,500,000 bushels. By 1947-48, production had reached about 15,500,000 bushels. But it was not until the early 1950's that the production of barley reached the figures that have remained fairly static, according to the season, over the past 10 or 15 years.

As a result of the introduction of wheat quotas in the various States, the production of barley may increase greatly throughout Australia. South Australia is by far the most important barley-producing State in Australia. In 1968-69, the acreage sown to barley in this State represented 43 per cent of the Australian total and we produced 41 per cent of the grain produced in Australia. Of the area sown, 90 per cent represented two-row barley, produced for grain. I do not know whether all members will understand what I am talking about when I refer to two-row barley. There are two types of barley (the two-row type and the six-row type) and the names are self-explanatory, although various types of barley are grown. As 90 per cent of barley grown in South Australia is two-row barley, this reflects the suitability of certain areas of the State for the production of high-quality barley. The board keeps statistical records of the high-quality barley produced in South Australia.

If one were to go to the Royal Adelaide Show and inspect the board's display, one

would see the trophies that have been presented to barleygrowers in this State for their production of the highest-quality barley produced anywhere in the world. That honour goes to Mr. Jim Honner, of Brentwood, who has been interested in barley production, who has been a member of the board for many years, but who has been more interested in the industry and in the marketing of the South Australian and Australian crops. Mr. Honner has been overseas once or twice to negotiate many barley sales on the board's behalf. To give further proof of this claim, the 1971 *South Australian Year Book*, at page 373, shows that not only does South Australia produce some of the finest-quality barley but that areas of South Australia are most suitable for its production, particularly the central division, including part of Yorke Peninsula.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about the north coast of Kangaroo Island?

Mr. FERGUSON: That area compares with Yorke Peninsula in the production of high-quality barley, although its production would be small in comparison with that of the area in the central division. I quote the following figures to show that the central division and Yorke Peninsula grow the most barley. In 1969-70, the acreage sown to barley in the central division was 474,000 acres, which produced 13,336,000 bushels. Many other areas of South Australia in latter years have grown barley, but they are not as suitable as the central division. In 1969-70, the acreage sown to barley in the Murray division was 372,000, which produced 5,581,000 bushels, but in that year the Murray lands suffered severe frosts, which reduced the estimated yield. In 1969-70, the acreage sown to barley in the Eyre division was 318,000, and that division produced 6,476,000 bushels.

The board's constitution and the Barley Marketing Act have proved to be in the real interests of the producers and the industry in general, both in South Australia and in Victoria. However, I am not so sure that all those who have been connected with the industry have loyally supported the board's operations. I suppose there are loopholes in almost any legislation and that there will always be people who will take advantage of them. I suppose that if a grower were in need of hard cash, as many South Australian primary producers are today, we could understand how he might negotiate with a buyer at perhaps a little less than he could get from the board. In these days of diversified farming, barley

is being used as fodder for pigs and other livestock. In the production of pig meat, poultry, and other livestock there is a tendency for consumers of the product to negotiate with growers for the purchase of barley in a private capacity.

I believe that clauses 4 and 8 of the Bill will help shut the gate on illegal barley sales. These clauses deal with the definition and transport of barley. Clause 4 includes growing crops and grain that may be gisted or any other grain which, in the ultimate, is sold as barley. Concern has been expressed that a crop of barley may be cut for hay, and as such it could not be offered for sale unless permission of the Barley Board was obtained. I am not concerned about this, because in these days of the wind-rowing of barley it would be quite easy for a barleygrower to wind-row his crop, have it baled and sell it, and the purchaser could thresh the barley and use it for his own purposes. I understand that stock food processing firms will not come within the ambit of this clause, because if they purchase barley for the purpose of producing their stock food they receive a permit from the board. If they buy it from another State they are within the law because of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. I do not think it is necessary for me to say more at this stage. The amendments to this Act are straight-forward, and I hope that they will be accepted by growers as their protection for the benefit of the barley industry in general. I support the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): First, I congratulate the member for Goyder on his excellent speech. He has not left much for me to say, but I should like to make a few comments. I see that the board agrees to these amendments in respect of increasing the size of the board and increasing the independence of the respective States with regard to their assessment of domestic use and with regard to their handling of their own finances. I am perhaps reading into this something that might not exist, but my fear is that this board, which since its inception has been known as the Australian Barley Board, but which has only South Australia and Victoria as participants, is now manoeuvring itself into a position in which it would be easier than before for Victoria to hive off and become independent if it wanted to. This may not be intended in this Bill, but I believe it is the import of its provisions, because it does give more independence to the two parties that make up the Australian Barley Board.

There is a tightening up of a few matters that concern the board considerably. Leasing is a practice that has been developing not only with respect to barley but also with respect to wheat as a means whereby someone who is a user of grain but who does not own land can lease the land for a price an acre from the owner, who then sows the crop and harvests it on the lessee's behalf. This has been a contravention of the Act and, if we are to support orderly marketing and to insist that no sales of this sort are made except by the consent of or through the board, this is a very necessary amendment to make; just as is the clarification of the definition of barley. I believe it has been difficult to prosecute in some instances because it was almost impossible to establish that it was in fact barley that had been used in some processed foodstuffs. This definition now makes it quite clear that anything that includes barley is, in effect, barley. If I were to try and avoid this matter by putting my barley through a hammer mill and selling it for the manufacture of pellets, under the definition of this Bill it would be clearly a contravention of the Act, as I would be selling barley and not some form of barley-based foodstuff.

Control over transport, which this Bill tries to tie up, may or may not be achieved. However, we have reached the stage where we are passing the onus of proof to the party who would be the appellant to prove that he is carrying this grain legally. I appreciate that, if the board had to try to establish where this grain came from, this would entail much work, as it would mean checking from receival points. It would be very difficult for it to prove that this grain might have been collected illegally, but this provision is a simple way of dealing with it. However, this is another case where the onus is placed on the individual to prove his innocence, and this is one of the areas where we seem to have forgotten that under British justice a person is innocent until proven guilty. I accept that there are reasons for attacking this loophole in this way, but for many reasons I regret that it has to be done this way.

I am pleased to see the inclusion of a clause to enable the reserving of funds from pool payments to assist in the provision of storage and to assist in the amortization of storage facilities. I think this is a desirable provision. I pay a tribute to one of the members of the board, Mr. H. W. Petras. I do not wish to single him out for any reason other than that he has worked tirelessly in the interests of the producer to have barley placed in bulk

storage. I think I would be right in saying that we might not have had barley in bulk storage today, with the classification system we enjoy, if it had not been for his tireless efforts, and I should like to place this on record. I believe that the Barley Board owes a lot to men of the calibre of Mr. Petras, who are prepared to give their time and effort to the industry. I believe they are doing it not only in the interests of themselves as growers but for the benefit of the growers they represent on the board. I support this Bill as being necessary legislation recommended by the board so that it can operate more efficiently.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the Bill. The situation concerning the Australian Barley Board has been well defined by previous speakers. Unfortunately, the term "Australian Barley Board" is not quite correct, as it implies all States, whereas only Victoria and South Australia are involved. However, we hope that eventually we will have an all-Australia barley-marketing board. The details of this legislation are straightforward and the provisions should be to the benefit of the industry, particularly as it may become necessary to place some restriction on barley production and to introduce quotas. Over the years, increased barley production in South Australia has not been encouraged among primary producers. This State for years produced more barley than was produced in the rest of the States combined.

In 1952-53 South Australian growers produced 25,901,684 bushels of barley, the total production for the rest of Australia at that time being only 9,143,236 bushels. However, the average production in South Australia over the past four years has been only 24,700,000 bushels (no more than what it was 20 years ago), but throughout the rest of Australia production has increased. For example, Western Australia alone last year produced 30,000,000 bushels of barley, more than was produced in South Australia which, as I have said, only a few years ago produced much more than did the rest of the States put together. The total barley production in Australia has been climbing each year to the degree that in 1969-70 it was 74,903,000 bushels, whereas 20 years ago it was 22,870,785 bushels. This represents a total increased production throughout Australia of 350 per cent, whereas in this State there has been no increase in production.

I believe that sooner or later Australian primary producers will agree that an all-

Australia barley-marketing board is necessary, especially when it may be found necessary under orderly marketing to restrict production. However, the production of South Australian growers, who in the past have produced the best barley in the world, will be based on a quota far below what it would have been had the barley industry in this State been encouraged in line with the encouragement given in the other States. Legislation is soon to be introduced in connection with an oat-marketing authority. Whilst I support orderly marketing to the hilt, I hope that the growers of this State will see that such an authority consists of capable and competent men.

Previous speakers have referred to the provision in this Bill which will go a long way towards stopping illegal trafficking in barley. In addition to the problem of over-quota wheat, illegal trafficking has been taking place in the barley industry for some time, but I consider that the provision contained in clause 8 will have some effect in placing responsibility on carriers who are involved in the illegal movement of barley. New subsection (1b) provides:

In proceedings for an offence that is a contravention of subsection (1a) of this section it shall lie upon the defendant to prove that the barley, in relation to which it is alleged that the offence was committed, was not bought in contravention of subsection (1) of this section.;

This is one aspect of the Bill that I have examined closely, as members, especially those on this side, view with concern any provision of this kind. We do not like the situation in which a person is considered to be guilty and must prove his innocence. However, having conferred on this matter with my colleagues, I consider that the provision is justified. It should not be difficult for a grower to clear himself in respect of any barley that he may be accused of obtaining illegally. I believe that this provision, which at some stage created doubt, is in order.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill, and I support most of the sentiments expressed by my colleagues. I have the pleasure of representing a district that produces a large quantity of barley. Unfortunately, over the years growers in the northern part of my district have been penalized through high freight differentials, and only this year have they had the opportunity to use the facilities at Thevenard for shipping their barley. I was interested to hear the remarks of the member for Mallee in praise of Mr. Petras, because he was one person, on the Barley Board who, when I

recently had the pleasure of taking a deputation to the board, was vehement in his opposition to growers in this part of the State having the same rights and using the same facilities as those in other parts of South Australia. This apparently being an occasion to throw a few bouquets, I thought I would correct the record.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member should speak to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I support the Bill, which is purely a machinery measure. I am pleased to see that the Barley Board intends to put funds aside for the occasions when only a small sum of money is collected in tolls, so that silo construction will not in any way be jeopardized. However, I am concerned about one provision in the Bill: I believe that if a farmer were to cut some of his standing crop of barley and bale it for hay he would have to obtain permission from the Barley Board before he could dispose of it. I believe that that provision is not warranted. I realize that the board would not put anything in a grower's way, but I do not believe that he should have to go to all the trouble that might arise. My district, like that of the member for Mallee, suffers at times from frosts, when growers have to cut their standing crops, and I think that they may be put to some unwarranted trouble in this regard. As I know that this measure and similar measures have been requested by the United Farmers and Graziers, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Constitution of Australian Barley Board."

Mr. FERGUSON: When I referred earlier to the personnel of the Barley Board, I am not sure whether I referred to the Hon. Sir Glen Pearson but, if I did not, I do so now. Before he entered Parliament, Sir Glen was a member of the committee that considered the original draft Bill for this legislation.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—"Accounts and audit."

Mr. FERGUSON: This provides for separate accounting by the respective States. I understand that the request for this provision was made by the grower organization in Victoria when the relevant legislation was reviewed in that State. As the member for Mallee has said, perhaps this is a result of the increased

production that has taken place in Victoria. This could be a good thing not only in regard to our Barley Board; if an all-Australia Barley Board were set up, it would be necessary for all States to have separate accounting. I wish to pay a tribute to Mr. Saint and Mr. Humphrey.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to speak along those lines.

Mr. NANKIVELL: For a long time Victoria wanted to sell a greater proportion of its crop on the home market rather than have it pooled with South Australia's crop. It may be for that reason that this provision is to the advantage of growers in Victoria rather than to the advantage of growers as a whole. Victoria has much less surplus of barley on a percentage basis than has South Australia. If it is given the right to determine its own domestic usage, it can determine that a larger percentage of its barley will go into the home market at home consumption price, leaving less to go into the pool to be sold under the normal sales arrangements of the Australian Barley Board.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I cannot say categorically whether that is the case, and I cannot find any reference to this in the docket. I understand that the Victorians were fairly emphatic about the request. I am told that had South Australian growers become sticky about the matter the Victorians might have gone off independently anyway.

Mr. VENNING: The move for this provision has come from the Victorian growers. About 20 years ago, when much barley was produced, we had to look for an export market. Victoria has increased its production. About three or four years ago, the board agreed that the first advance to the Victorian barleygrowers would be 10c more than the advance to South Australian growers. The provision in their favour was made to satisfy them so that we could still hold the marketing authority together. We hope eventually to mould this into an all-Australia Barley Board so that there will not be competition between the States for sales overseas.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Duty of board to market barley."

Mr. FERGUSON: I am glad this clause has been included because often, particularly at the end-of-season selling, many barley-growers complain bitterly about the fact that

they have to have regard to feed requirements in South Australia and Victoria. This clause will enable each State to look after its own requirements.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 13) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT
BILL (SEAT BELTS)**

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 26, at 2 p.m.