

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 13, 1974

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

PETITION: LOCAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS presented a petition signed by 323 residents of the District Council of Peake expressing dissatisfaction with the first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and praying that the Legislative Council would reject any legislation to implement the recommendations of the Royal Commission in respect of the Peake district.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS**STRATHALBYN PRIMARY SCHOOL**

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I refer to a letter in yesterday's *Advertiser* which gives details of the appalling conditions of the infants section of Strathalbyn Primary School—for example, overcrowding, with 26 children in a classroom measuring 5.8 metres by 5.5 metres. The staff, according to the letter, is not much better off, the Assistant Headmaster having his office in an unsealed, unlined, corrugated iron enclosure at the end of a corridor. First, is it planned to bring this school up to the standard of the schools in the Minister's own electoral district? Secondly, is any renovation at the school planned, and, if it is, what is the date of its commencement?

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: On July 23 I asked whether the Minister of Local Government would consider a cooling-off period to allow people to assess the report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas and to allow time for further evidence to be assessed by the Minister. The Minister did not agree to my suggestion, as can be seen from his reply in *Hansard*. A report in the *South-Eastern Times* of August 8 states:

Councils which are dissatisfied with the recommendations in the local government boundaries report have been invited to lodge their objections with the Royal Commission. The Minister of Local Government (Mr. Geoff Virgo) told Parliament on Wednesday that the Chairman of the commission was willing to receive written submissions from councils and others, who objected to the report's recommendations. Mr. Virgo said Friday, August 30, would be the last day for receipt of submissions for the consideration of the commission.

The Minister now appears to have changed his attitude, but the time allowed for councils to present reasoned appeals (August 30, according to the press report) is quite ridiculous. Because his colleague in another place has changed his mind on the question of appeals, will the Minister of Health ask him to extend to a more realistic period the time for lodging such appeals?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the Leader's question to my colleague.

RURAL RECONSTRUCTION

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Acting Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: My question is about rural reconstruction, a subject that has not been mentioned in this Council for some time, but I have no doubt that we will hear more about it soon. My question relates to interest rates on rural reconstruction loans. Over the past few months we have seen building society interest rates and current mortgage rates almost double, and there seems to be some concern about whether such a change has occurred in rural reconstruction loans. Some development loans have interest rates that are now almost 14 per cent. Can the Minister say whether any alterations have been made to interest rates on existing loans granted either for rural reconstruction or for farm build-up? If they have, what is the current interest rate for existing loans and what is the current interest rate for new loans? If interest rates have increased, is this likely to lead to further problems for farmers who have already been assisted? If an existing borrower is financially embarrassed by the increase in interest rates, what arrangements will be made to cover the problem? Does the Government intend to ensure that existing borrowers are not forced into financial difficulties because of increases in commitments beyond the control of the borrower?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will obtain the information for the honourable member and bring down a reply.

CONTROLLED ACCESS ROADS

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: Under the Highways Act, roads may be proclaimed as controlled access roads. When any such road is so proclaimed, it is illegal to drive stock on or alongside it. Problems have arisen when such roads have been proclaimed as controlled access roads and when farms are split by the road, the farmer having some land on one side of the road and some land on the other side. In certain cases applications have been made to the Commissioner of Highways for a permit to drive stock across roads in such circumstances, and the Commissioner has replied, correctly, in terms of the Act as it now stands, that section 30e (f) provides:

Any person who uses a controlled access road for movement of livestock except by transport in a motor vehicle in accordance with the provision of this Act and any regulations made in that behalf shall be guilty of an offence...

Will the Minister ask his colleague to consider amending the legislation so that it will be possible for the Commissioner, in proper circumstances, to issue permits to enable people to drive stock across controlled access roads?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the question to my colleague.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: In reply to a question I had asked previously regarding the refurbishing of members' rooms at Parliament House, I was told last week that the

major portion of the works being undertaken at Parliament House was for maintenance and upgrading, and that refurbishing was not included in the existing approval. If no approval has been given for refurbishing, will the Minister please ascertain under what authority the upgrading and refurbishing of the Premier's suite in Parliament House was undertaken?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to the Minister of Works and bring down a reply.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On July 25 I asked the Minister of Agriculture, as Leader of the Government in this Chamber, questions about the renovation work being carried out at Parliament House. In November last year I was told that \$1 720 000 had been set aside for the renovations. I indicated that the work must be behind schedule, and asked the Minister to obtain a new time schedule and to say whether the money provided for the work was insufficient and, if so, what the total expenditure was expected to be. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Minister of Works states:

As the honourable member is probably aware, the renovation work to Parliament House was late in commencing. For this reason, and because of variations to the original project, it is now expected that the total renovation construction work will be completed by Easter, 1975. Originally, funds for the basic scheme were approved to the extent of \$1 720 000. The estimated cost of completing this project has risen to \$2 800 000. This increase is largely attributable to the rapid escalation of building costs and approved requests by Parliamentary authorities for additional work.

GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIR

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: As the Minister would be well aware, the strike at the South Australian Meat Corporation abattoir at Gepps Cross is causing much trouble throughout the country. I notice that Commissioner Pryke of the South Australian Industrial Commission has ordered the men at the abattoir to go back on the job this morning. I also understand the men were to have held a meeting at 8 a.m. today to decide whether they would do as they had been told. Has the Minister any up-to-date information on whether Commissioner Pryke's instruction has been carried out and whether the men have returned to work?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The information I have received is that work commenced as normal at 10.30 a.m. today.

TELEPHONE DIRECTORIES

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of you, Mr. President.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I understand that the city edition of the current telephone directory is not yet available. However, it has come to my notice that the country editions (or at least some of them) have been available for some time. Probably as a result of the reconstruction that has happened in this place, some of the country editions available to honourable members are more than a year old whilst others seem to have been lost in the moving around of materials. Would you, Sir, endeavour to get the Post Office to supply current editions of country directories?

The PRESIDENT: As soon as telephone directories are received they are distributed to honourable members. If this has not been done, I shall inquire into what has happened.

PRIMARY INDUSTRY

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Attorney-General to my question of July 23 regarding primary industry?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs states:

The only secondary industries subject to control under the South Australian Prices Act, 1948-1973, are those that produce goods or services declared under the Act. There is also a number of additional items subject to price justification where agreement exists with a number of secondary industries that, before prices are increased, at least 14 days notice will be given to the branch together with reasons therefor and cost information in support of the proposed increases.

One of the limitations of State price control is that it is virtually impossible to fix interstate manufacturers' selling prices; however, all industries with annual sales of over \$20 000 000 are subject to the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth Prices Justification Tribunal. With regard to machinery manufacturers, many are based either in other States or overseas and there is little indication that South Australian manufacturers are making excessive profits.

The Commissioner has furnished lists of the more important items in each category referred to, and I seek leave to have them incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

ITEMS

A. Items on which maximum prices or margins are fixed:

Groceries—Foodstuffs:

Bread
Flour
Breakfast foods
Infants and invalids foods
Soap, toilet or laundry
Country milk
Meat pies and pasties

Clothing:

Infants', boys', girls', youths' and maids' clothing and garments, including school and college wear
Men's working attire

Footwear:

Children's, youths', and maids' school footwear
Working boots

Petroleum products:

Including petrol, lubricating oils, distillate, furnace oil, heating oil and kerosene

School requisites:

Kitbags, satchels and cases
Exercise books

Miscellaneous:

Quarry products
Superphosphate
Sulphuric acid
Gas
Cartage
Feed wheat, bran and pollard
Some stock and poultry foods
Funeral services

B. Items subject to prices justification:

Aerated waters
Ice cream
Liquor
Cement
Clay bricks
Concrete bricks and blocks
Concrete roof tiles
Terra cotta roof tiles
Cement pipes
Earthenware pipes
Galvanized steel sheets
Galvanized piping
Glass
Paint
Timber
Electrical rates
Plumbing rates
Dental fees
Medical services

SUPERPHOSPHATE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on July 30 regarding superphosphate supplies?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I contacted Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers Limited following the honourable member's inquiry and was informed that the effects of rationing of superphosphate in 1973-74 would have been felt mainly by those who either placed orders late or who deferred giving the necessary delivery instructions. The latter could have been caused by unavailability of contractors or excessively wet conditions on the farm. It was only after March 25, 1974, that it was found necessary to apply any restrictions, when it became evident that later users such as cereal growers would otherwise not receive their share. At that stage, the quantities of undelivered orders were reduced by 10 per cent provided that each customer would receive not less than the equivalent of his 1972-73 usage. Also, new orders were subsequently accepted only at the 1972-73 level. After April 22, new orders were deferred altogether and orders in hand were satisfied to 75 per cent with the balance deferred until all had received their proportion. Delivery of the final 25 per cent was then severely upset by industrial disruption that occurred from May 31 to and after June 30. I am informed that the company has always supplied a small quantity of superphosphate to Victoria. There is always a strongly competitive market between the two States, and this year that market was supplied to a greater than usual extent from Victoria because, after applying its own form of rationing in Victoria, excessively wet conditions in the western districts caused severe curtailment of deliveries to that area from Portland, thus making available much greater quantities to be sent into the south-eastern parts of South Australia. The company states that during the 1973-74 season it gave more than usual publicity to the need for farmers to place their orders in time for it to assess the demand. Despite this, many did not do so until the season was well advanced, and it is not possible to withhold supply to regular interstate customers while awaiting local orders which may not eventuate. It recognizes the need to satisfy the local market first and will do so to the best of its ability. Clearly, however, the situation is not a simple one. Details of superphosphate consignments to South Australia from other States are difficult to obtain. My inquiries have elicited that reciprocal trade, particularly between Victoria and South Australia, has been going on for many years and the two companies mainly concerned have representatives stationed in each State, one from Victoria at Bordertown and one from South Australia at Horsham. Year in, year out the trade probably balances. I hope that the information I have given adequately answers the honourable member's question and also satisfies the inquiry of the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill. If the Hon. Mr. Dawkins requires further details, I suggest he may care to consult Sir Arthur, who I believe is a director of Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers Limited.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: As a matter of personal explanation, I should like to say that I am not a director of Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilizers Limited.

SEAS AND SUBMERGED LANDS ACT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: In the *Advertiser* of July 7 the Premier is reported to have said that South Australia would challenge the validity of the Seas and Submerged Lands Act in the High Court and that he was reluctant to take the action but, in the circumstances, he had no alternative because similar action had been instituted against the Commonwealth by other State Governments. According to the view expressed in that article, does the Government of South Australia still intend to institute proceedings in the High Court to challenge the constitutionality of the Commonwealth legislation?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The answer to that question is "Yes", but I will refer it to the Premier and get a more specific answer than I have already given. However, I cannot say at this stage when the matter will be contested. If I can obtain more information, I will do so.

HOSPITALS DEPARTMENT

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about parking facilities at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: There are no immediate plans to extend the Bee-line bus service, because of the lack of buses. When more buses become available, consideration will be given to additional Bee-line type services. Present indications suggest that a service between the railway station, Royal Adelaide Hospital and Victoria Square would be given a high priority.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about the Hospitals Department?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: First, increased costs to the Hospitals Department relating directly to recent determinations made in respect of awards for hospital staff are: (a) from March 1, 1974, to June 30, 1974, \$8 672 000; (b) since June 30, 1974, estimated, \$10 000 000. Secondly, as regards increase in income from the recently announced increased charges to patients in Government hospitals, at current levels of occupancy the estimated increase is \$3 900 000. However, during 1974-75, the increase in fees will be for 10 months only and, owing to the time lag in actual receipt, the real increase in receipts during 1974-75 will be about \$3 000 000. I said previously that, although I was only guessing at the figure, I thought from memory that the estimated cost to patients would be about \$4 000 000: actually it will be \$3 900 000.

TAXI-CABS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In the last session of Parliament regulations were laid on the table concerning the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board and its desire to have all taxis in Adelaide fitted with a new taxi sign, to be installed directly on the roof of each taxi to indicate whether the vehicle was vacant or engaged; also, it was to be connected electrically, I understand, with the meter. At that time it was claimed, during the discussion in this Council about whether the regulations should be allowed or disallowed by this Council, that this was an urgently required modern facility. The regulations were not disallowed. As they are dated December, 1973, and as it appears that some taxis now have this new sign and some have not, why has the board not

proceeded with the fitting of all taxis with the sign; and, if there are any reasons for the delay, what are the reasons?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek the information from my colleague and bring back a report.

PREMIER'S OVERSEA VISIT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to a question I asked on August 1 about the Premier's oversea visit?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I refer the honourable member to the reply given by the Premier on August 6 in another place to a question on notice concerning this matter. That reply was as follows:

It would be neither desirable nor possible to give to Parliament a diary account of all the matters studied. The conclusions arrived at on several matters have already been stated. In other cases the information gleaned will be detailed when the relevant topics are before the House.

PETRO CHEMICAL INDUSTRY

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On August 1 I asked the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Development and Mines, whether a report could be obtained on how the Government intended to finance the provision of housing, hospitals and other ancillary services at the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. Has he a reply?

The Hon. T. M. CASBY: The Minister of Development and Mines states:

The South Australian Government agrees that there will be a need for a considerable housing project to be undertaken in addition to other social infrastructures to cater for the needs of the staff of the Redcliff petro-chemical plant. These matters are currently the subject of negotiation with the Australian Government regarding finance. Whether these negotiations will be completed before the introduction of the indenture Bill is difficult to predict at this stage.

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

1. For each of the recommended areas of study detailed in section 5 of the plan for environmental study published by the Environment and Conservation Department for the proposed petro-chemical industry at Red Cliff Point:

- (a) What studies are presently being undertaken?
- (b) When did the studies commence?
- (c) What authority or department is responsible for the study?
- (d) When will the findings be available to the Government?
- (e) Will the studies be presented to Parliament?

2. What studies are to be undertaken into the effect and quantity of seepage of effluent water from the proposed ponding area to gulf waters?

3. What studies are to be undertaken as to the effect of atmospheric emissions to all forms of life?

4. Will the studies reveal the degree of toxicity of all substances discharged, whether to land, sea or air?

5. Will the studies reveal the quantities of toxic substances to be discharged?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

1. This answer follows the sequence and numbering used in the study plan referred to. In relation to (c), it should be noted that all studies are being carried out for the petro-chemical consortium which is utilizing the services of the various individuals and organizations specified.

Major Process Plant and Site (5.1)—5.1.1 and 5.1.2:

- (a) Physiography, pedology, geology, hydrology.
- (b) Early July, 1974.
- (c) Mines Department.
- (d) Early September, 1974. Completion date for remainder of study not yet finalized.
- (e) Yes.

5.1.3:

- (a) Microclimatology.
- (b) Planning finalized.
- (c) Horace Lamb Institute of Oceanography.
- (d) As available.
- (e) Yes.

5.1.4:

- (a) Fauna.
- (b) March, 1973.
- (c) Environment and Conservation Department; Field Naturalists Society of South Australia; Waite Agricultural Institute; University of Adelaide.
- (d) As data are obtained.
- (e) Yes.

5.1.5:

- (a) Flora.
- (b) July, 1974.
- (c) The Botanic Gardens. Herbarium of South Australia.
- (d) Preliminary report by early September, 1974, and final report by December, 1974.
- (e) Yes.

5.1.6:

- (a) Land use.
- (b) Formal study commenced July, 1974, but considerable background data were available much before this date.
- (c) Lands Department, Agriculture Department, Environment and Conservation Department.
- (d) Formal summarizing report will be completed by early September.
- (e) Yes.

5.1.7:

- (a) Historical.
- (b) January, 1974.
- (c) Environment and Conservation Department.
- (d) When finalized.
- (e) Yes.

5.1.8:

- (a) Archaeology.
- (b) 1973.
- (c) Environment and Conservation Department.
- (d) When finalized.
- (e) Yes.

Sources of Raw Materials (5.2)—See answers given above.

5.2.1 and 5.2.2: Physiography, pedology, geology, hydrology.

5.2.3 Fauna.

5.2.4 Flora.

5.2.5 Land use.

5.2.6 Historical features.

5.2.7 Archaeological sites.

5.2.8 Amenities, to be undertaken by the Environment and Conservation Department.

The salt source is not yet finalized. Therefore, the above studies have not yet been undertaken in detail for this raw material.

Gulf Waters (5.3):

- (a) Gulf waters.
- (b) Surveys commenced September, 1973.
- (c) Fisheries Department.
- (d) Preliminary survey published March, 1974. Completion of other studies will vary depending on their nature. Monitoring will continue after construction has commenced.
- (e) Yes.

Marine Loading Facility (5.4): The design of this facility has not yet been finalized but an underwater study along the probable site has been made. The design of the facility will be made taking account of the results of that study and the wellknown necessity to ensure that water movements are unimpeded.

Pipeline Routes (5.5): Detailed studies not yet commenced although preliminary surveys on possible routes have been undertaken and discussions held.

Surrounding Urban Areas and Facilities (5.6)

- (a) A large amount of work is being carried out in this general area of interest, including input from the Environment and Conservation Department, Community Welfare Department, Education Department, South Australian Housing Trust, Aboriginal Affairs Department, and Public Health Department, among others.

(b) 1973.

(c) See (a).

(d) As available.

(e) Yes.

2. This question assumes that there will be seepage of effluent water from a proposed ponding area to gulf waters. This need not occur from any ponding system, and care will be taken to ensure that it does not occur at Redcliff. As described in paragraph 3.2.2 (b) of the plan for environmental study, the effluent to be subjected to biological oxidation treatment will first receive primary treatment to remove oil and suspended solids. The biological oxidation treatment involves the use of holding lagoons or basins which can and will be sealed, most probably with concrete, although other materials could be used, so obviating seepage.

3. This all-embracing and non-specific question cannot be answered completely. A vast amount of study has been carried out and numerous books and reports have been published on the effect of atmospheric emissions on all forms of life. The Report of the Committee on Environment in South Australia, a copy of which is in the Parliamentary Library, gives some details of the kinds of problem which can arise from emissions to the atmosphere (pages 13-20), of the meteorological associations with such problems (pages 20-28), and of the effects of a damaged air environment (pages 28-30). The Government's role in such areas of research is likely to be restricted to examining areas of the State in which atmospheric emissions are known, or can reasonably be expected, to occur. Studies of a more general nature are likely to continue to be carried out in universities, colleges and other research institutes throughout the world. On the basis of such studies, emission limits are laid down and enforced. In conjunction with such a programme, a monitoring system is usually set up, as in Adelaide, to give information on the levels of ambient air pollutants and the rates at which they dissipate.

4. The degree of toxicity of an extremely wide range of substances is already known in relation to an extremely wide range of animals and plants. Studies of this nature have been, and continue to be, carried out in many countries of the world. It is on the basis of such data that discharge levels are established and controlled. But a monitoring system is also required to ensure that the discharge levels continue to satisfactorily protect the environment.

5. Yes—to ensure that the environmental protection requirements and standards are being met. Specifically, the quantities and types of effluent to be permitted and their toxicity at the required level of dilution on discharge to sea, air and land will be published.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (on notice):

1. What is the total proposed production of ethylene-dichloride at the Redcliff petro-chemical project?

2. In what form is this material to be exported?

3. What quantity of ethylene-dichloride reaching the gulf waters would be considered dangerous to the ecology?

4. If quantities of ethylene-dichloride reach gulf waters, what methods can be used to remove this substance?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The replies are as follows:

1. The total proposed production of ethylene-dichloride (EDC) at Redcliff is 600 000 tonnes a year.

2. EDC is a liquid and will be exported by sea in tankers.

3. Studies are being undertaken to determine toxicity levels for EDC.

4. A large spillage of EDC to the gulf would constitute a major catastrophe although trace quantities will naturally oxidize. Every measure will therefore be taken to prevent the occurrence of any spillage but as a security precaution the consortium is preparing contingency measures for the long odds of such an event occurring.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dairy Industry Act, 1928-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is the first of three measures intended to enable a new dairy product "dairy blend" to be lawfully marketed in this State. This new foodstuff, in broad terms, consists of an admixture of milk fat in the form of cream and vegetable oils. The product has the flavour and nutritious value of butter but, because it is easier to spread, it appears likely to have a wide public acceptance.

Honourable members will be aware that for a number of years the legislation of this State and indeed of all the States of Australia has had the effect of prohibiting the addition of vegetable oils to butter. It is in the context of this legislative framework that appropriate amendments must be made to permit the marketing of this product which, incidentally, was developed in the Agriculture Department's Northfield laboratories. This Bill amends the principal Act (the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended), and the contents of this measure can be best considered by an examination of its clauses.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This clause is most important, as all the amending Bills giving effect to the scheme must necessarily come into operation on the same day. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "dairy blend", and I commend this definition to members' closest attention. So far as possible, the definition of "dairy blend" is to be uniform throughout the States of Australia. The manifest advantages of this approach are, I suggest, obvious. In addition, by an amendment to this section, dairy blend is included in the definition of "dairy produce" and, by and large, the provisions of the Act applicable to butter are extended to touch on dairy blend.

In addition, two minor metric amendments are made to this section. Clause 4 amends section 21 of the principal Act by extending the grading provisions relating to butter to include dairy blend. Clause 5 amends section 22 of the principal Act and makes a metric amendment which is self-explanatory. Clause 6 amends section 28 of the principal Act by extending the power to make regulations to cover the dairy blend. Finally, I would indicate that once this product comes on the market it may not necessarily be marketed in the name "dairy blend": it is likely that the trade name "dairy spread" will be used.

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

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Margarine Act, 1939-1973. Read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is 'the last of the three measures that will facilitate the marketing of dairy blend. The effect of this short Bill is to take "dairy blend" as defined for the purposes of the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended, out of the definition of "margarine". As a result, the Margarine Act will have no application in relation to dairy blend. In addition, opportunity has been taken to amend section 16 of the Margarine Act, which deals with the distance by which butter and margarine factories must be separated, to make this section consistent with section 22 of the Dairy Industry Act, as that section is proposed to be amended.

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

NATURAL GAS PIPELINES AUTHORITY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

That the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority Act Amendment Bill, 1973, be restored to the Notice Paper as a lapsed Bill, pursuant to section 57 of the Constitution Act, 1934-1974.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Several important developments have occurred since this measure was introduced into the Council in the last session of Parliament. The legislation was in fact introduced with a view to facilitating these developments, but it was not possible to obtain its passage at the close of the last session. These developments have now come about and, although the present state of the Act has not proven an insuperable obstacle, the amendments will greatly assist in tying up what loose ends remain. The honourable Mr. DeGaris, in speaking to this Bill on March 27, 1974, stressed the fact that the producers would, if the measure passed into law, be denied representation on the authority, even though they would continue to carry the financial burden for the development. Mr. DeGaris stated:

In my opinion the producers have a right to representation, if for no other reason than to have some say in the exercise of proper control over expenditures. The expenditures on the pipeline are wholly the responsibility of the producers.

As a result of the developments which have taken place since that time, that is no longer the case and, as a result, the whole argument falls to the ground. Under a new agreement that has been entered into by the producers and

the Government, the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority has become the monopoly purchaser of all methane produced on the South Australian field. A field gate price of 24c a million British thermal units has been established to operate from May 1, this year. The authority in turn is selling the gas to the primary consumers (the South Australian Gas Company and the Electricity Trust of South Australia) and certain industrial establishments, and is responsible for all future developmental expenditure.

As part of a *quid pro quo*, the producers have agreed to review their exploration commitments and to enter into an agreement whereby they will spend \$15 000 000 on exploration for new gas in the Cooper Basin over a five-year period, with a minimum of \$2 000 000 spent in any one 12-month period. Agreement has been reached by the Mines Department as to the specifics of the first year's programme. In the light of all these developments I submit that the arguments raised in the Council when the matter was first introduced are no longer relevant. Concerning membership of the board, it is possible that somebody intimately associated with the producing interests will serve on the reconstituted authority, but this will arise not as a matter of right but as a matter of convenience.

The PRESIDENT: I point out to the honourable Minister that the second reading of this Bill has been moved previously and that, with the leave of the Council, his remarks will merely form part of the second reading debate.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: Very well, Mr. President.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills. The three persons representing the House of Assembly on such a committee would be the Hons. D. A. Dunstan and L. J. King, and Mr. Chapman.

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

That the House of Assembly's request be agreed to and that the members of the Legislative Council to be members of the Joint Committee be the Chief Secretary, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, and the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, of whom two shall form the quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

Motion carried.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL

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

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides in the usual manner for the payment of compensation to any person who suffered loss by reason of the actions of eradication officers in relation to those areas of the State affected by the various outbreaks of fruit fly during the early months of this year. The districts involved were Kent Town, North Adelaide, Parkside, Rosslyn Park, St. Peters, Hindmarsh, Hillcrest, Highbury, and Vale Park. All in all, eleven proclamations were made, and it is expected that the total cost of compensation could be about \$50 000.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 directs that this new Act be read in conjunction with the Fruit Fly Act. Clause 3 sets out the basis for entitlement to compensation.

Clause 4 provides that any claim for compensation must be lodged with the Fruit Fly Compensation Committee no later than August 31, 1974.

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

EMERGENCY POWERS BILL

The House of Assembly intimated that it had disagreed to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council do not insist on its amendments.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): After that impassioned plea in putting so very clearly the case why the Council should not insist on its amendments, I wonder whether the Minister would report progress at this stage to enable me to consider moving an amendment alternative to those made by the Council to the Bill.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The only reason why I merely moved formally that the Council do not insist on its amendments was that I had not been informed by the Leader that he wanted to move a further amendment, although I had heard on the grapevine that he did. If he is not satisfied with the way I handle the business in this Council he should say so, and not make snide remarks. I mean that quite genuinely. I am quite willing to report progress so that the Leader can draft a further amendment.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He might do a Dean Brown on you.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: He can if he likes. I do not like snide remarks at any time from anyone. Nevertheless, I am willing to co-operate in the best way I can, and I ask the Leader to do likewise. If we are to get somewhere during this session we must have the co-operation of every honourable member at all times. I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BOATING BILL

Order of the Day, Government Business, No. 1: Report of Select Committee to be brought up.

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be extended until Tuesday, September 24, 1974.

Motion carried.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dairy Produce Act, 1934-1946. Read a first time.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is the second of three measures intended to facilitate the marketing of dairy blend. The principal Act, the Dairy Produce Act, is the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is established. One of the main functions of this board is to recommend and promulgate quotas for intrastate sales of butter and

cheese within the framework of the Commonwealth Dairy Produce Equalization Scheme. I am sure that all honourable members who have an interest in this field will be aware of the application of this Act to butter and cheese. Shortly, the effect of the amendments proposed by this Bill is to extend the application of the Dairy Produce Act to dairy blend.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of dairy blend in terms of the definition inserted in the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended. This clause also extends the definition of dairy produce to encompass the product dairy blend. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing that, in the constitution of the Dairy Produce Board, manufacturers of dairy blend will be recognized. Clause 5 amends section 15a of the principal Act by extending the powers of the board to reporting on the wholesale price of dairy blend in the same way as it reports on the wholesale price of butter, and the powers of the Governor under this clause are consequently amended. Clause 6 amends section 16 of the principal Act and gives the board power to determine quotas for dairy blend in the same manner as it determines quotas for butter and cheese. Clause 7 amends section 17 of the principal Act and is an amendment to the penalty sections consequential on the increased powers of the board. In addition, paragraphs (6), (c) and (e) of this clause effect metric amendments. Clause 8 is a consequential amendment.

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

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 8. Page 359.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the Bill. At the outset I congratulate the Minister of Agriculture and the Egg Board, and particularly the committee that worked so hard to bring these amendments before the Council and to sell the concept of orderly marketing to the industry. This legislation is one of the successes of the Minister's administration. It is a measure the industry required. Before the Act came into operation there was much friction in the industry. The appointment of Mr. Ray Fuge as Chairman of the Egg Board and the subsequent changes made in the board's structure, as well as the talents of these people, ensured that the Minister was properly advised about this matter.

The opportunity was taken to keep growers fully informed about what was happening in the industry, the result being that a happy arrangement was reached from those negotiations. The board has been operating for some months now and seems to have settled down well, with the exception of the three matters dealt with by the Bill. The amendment regarding the number of hens that should be exempted is a logical alteration. As has been pointed out, the previous provision was an oversight that militated against a person who had, say, up to 40 hens. It did not affect the large operator.

The second amendment of consequence relates to sections 13 (3) and 20 (3), which deal with group I and group II licences provided for in the Act. It was not expected that everyone would be able to take advantage of the provisions of the Act, and the 28 days allowed has proved to be insufficient time. The Minister accepted the recommendation, and this provision will operate from a date to be fixed by the Minister, thus giving everyone an equal opportunity.

Only about nine people are involved in this matter; they are all known, and they will be dealt with by the committee set up under the Act for licensing and relicensing.

As soon as these people fulfil the necessary requirements to qualify for the other type of licence, this amendment will not be necessary. However, it seems to me that it is good to leave the matter at the discretion of the committee, because it will save time and trouble in having to come back to Parliament. The measure cannot be used improperly, because the people are known, and I imagine their names will be available to any honourable member who wishes to approach the Minister. The main amendment is contained in new section 20 (a), which deals with groupings. I am happy about the amendments of the Bill and pleased that the egg industry seems at last to be settling down and getting somewhere.

The industry was in a shocking condition in the late 1960's. In fact, it was in absolute chaos. I am glad we did not take the advice of the experts who would have cost the industry well in excess of \$1 000 000 in setting up a pulping plant in South Australia. Had that been done, the plant would have been lying idle and would have been a debt left with the growers. Eventually the Government would have had to come to its aid and either put the obligation squarely on the producers left in the industry or written it off. It is indeed heartening to see the industry going ahead as it is at present.

This Council is obligated to the Hon. Mr. Burdett for the tremendous amount of time he has spent in researching this matter. He presented a clear dissertation on the matter. I congratulate him also for the work he did during the meetings held throughout the State in order properly to apprise the producers of the situation. I appreciate the work done by the United Farmers and Graziers poultry section and the Hon. Mr. Burdett, who have done much to bring this legislation to fruition.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I thank both the Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Hon. Mr. Story for their contributions to the debate. I, too, express my approval of the work done by the Hon. Mr. Burdett not only in this measure but also in the measures that came before the Council last year. Without his help, producers might have been pushing uphill in getting the legislation through this year. As I said last year, the honourable member has done a great service to the egg industry in South Australia, and I am sure it is much appreciated. Although the amendments are minor, they are of infinite value to the industry if it is to continue to have orderly marketing of eggs in South Australia. I am sure that the amendments contained in this Bill were not foreshadowed last year when this legislation was introduced, but I gave an undertaking then to the egg industry that if amendments needed to be made they would be brought before Parliament as soon as possible so that the Act could be brought up to date and put into true perspective. Once again, I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Licensing Committee may allot base quotas in special cases."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: In his introductory remarks, the Minister said that this clause was introduced to assist eight or nine cases out of a total of 1 678 farmers who sought a base quota under the group 2 classification, and that the insertion of new section 20a would assist this small number of people who otherwise, under the original

measure, would not be eligible. The Hon. Mr. Burdett has looked at this closely and checked that about nine people are involved.

When I reviewed the Bill, I wondered whether new section 20a needed to be made subject to Ministerial approval or, alternatively, whether the Review Tribunal might need to have some say, because the person, being one of these nine people, who expected to obtain a base quota after the Bill became law might not receive it. In those circumstances such a person should have a right to appeal to someone to have justice done. I understand that the persons concerned already know their case will be considered favourably if this Bill passes. The best way in which I can be satisfied on this matter is to ask the Minister whether he can give an undertaking that, if this Bill passes, this small group will obtain quotas.

If the Bill does pass, they can be considered favourably by the Licensing Committee under new section 20a. Would the Minister comment on that matter? I should not like it to happen that one of these people would go to his local member or perhaps directly to the Minister in a month or so and say, "I was expecting to receive a base quota from the Licensing Committee; I am eligible but, although I was expecting to obtain that quota, I have now not been given a quota." He would be most upset in those circumstances.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY (Minister of Agriculture): I am sure the fears expressed by the honourable member are not justified, because we have been to much trouble to amend the Act bearing in mind the position of these few people. We would not have so amended the Act unless we had been willing to show them every consideration. I cannot guarantee unconditionally that those people will get that quota, because I am not on the Licensing Committee. The amendments were introduced to deal with what we believed to be an anomaly. If those people are still not satisfied, they can go to the Review Tribunal and put their case. Section 29 (2) provides:

The Review Tribunal may do all acts necessary for or incidental to the exercise or discharge of the powers, authorities, duties or functions conferred or imposed upon it by or under this Act.

So, if these people are not satisfied with these amendments, the tribunal can act; but I do not believe it will reach that stage, because the Licensing Committee is fully aware of these people's problems and will do its best to solve them.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am only partly satisfied with the Minister's reply because, in my view, these people cannot go to the tribunal. Will he tell me exactly where in the Act or in the Bill it is provided that the Review Tribunal can hear the case of one of these eight or nine people? Certainly, it is provided that the Review Tribunal may do all acts necessary for the exercise or discharge of the powers, authorities, duties or functions conferred or imposed upon it under this Act, but it is not concerned with section 33, which provides:

The Review Tribunal shall hear and determine appeals submitted pursuant to this Act.

I cannot see where it is provided that these persons can appeal to the tribunal. Certainly, it does not apply under section 20 of the principal Act, because that is more of a statistical approach to egg quotas; so an appeal does not come into it. However, by writing this new section into the Act, we are introducing a discretionary power to the Licensing Committee, which, although it comprises three people, has a quorum of only two persons, so two persons will have this discretionary power. As I read the

Bill, "that is it" for any person who expects to get a quota as a result of the passage of this Bill: yet he may not get one.

That is why I asked the Minister for some kind of undertaking. I do not think any person dissatisfied with the situation that I have described has any appeal. This Council is passing this Bill to help those persons. The Minister has said there are eight or nine of them. Therefore, he and the Licensing Committee know who they are. Perhaps that committee has already told those people that, if the Act is amended, it can give them a quota. Having gone that far with all this machinery, the Minister should be able to say, "These people will get their quotas." I shall be happy with the clause if he is prepared to do that.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I do not know what the honourable member is really driving at. The amendments have been drawn up at the instigation of the board so that these people can get what they are justly entitled to get. Some of them already have a quota, and this clause is to enable them to get the increase to which they are entitled. The honourable member talks about two people having jurisdiction, their decision being final. I draw his attention, however, to the tribunal, which consists of one person. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that, if they go to the appeals board, which has only one member, and if that person decides for or against, there is no further appeal. According to section 34 of the principal Act, the decisions of the Review Tribunal shall be final and without appeal.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: But that is an appeal.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: That does not matter: the honourable member said that he was not satisfied in connection with two persons deliberating, yet in the case of an appeal the honourable member is satisfied in connection with a tribunal with only one person deliberating. The honourable member says that these people have not got a quota, but I think that in all cases they have got a quota. The point is that they are entitled to more than what they have got. The members of the Licensing Committee are Mr. R. Fuge (Chairman), Mr. George Jeffery (Deputy Chairman), and Mr. N. Mair. These men are not producers in their own right, so they are independent. I do not think the honourable member need have any fears.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I am still not certain whether the Minister is saying whether or not these people will get their quotas. I am not concerned about whether it is a new

quota entirely or an increased one. The point at issue is the new quota that they will receive: whether it is a first issue or a second issue does not matter.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: You mean an increased quota.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: All right. We are talking about the final quota that these eight or nine people are expecting to get after this Bill has passed. Actually, I believe that one is an entirely new quota.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: That could possibly be.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Minister's argument about the number of people on various bodies does not have great force, because when matters reach the tribunal they are being considered for a second time. So, the Minister may as well say that there is an aggregate of so many people who have considered a person's case. The point at issue is that the people are expecting to have a quota when this Bill passes. Can the Minister say whether or not they will get it? If they do not get what they expect to get, the door is closed to further consideration.

Contrary to what the Minister has said, the tribunal does not come into it; the Minister was wrong on that point. The Minister cannot interfere, because he would not want to interfere with the Licensing Committee; so, he cannot help the people, and the tribunal cannot help them. I therefore want to know whether the eight or nine people will get what they expect to get as a result of this clause.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I cannot satisfy the honourable member any more than he can satisfy me, because I am not a member of the Licensing Committee or the special committee. I cannot say whether a licence will be issued that will be acceptable to a certain grower. The people would not have had any consideration prior to the introduction of this Bill. The Bill was introduced to cover the people who would have been outside the Act, anyway. There is a matter of good faith here, and the Licensing Committee has taken this action in the interests of the eight or nine people so that their cases can be considered on their merits. I cannot guarantee the honourable member that the people will be given a quota that will satisfy them, but I am confident about the committee's independence and integrity.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.52 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 14, at 2.15 p.m.