LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, November 24, 1977

The PRESIDENT (Hon. F. J. Potter) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PARLIAMENTARY TITLES

The PRESIDENT: Before calling on questions, I think I will give the answer to the further question raised by the Hon. Mr. Blevins a couple of days ago regarding the title "honourable" for members of the Legislative Council. I reiterate that the practice is one of long standing, and all members knew, or should have known, that when they were elected to this place they would be referred to as the honourable Mr., Mrs. or Miss in the same way as their predecessors had been known for many years. The practice was instituted by Royal decree, applies to members of the Legislative Council in all Australian States, and, I believe, can be taken away by Royal decree only. Although it is contended by some members that the title is irrelevant in 1977, this may not be the view of all members of this Council, and it is not practical for me to differentiate between members. It is not for me, therefore, to direct its discontinuance on my own initiative or at the request of certain members. For further consideration to be given to this matter, it would be necessary for the Council, as a whole, to express its views on this question.

QUESTIONS

ADVISORY HEALTH COMMITTEE

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Health a question regarding the proposed advisory health committee.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As all honourable members would know, when the Health Commission Bill passed in this Council, provision was made therein for the establishment of an advisory health committee. Although I have seen in the press reference to members of the Health Commission itself, I have seen nothing regarding the appointment of the members of the advisory committee. Will the Minister say whether the appointment of that committee is proceeding and, if it is, when an announcement will be made regarding its composition?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The appointment of members of the committee is proceeding. Names have been received from various groups and, indeed, a number of them have been accepted. Offhand, I cannot recall the names of the various people involved, although I assure the honourable member that the committee is well on the way to being set up. Indeed, I have written to some of the people who will be on the committee advising that they have been accepted.

URANIUM

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question regarding uranium.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Following the disclosure that the mining company named Uranerz from Germany is exploring for uranium in the Gawler-Kersbrook area, I ask whether, should the mining company discover any substantial reserves of uranium in any metropolitan watershed area, the Government will favourably consider removing the moratorium that has applied on the mining of uranium so that it may be removed to prevent any possible pollution of reservoir water.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring down a reply.

RAILWAY CONSTABLES

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question regarding railway constables?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The high cost of providing railway constables on the Overland, combined with the present shortage of such staff, precludes any attempt to implement this service. Following the declared day, Commonwealth Police working under Federal by-laws will be responsible for Australian National Railways activity, and this may be the solution to the existing problem.

HOSPITAL INTERPRETERS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to give a short explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health.

The PRESIDENT: On the subject of?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On the subject of the interpreter services being either available or not available at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and other public hospitals.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: An elderly Russian migrant, whose name and address I can give the Minister, has been a patient at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. He believed that he could not convey his opinions and feelings in regard to his illness and its symptoms to the staff of the hospital, because of his language difficulties, and he sought the services of an interpreter and also asked the staff to contact his priest. The Translator and Interpreter Service of the Federal Department of Social Security offered to provide a contract Russian interpreter at Government expense to assist this old man with what was to him a very serious problem.

Yesterday, I am informed, a nursing sister at the hospital refused the Translator and Interpreter Service the right to send an interpreter to him and, also, the priest was not called. Last evening a friend of the patient met his two requests and now the problem has been solved. However, I ask the Minister whether any tuition is provided or any instructions given to the staff in our public hospitals on the extreme and urgent need to co-operate with ethnic people in their care by helping to arrange for interpreters and, indeed, by encouraging the practice of interpreters being present at times when symptoms and other health questions are discussed between patient and staff.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is an instruction to the hospitals to try to see that they give to patients every assistance that they possibly can. I am not doubting what the Hon. Mr. Hill has said, but I should be pleased if he would give me the name and the address of the patient concerned, when I will get a report, because what he has said certainly does not seem to be in accordance with the normal procedure at the hospital.

BLUE TONGUE

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a statement prior to asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about blue tongue.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: Recently, and rightly so, there was a great flurry of publicity concerning what has become known as Australian blue tongue in the Northern Territory, but I have noticed in the past week or 10 days that there has been little in the press about it. Can the Minister tell the Council the present position?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Whilst there has not been much publicity on blue tongue in the northern part of Australia, there has been much activity and testing of blood samples of the Sentinel sheep in the Northern Territory to find out whether diseases are entering from that area. I did report to the Council about 10 days ago that clinical signs of blue tongue had been identified in the Sentinel flocks in the Northern Territory, but they still cannot be identified positively as blue tongue, and work is still continuing on both post mortem examination of sheep in that area and blood samples from those Sentinel sheep. The blood virus has been examined in the World Reference Laboratory under the electron-microscope.

It seems to show some distinct difference in structure between the Australian virus compared with the classic blue tongue virus that has been found elsewhere in the world. Presently, the consultative committee of veterinary officers throughout Australia considers that the slaughtering of stock is not justifiable, because it is impossible to carry out a disinfection of the whole area to eradicate the insect vectar that plays such an important part—

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Which insect vectar is it?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The biting midge. There is no guarantee that the insect vectar will not re-enter Australia. That is another major problem. The committee considers that the sort of country the virus has been identified in is too difficult to enable a complete slaughter of wild animals and buffaloes carrying this virus. A complete slaughter programme would be virtually impossible. As I stated earlier, the pathogenicity of the virus is still unproven. We cannot justify carrying out a slaughter programme until it is proven.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PHILLIP LYNCH

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Yesterday, I directed a reasonable question to the Leader of this Council regarding the affairs of the Deputy Leader of the Australian Liberal Party concerning the buying of land at 1973 prices and its flogging at 1975 prices, thereby ripping off the younger members of the community.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Who was that?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Phillip Lynch.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! We do not want to have a debate on the honourable member's personal explanation. He should be heard in silence.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I refer to yesterday's *Hansard* report of my question, after you called for order to make a ruling. The report is as follows:

> The President: Order! The honourable member cannot express those sorts of opinions. They are not only his own opinions; also I think they reflect upon the honourable member of another House.
>
> The Hon. N. K. Foster: He is not honourable.
>
> The President: It is contrary to Standing Orders.
>
> The Hon. J. R. Cornwall: On a point of order, the matter on which you have ruled, Mr. President, is a matter of public record.
>
> The President: Not the statement that the Hon. Mr. Foster has just made. He has made his own comment upon that record. I am talking about not what he quoted from *Hansard* but what he said afterwards.

I was referring to Commonwealth *Hansard*. The report continues:

> The Hon. N. K. Foster: If I may refer—
>
> The President: The honourable member said that "in his opinion"—
>
> The Hon. N. K. Foster: I did not say that.

You, Mr. President, would not further listen to me and called on another matter. However, on perusal of *Hansard* I find that I was correct and that you, in your arduous task as President, had erred. Therefore, in future I want you, while you occupy the Chair, to refer to the shorthand notes of the reporters when giving a ruling or an opinion which a member believes is contrary to what has been stated in this place.

The PRESIDENT: In reply to the honourable member, if I could get the shorthand report within 30 seconds of the honourable member's speaking, I would be in a better position.

BOLIVAR WATER

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On November 2 this year I asked the Minister of Health, representing the Minister of Works in this place, a question relating to the difficult situation regarding water supplies in the Angle Vale-Virginia areas, and the need for the use of recycled Bolivar water to supplement those quotas. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Government is very conscious of the importance of the allocation of Bolivar effluent water to its most beneficial use or uses and will determine its attitude in a proper and responsible manner after careful consideration of all the factors involved. Then an announcement of the decision of the Government will be made.

RADIUM HILL

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I ask the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question on mining of uranium at Radium Hill.

The PRESIDENT: What is the subject?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: Why do I have to give the subject?

The PRESIDENT: I thought you were asking for leave to make a statement.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I was asking a question. First, during what period was mining activity carried out at Radium Hill? Secondly, who were the authorities engaged in such activity? Thirdly, how many workers were engaged in mining operations and in associated activities where they could have come into contact with radioactive materials? Fourthly, is there a list of the names of such workers? Fifthly, has any follow-up study been done attempting to assess the subsequent health histories of those persons? Sixthly, if no such study has been carried out would the Minister initiate a study for the purpose of

assessing the incidence of cancers and other disabilities which may have been caused to the workers by virtue of their contact with radioactivity? Lastly, would the Minister make similar investigations in respect of all of the operations involving contact of workers with radioactive materials at Maralinga?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring down a reply.

FISHING AUTHORITIES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has a reply to my question regarding fishing authorities.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Amalgamation of rock lobster pot allocations has previously been allowed in the situation where two vessels had unfilled quotas of pots, and a third vessel could be bought, taken out of the fishery, and the pots reallocated to joint purchasers. This allowed a small decrease in total effort in the fishery, which is desirable. The recent case referred to by the honourable member was the first of its kind in that an authority holder sought to reduce his quota of pots and the proposal was approved because it produced no increase in overall effort. The pots may be transferred to another fisherman with an unfilled quota, but not by way of direct purchase because, in considering an application to transfer an authority, no value is conceded to individual pots. This arrangement has been approved for a limited period, pending receipt and consideration of the report on the rock lobster fishery by Professor P. Copes.

FURTHER EDUCATION

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Minister of Education on cut-backs in some areas of further education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Students at the Underdale High School further education enrichment class in wood carving are concerned that the class may close next year, or alternatively, that fees will increase from $14 to $26 a quarter. The reason for these possibilities is the apparent lack of Government funds. The students understand that grants for technical and further education have been increased this year by 22 per cent, against an Australian average of 9 per cent. If such an increase has occurred, why is it that further education, especially in the enrichment fields, is being pruned, or alternatively that student fees are being nearly doubled in the new year?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Education and bring down a reply.

INTEREST RATES

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement, before directing a question to the Leader of the House, regarding interest rates and bridging finance on first and second mortgages.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: At present, and over many years, the differential between the cost of building a house and the sum available through first, second, and third mortgages and even bridging finance in some cases has placed tremendously heavy burdens on younger people who are purchasing houses. The Hon. Mr. Hill has a greater knowledge of the way in which the industry works than I have. When the ceiling is reached in connection with finance from a particular institution under the Housing Agreement Act and other Acts, that same institution will inform its client that it cannot advance any more than the stated sum. It will then refer the people to another financial institution, and they are required to sign documents in some, if not all, cases stating that they will get their second mortgage finance from that other financial institution, only to find that that other institution is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the bank that referred them to the institution. A classic example is the link between the Bank of Adelaide and Finance Corporation of Australia. Other banks are similarly associated with finance companies. The interest rate charged by these subsidiaries can reach the exorbitant figure of more than 20 per cent.

In addition, there is the question of bridging finance. Although it is not apparent to the young people interviewing the bank manager, actually they are not required necessarily to sign a form tying them with the bank or its subsidiary. When one examines the mushrooming number of finance companies tied to financial institutions (the companies having all sorts of odd names that one cannot trace), one finds that those firms and the almost shady companies supplying bridging finance are tied to the parent organisation. The Hon. Mr. Burdett and the Hon. Mr. Hill may laugh, but they are in such an age group and such a position of privilege that they are not placed in a position where they are ripped off every day as purchases of houses are made.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Let me remind you—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Council is getting out of order, and for one reason only: the Hon. Mr. Foster is getting on to his favourite habit of expressing opinions.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: You, Mr. President, must be blind in one eye, while not being able to see out of the other eye. The Hon. Mr. Hill has been yelling at me for the last 10 minutes. It is on record that you let the honourable member ask a question and give a preamble that went on for 22½ minutes. Time it! Check your own record!

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am not worried about how long the honourable member takes. He can take half an hour if he wants to, so long as he stops giving these opinions, which only provoke interjections from the other side.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Rubbish! Every time I get up you start jumping up and down like a jack-in-the-box. My question is this: will the Minister ascertain the additional cost that is borne by people purchasing new houses, resulting from bridging finance and exorbitant rates of interest on second mortgages, particularly when the second mortgage is provided by the same financial institution as was the initial mortgage? What is the differential interest rate between first and second mortgage finance, and will the Minister take up these matters with his colleague to have an investigation made?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I, too, am concerned about the rising costs to the young house builders, having read in this morning's press that there may be a delay in further grants from the Federal Government for this purpose. That makes the position that much worse and it could make young people aware of another promise going overboard. Nevertheless, I will seek an answer for the honourable member.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Health. In view of the concern expressed by the Hon. Mr. Foster and the Minister at the situation in which young house buyers find themselves today, will the

Minister make immediate representations to the Treasurer of this State to see that the first mortgage ceiling is lifted in this State so that people can borrow more money on first mortgage so that they will not be forced to be concerned about second and third mortgages?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Federal Government made a promise two years ago that these home grants would be available.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: And it is still giving them.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Of course it is, but it is six months behind. The recommendation from the Federal Treasury is that they be cut out.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: On a point of order, what about these interjections now? It's not me—it's others.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is always a problem, because the lifting of the amount of money for the first mortgage is something that has to be agreed. There is only a certain amount of money available for distribution in this way and we have to make up our minds whether we lend that amount in larger sums of money to fewer people or distribute that money among more people, so that each receives a smaller loan.

RADIATION AT MARALINGA

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health about radiation at Maralinga.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: It has come to my attention that a number of former Commonwealth police officers who worked at Maralinga in the 1950's and 1960's, during the period when this area was used for the testing of atomic weapons, are now extremely concerned at the damage to their health which may have occurred as a result of their coming in contact with an excess amount of radioactivity. It will be appreciated that public information about this matter has been very scanty because Commonwealth police officers who were engaged in the operations of guarding atomic materials were sworn to secrecy and of course have been extremely reluctant to make public allegations about this matter. However, in recent times the general public has become very much more aware of the close relationship that may exist between working in an area involving exposure to radiation and the incidence of cancer.

It is alleged that about four years ago one of these former Commonwealth policemen died of cancer; another one is said to be very sick and dying of a tumour of the brain. In view of the recently reported court case in England in which British Nuclear Fuels conceded liability in respect of the deaths of several nuclear power industry workers due to cancer, and since the public is becoming increasingly concerned about the risks of nuclear processes generally, it is most important to discover whether those concerned with the development of nuclear technology in Australia have in fact exercised stringent care in dealing with radioactive materials or whether they have negligently permitted the workers under their control to be contaminated by excesses of radioactivity and thereby be injured or killed.

Will the Minister make the necessary investigations and inquiries to obtain information from the relevant Commonwealth authorities concerning the following matters: First, does the Commonwealth still have the names of all persons who either worked for the Commonwealth at Maralinga during the period in which atomic tests were conducted in that area or the names of people who were admitted to that area during the said period?

Secondly, has any follow-up health testing been undertaken by the Commonwealth to assess whether any of these persons have developed cancers or other disabilities by virtue of their contact with radio activity at that time?

Thirdly, even if the Commonwealth has not carried out any follow-up activities, has the Commonwealth any knowledge of whether or not any persons who were at the Maralinga site have developed cancers or other disabilities or have died from the same?

Fourthly, if follow-up studies have been undertaken, has it been discovered from any such study that any persons who were in the Maralinga area have died from or have contracted cancer?

Fifthly, has the State Government any records of its own dealing with the above matters and, if so, do these records disclose any of the above matters?

Sixthly, if no study has been carried out by the Commonwealth, or alternatively by the State, will the Minister initiate a study for the purpose of assessing the incidence of cancers and other disabilities that have or may have been caused to these persons by virtue of their contact with radio activity associated with nuclear energy?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will seek the information requested by the honourable member.

SUICIDES

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health or, if he is considered the more appropriate Minister, the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Community Welfare, regarding attempted and actual suicides amongst young unemployed people.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: During discussions which I had last week with a senior social worker, I was appalled to learn of the number of attempted suicides that had occurred in a certain suburban area in Adelaide. These young people, we are told from time to time, are in a state of continual depression, particularly after they have applied for, say, 40, 50 or 60 jobs and been refused. Much play has been made over the years of the fact that these people were happy to lie in the sun and collect unemployment benefits. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth. This is an enormous social problem that we have in our midst. I should like to know whether any record is being kept of the number of attempted or actual suicides among the unemployed because of the acute depression being caused as a result of their unfortunate position.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Community Welfare and bring down a reply.

WHYALLA PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Has the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in the Council, a reply to a question I asked recently regarding the Whyalla employment situation?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The State Government has no intention of reducing or dismissing any of the Public Service staff employed at Whyalla. The Premier has previously indicated that any movement of staff from Whyalla is not justified in the light of the present

circumstances at that city. The Public Health Department presently maintains a regional office at Port Augusta and one officer at Whyalla. Currently, there are no plans to alter this staffing development.

Regarding the development of the Whyalla Hospital, preparation is well advanced. The necessary documentation, which is a prerequisite to the calling of tenders, is currently being prepared.

SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport, a question regarding the South-Eastern Freeway.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members have noted with considerable interest the progress made on the South-Eastern Freeway over the years and, in common with all other honourable members, I have been invited to the opening of the latest stage of the South-Eastern Freeway which is, I understand, now completed as far as Callington. Can the Minister tell the Council what stage the further construction beyond Callington has reached, and what is the latest estimated date of completion of the whole freeway?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Transport and bring down a reply.

URANIUM

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question regarding the one asked earlier this week by the Hon. Mr. Blevins about uranium exploration.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I think the best way to explain my question is for me to read the question asked by the Hon. Mr. Blevins on Tuesday, as follows:

> Some information was given to me, the accuracy or veracity of which I cannot vouch for, which relates to delivery of a load of petrol from Golden Fleece to the Plumbago Station, in the northern area of the State on the Broken Hill line. The worker who delivered the fuel had been told by the Golden Fleece company that it was for an airstrip. Upon arrival at Plumbago Station, he was told that an airstrip had existed for a number of years and that the fuel was for a mining site 10 miles further on. When he arrived at the mining site, the worker was surprised to find a high content of managerial staff there and virtually no workers. Questioning one of the workers, he found out that companies were said to be drilling for uranium. One worker even showed the union member delivering the fuel some of the uranium retrieved from the ground. The companies involved were said to be Rockdrill, Thompson, Esso and Nieztche. As I said, I have no way of finding out the accuracy of that report, but would the Minister investigate it and let me know if uranium exploration by these or any other companies is taking place on Plumbago Station, or north of that station, on the Broken Hill line?

The information that was sought would be available immediately if the matter was referred to the department of the relevant Minister, that is, the Minister of Mines and Energy. I ask why, because of the extreme importance of the Hon. Mr. Blevins's question, the Minister has not yet brought down a reply thereto. Secondly, is it true that ore that has been mined by Esso in the area in question is stored at present, with Mr. Dunstan's consent and approval, in bags in a tin shed at Yunta?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring down a reply. I certainly do not think it unreasonable that a reply to the Hon. Mr. Blevins's question has not yet been given, as the question was asked only on Tuesday.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 23. Page 962.)

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I object strongly to the provisions in clause 4 of the Bill, which seeks to extend the long service leave entitlements for about 10 000 persons employed under the State Public Service Act. I will support the second reading of the Bill so that it can go into Committee, where I will move amendments to disallow the proposed increase in long service leave from nine days to 15 days a year after 15 years service, with retrospectivity to July 1, 1975.

Honourable members will be aware that this is the fourth Bill dealing with long service leave to have come before the Council within the past two years. These are but links in a chain of progressive amendments stemming from the original State Long Service Leave Act, which was introduced in South Australia in 1957. Since then, a succession of increased benefits has been granted to public servants, to employees so entitled under the State Act and, more recently, in the form of portability in the building industry.

Honourable members will be aware that Australia is the only country in the Western World with statutory provisions for long service leave. In South Australia, public servants already enjoy long service entitlements as favourable as or better than are given to employees in the Commonwealth and most other State Public Services. Furthermore, the South Australian Long Service Leave Act grants to employees in the private sector whose rights are covered by that Act better privileges than apply in other States and far better than is granted by most Federal awards.

Although only about 15 000 persons are affected by this Bill, it must be remembered that State Government departments employ in addition about 65 000 on weekly hire, plus thousands more in semi-governmental authorities. If further privileges are granted to persons engaged under the State Public Service Act, demands undoubtedly will be made by Government employees on weekly hire and those in the private sector covered by the State Act (for more favourable entitlements).

The Government may regard it as socially desirable to grant extended leave provisions to its permanent public servants, but I think that the timing is inopportune. Financial and economic conditions in the public and private sector in South Australia are poor. The Government is facing a deficit in this financial year but still wants to minimise increases in State taxation. Meanwhile, the private sector is fighting to sell its product interstate and overseas whilst combating a high wage structure and over-valued currency.

Consider the cost of this present scheme. If the average wage of persons under the Public Service Act is $250 a week, if one half of them (say 7 500) have 15 years service, and if the Government continues its past practice of allowing public servants to accrue long service leave until

retirement rather than take it when it comes due so that they can use a loophole and pay tax on only 5 per cent rather than the whole, the cost would be $1 500 000 a year, subject to escalation due to inflation.

The Government may regard this as a small price to pay to mollify its public servants but, if this concession flows into the State Long Service Leave Act, which is more than likely, the extra cost to South Australia, according to my calculations, would be about $10 000 000 a year. This is an extra burden which the South Australian economy can well do without at the present time. These calculations are based on the assumption of an average wage of $200 a week and an entitlement of 60 000 workers with more than 15 years service, under State awards. As I calculate, this is an extra burden of $11 500 000 a year that the South Australian economy can do without at present.

In years past, public servants in South Australia were poorly paid compared to their counterparts in the Federal and other State services and in the private sector, but this no longer applies. Within the past year a committee comprising Mr. Graham Inns (then Chairman of the Public Service Board), Judge Olsson (the Senior Judge in the Industrial Court) and I submitted recommendations to Cabinet which were accepted whereby the salaries of executive officers grades 1-6 within the Public Service would be increased to make them comparable to salaries paid to persons of similar qualifications and responsibility in other Public Services in Australia.

Reference was made also to the salaries and fringe benefits, such as long service leave, etc., of executives in the private sector. After adjusting the salaries of executive grade officers, the Public Service Commissioners intended to adjust the salaries of those on administrative officer level. As well, apart from these adjustments, public servants to the highest seniority receive quarterly salary increases in accordance with the wage indexation decisions given by the Industrial Commission.

I have said that the proposal to increase long service leave entitlements from nine to 15 days a year after 15 years of service is inopportune and I wish to refer to entitlements applying elsewhere. Under the Acts or ordinances for persons in the Commonwealth, South Australian, Victorian, Queensland and Tasmanian Public Services, an employee receives 90 days or three months long service leave after 10 years service, and entitlements accrue at the same rate of nine or 9·1 days a year thereafter. In Western Australia, an employee receives three months leave each 10 years for the first 20 years, that is, nine days a year, but thereafter three months for each seven years, which is equivalent to 13 days a year. Under the New South Wales Act, provisions are different: an employee receives only two months after the first 10 years, that is, 6·08 days a year, but thereafter has an entitlement of half a month, or 15 days a year.

In this Bill, a South Australian public servant would receive nine days a year leave for the first 15 years, that is, 135 days, and 15 days a year thereafter, and this is identical to the provisions in the New South Wales Act, which provide 60 days for the first 10 years and 75 days for the next five, making 135 days after 15 years. Thereafter both States would continue at the rate of 15 days a year. The Commonwealth and the other four States grant 135 days after 15 years but thereafter accrue at only nine days a year.

In contrast to entitlements for public servants, South Australia grants more favourable long service leave benefits to employees whose entitlements are governed by the State Act than are granted by other States. A State Long Service Leave Act covers employees under State awards and those under Federal awards where the award does not contain a long service leave provision. Under the New South Wales, Victorian, Queensland, Western Australian and Tasmanian Acts, an employee receives long service leave at the rate of 13 weeks after 15 years of service, that is, 6·08 days a year, whereas in South Australia an employee receives 13 weeks after 10 years, that is, 9·1 days a year, which is about the same as applies under the State Public Service Act. Under each State Act there is provision for pro rata leave. This applies after five years in New South Wales, seven years in South Australia and Tasmania, and 10 years in Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland. Speaking generally, employees are entitled to pro rata long service leave if they leave their employment for any reason other than serious and wilful misconduct, except that in New South Wales entitlement to pro rata leave is conditional after five years but absolute after 10 years; that is, serious and wilful misconduct is then no longer a factor.

I refer now to long service leave provisions under Federal awards and, as honourable members know, more than 50 per cent of workers in South Australia are covered thereby. The major Federal awards, such as the metal, vehicle, aircraft, graphic arts, engine drivers and firemen, and ship painters and dockers awards, include long service leave provisions. These grant 13 weeks leave after 15 years service, that is, 6·08 days a year, which is similar to that applying under each State award other than South Australia, where the benefits are greater. Some other Federal awards have no such provisions, and their employees are entitled according to the award in the State where they are resident.

I have outlined the long service leave entitlements granted to employees in the Public Service and under State and Federal awards in order to show that public servants in South Australia who now receive nine days leave a year are treated at present as generously as any employee in the private sector in Australia, except public servants in New South Wales after 15 years and in Western Australia after 20 years. I am not conversant with the provisions for those in the maritime industry, who are dear to the heart of the Hon. Mr. Foster and who are a race apart.

I have spoken at some length against granting extra long service leave as provided in clause 4 of this Bill. There are certain other proposals within the Bill which I regard as unusual.

I should perhaps explain that I became a manufacturing manager at Mile End in 1956, just one year before the first long service leave Bill was introduced in the South Australian Parliament, a concept unique in the Western World; and I have seen many changes or advances in this field of legislation within the past 20 years.

Clause 3 refers to effective rather than continuous service and provides for periods of legitimate absence. Clause 5 grants *pro rata* entitlements after five years of service, such as applies in New South Wales. Clause 6 eliminates wilful misconduct as grounds for depriving an employee of long service leave after seven years of service. I have previously protested against removing this safeguard, but I note that it will be taken from the Federal metal trades award in January, 1979, and, in my mind, that award is still the yardstick.

Clause 10 grants a concession to public servants who were regressed (in my terms, this means demoted) prior to retirement and shall have long service leave calculated according to their previous highest salary. Clause 11 enables persons who join the South Australian Public Service from the service of the Commonwealth, other States or semi-governmental authorities to accrue long service leave.

The provisions mentioned above take the concept of

long service leave far beyond what was originally intended. I could protest, but realising that change is inevitable, I shall not oppose these amendments. I support the second reading, but, in Committee, shall move an amendment regarding the increase of long service leave.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 23. Page 962.)

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I rise to support the second reading of the Bill. I support it only because it is necessary to extend the price-fixing provisions of the parent Act for a further 12 months. Actually, I believe there is more in the Bill with which I disagree than with which I agree. The new definition of "consumer" is enormously wide. This does not extend the scope of the price-fixing powers in the Act. However, it will considerably extend the investigatory powers of the Commissioner.

When one considers how wide these powers are, the question of extending the scope of matters which may be investigated takes on some importance. Under section 8 of the Act we find that the powers of the Commissioner to investigate (and these powers extend to requiring any person to make a statement, to answer any question, to produce any documents, to answer questions on oath and the like) are wide indeed. They go so far as permitting the Commissioner to require a person to attend at a particular time to make a statement, produce papers, and answer questions, whether on oath or otherwise.

Honourable members can see how wide these powers are, and persons called on for information can be put to much trouble and expense, at least in the form of lost time. It is necessary to see that as far as possible the exercise of these powers is restricted to cases where it is warranted. I oppose the principle of clause 2 *(b)*, which extends the definition of "consumer" to include the purchaser of land. The legal definition of land, of course, includes fixtures such as houses, and the purchaser of a house is the example used in the second reading explanation.

Regarding the purchase of land, the consumer is now given a comprehensive code of protection in the Land and Business Agents Act. The requirements of that Act extend to vendors who do not sell through an agent. Although many people consider that that Act is unduly oppressive against vendors, protection is provided through the Land and Business Agents Board. I support the legislative protection necessary to protect consumers, especially the purchasers of such important items as houses, but legislation should not be made unduly oppressive on vendors.

I cannot see the need for a multiplicity of protections. Where an item such as land is sufficiently important to attract specific protection, the relevant legislation should provide a complete code regarding that item. I believe that the Land and Business Agents Act is a fully developed, comprehensive and complete code of protection for those purposes. Where it may prove lacking in particular areas it is that Act which should be amended. Indeed, I believe that the Government intends introducing an amending Bill shortly. I can see no reason why vendors and agents should also be subjected to the considerable investigatory power of the Commissioner to which I have referred.

I understand that hundreds of so-called complaints have been made to the Commissioner about land transactions. However, I also understand that many of these complaints are really questions relating to things such as the amount of stamp duty applicable, and I see no reason why the Commissioner's office should not answer such queries if it wishes to do so.

Paragraph *(c)* of the new definition of "consumer" includes the recipient of any service for fee or reward, otherwise than in the course of business. This would include, for example, legal, medical and other professional services. These would also appear to be included in the present definition. I merely note in passing how wide the definition is. Paragraph *(d)* extends the definition of "consumer" to a borrower of money other than in the course of business. Under the present definition a borrower is included only where he borrows for the purposes of purchasing goods. This extension is not referred to in the second reading explanation, and I do not believe that this extension is justified, because once again there is a complete code of protection for the borrower of money in the Consumer Transactions Act and the Consumer Credit Act. I do not see the need for a multiplicity of remedies, and it is unnecessary on this occasion.

Further, I note that the explanation of clauses given in the second reading explanation is totally inaccurate and incorrect. In fact, it is utterly wrong. The numbers do not correspond, and I believe that the Council should have been given a correct explanation. Indeed, it is an insult to this Council that a correct explanation of the clauses was not given. Clause 2 is said to amend section 5, but it does not; clause 3 is said to insert a new section relating to personating an authorised officer, but it does not; clause 4 is said to amend section 18, but it does not; and clause 5 is said to amend section 53, but it does not.

The explanation for this inaccuracy is obvious. Clause 2 of the Bill, redefining "consumer", was obviously an afterthought inserted in the Bill at the last minute. That is why it is not referred to in the explanation of the clauses. The remaining explanations all relate to the wrong clause. I suggest that this is because the new definition is an afterthought, and an ill-conceived one at that. I do not oppose clause 3, which inserts the following new subsection in the Act:

> (6) A document purporting to be signed by the Minister stating—
>
> *(a)* that he has appointed a person to be an authorised officer on the recommendation of the Commissioner;
>
> or
>
> *(b)* that he has delegated to the Commissioner, or, on the recommendation of the Commissioner, to any person, any powers, authorities, duties or functions conferred or imposed upon him by this Act,
>
> shall, in any legal proceedings, in the absence of proof to the contrary, be accepted as proof of the matters stated in the document.

In a way this may seem to be reasonable, and it has been followed in other legislation, but suppose the authority had not been properly given. How would the other party disprove it? How could he? To change the onus of proof in this way may pose some difficulties. Clause 4 is the only one for which I have any enthusiasm. I agree with it, because it makes it an offence for a person to represent falsely by words or conduct that he is an authorised officer. Clause 5 proposes some radical amendments to the present law. Now the Commissioner may only undertake the investigation on the complaint of the consumer. The Bill proposes that an investigation be undertaken on that basis or otherwise. Therefore, the Commissioner could conduct an investigation with the extremely wide investigatory powers to which I referred, even though no

complaint had been made. This is quite unjustified.

If a consumer makes a complaint, it is reasonable that the investigation be carried out, but if an officer of the department had overheard the complaint in a hotel or in the street, or if it was just an idea off the top of his head, it does not warrant an investigation or mean that people should be obliged, under penalty or the payment of a fine, to answer questions on oath, produce books and documents, make sworn statements, and even attend at a particular time and place to do these things.

Furthermore, in clause 5 another amendment to the present law is made. Now the Commissioner is empowered to prosecute on behalf of a complainant. That is reasonable enough, but it also enables the Commissioner to take over the conduct of proceedings already commenced. I can see arguments to the contrary, but I believe that this is unduly oppressive. One must remember that, where the Commissioner undertakes the prosecution of proceedings, the consumer is at a considerable advantage. From a monetary point of view, it may be quite a small matter, but the supplier is faced with legal proceedings undertaken by the Commissioner, professionally and usually efficiently, and the person concerned is put to the trouble and expense of defending those proceedings; or he has to engage legal counsel to do that on his behalf. Not only is he put to that expense, but also there is his own time and trouble involved.

That is reasonable if the consumer elects to go to the Commissioner first, but surely the consumer should be able to say, when he believes he has a cause of action against the supplier, "I will do this myself and undertake it personally. I will go to my solicitor and get him to undertake it," or "I will go to the Commissioner." It seems proper that he should be bound by a direction. He cannot first undertake the proceedings himself, personally or through his solicitor, and then change horses midstream and decide to go to the Commissioner. The final clause with which I totally disagree is clause 6, which provides:

> Section 53 of the principal Act is repealed.

The purpose of this (and we have heard it before) is to make the price-fixing provisions of the Act permanent. At least since 1948, the price-fixing provisions have had to be brought back to Parliament each year for Parliament to be reviewed and approved. The purpose of this last clause is to write permanently into the Statute Book the price-fixing powers of the Commissioner, and those powers are very wide.

It would be possible through price-fixing to control entirely the economy of the State and, therefore, all the State, because economic matters are so important. If the Government had the power through price-fixing, completely unrestrained and without reference to Parliament, it could control the State. I believe that that is the intention in this last clause. Presently I cannot say that there has been any abuse of price-fixing in South Australia; it has been very moderately exercised, and few items are so controlled. However, this is partly because the legislation has to come back to Parliament yearly. The power of fixing prices by decree, as it were, is a power of controlling the whole State and not one that should be left in the Government's hands. It is probably one that should be referred back to Parliament each year.

I totally oppose this clause and propose to move an amendment to continue the present procedure whereby the price-fixing provisions of the Act have to be referred back to Parliament each year. I believe that will preserve the reasonable balance we have at present whereby those powers are moderately exercised. I support the second reading, but I will move the amendments I have foreshadowed which will probably completely change the Bill. The only parts I do not propose to change are clauses 3 and 4. However, I support the Bill, because it is necessary to continue the price-fixing provisions for a further 12 months.

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

INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION JURISDICTION (TEMPORARY PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 23. Page 962.)

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I support the second reading of what the Minister of Health described as a simple Bill, and in Committee I will move a simple amendment, which is on file and is identical in wording, except for a change in date, to the amendment to the principal Act introduced by the Minister of Health last October, which my Opposition colleagues were pleased to support.

I wish to refer to the original object of this legislation. In April, 1975, the Australian Conciliation and Arbritration Commission decided that it would in future set Federal wage rates quarterly, subject to eight conditions, which became known as the wage indexation guidelines. Six months later the Minister of Health introduced a Bill so that the South Australian Industrial Commission could order a flow-on of these Federal wage indexation decisions into State awards. The Bill also provided for the registration and control over sweetheart agreements. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

> This Bill which is essentially of a temporary nature, being expressed to expire on December 31, 1976, sets up the legislative machinery under which certain principles, guidelines and conditions expressed or given effect to in relevant decisions of the Australian Industrial Commission relating to wage indexation may be applied in the industrial jurisdiction of this State.

The Bill passed, and a year later the Minister of Health introduced an amendment which provided that the Act should expire on a day to be fixed by proclamation but that, if the proclamation had not been made before December 31, 1977, the Act should expire on that day. This amending Bill also passed.

The wording of this present Bill is different in that it provides for the Act to expire on a day to be fixed by proclamation without stating an ultimate finishing date. I object to this, and prefer the wording chosen by the Government in 1976.

As honourable members know, the Federal Conciliation and Arbritration Commission is considering whether to continue the concept of quarterly wage indexation and the guidelines in whole or in part. Section 5 of the principal Act empowers the South Australian Industrial Commission to apply to State awards with or without modification the decisions of the Australian commission. This means that, whereas in future partial indexation only may be applied in Federal and other State awards, full indexation could be granted for South Australian awards. This would turn South Australia into a high-wage State and in my opinion would act to the detriment of its economic development.

It is therefore important for this Council to place a time limit on the operation of this Act so that it can judge the actions of the State Industrial Commission during the ensuing 12 months. I support the second reading, and I commend my foreshadowed amendment, which is identical in wording to that introduced by the Government in 1976.

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

MINORS (CONSENT TO MEDICAL AND DENTAL TREATMENT) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 23. Page 965.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): In opening her second reading explanation, the Hon. Miss Levy said:

> There are currently uncertainties in the law regarding the ability of minors to consent to medical and dental procedures. We have no statute law in this State concerning this matter, and the common law situation is confused, as any lawyer will confirm if requested to look into the question.

The Bill has quite a lot of merit, and I am willing to support the second reading. The statement I quoted from the second reading explanation is a reasonable statement of the present position. As there is at present no Bill on honourable members' files, I will not speak at any length at this stage, but I will seek to conclude my remarks when the Bill is on file. I believe that this Bill should be referred to a Select Committee for examination and report. I appreciate that similar legislation to this Bill exists in New South Wales and the United Kingdom, although it appears at first glance that there are variations between the New South Wales legislation and the United Kingdom legislation. It may be argued that, because of the existence of that legislation, there is little or no need for reference to a Select Committee in this case. Because the Bill seeks to clarify the common law situation, I believe that the Council would be wise to allow evidence to be called by a Select Committee, which would report to this Council. I seek leave to conclude my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

At present the Pay-roll Tax Act provides that, in calculating his liability for pay-roll tax, an employer may deduct the sum of $48 000 from his annual pay-roll. However, once his annual pay-roll exceeds $48 000, the permissible deduction reduces by $2 for every $3 by which the pay-roll exceeds $48 000 to a minimum deduction of $24 000. This has been the position since January 1, 1977.

It is now proposed that the maximum annual deduction be increased to $60 000 and the minimum annual deduction to $27 000. There is inevitably a considerable element of judgment necessary when limits of this kind are set, but honourable members will notice that the minimum deduction is to be increased by 12½ per cent, which is roughly in line with recent movements in average weekly earnings. The maximum deduction, which is of benefit chiefly to small businesses, is to be increased by 25 per cent. This means that it is to go well beyond a form of indexation and will afford such enterprises a measure of real tax relief. These changes are planned to take effect from January 1, 1978, and are expected to cost about $1 600 000 in a full year and about $700 000 in 1977-78.

In order to provide some background for the measures contained in this Bill, I will summarise briefly the latest information from other States about pay-roll tax. From the beginning of 1978 the situation will be that Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia will have a maximum deduction of $60 000, reducing by $2 for every $3 by which the pay-roll exceeds $60 000 to a minimum deduction of $27 000 for pay-rolls of $109 500 and above. New South Wales and Tasmania will have the same maximum deduction, but in those States the deduction will continue to reduce beyond $27 000 and will disappear altogether at pay-rolls in excess of $150 000 per annum. In Queensland the maximum deduction will be $100 000, reducing by $5 for every $2 by which the pay-roll exceeds $100 000 to a minimum deduction of $27 000. The Queensland Government has also announced that as from July 1, 1978, the maximum deduction will be increased to $125 000.

There is one other matter contained in the Bill, and that is the removal of the requirement for pay-roll tax returns to be submitted in triplicate. With the advent of a computerised system of handling pay-roll tax accounts, this procedure is no longer necessary. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure shall come into operation on January 1, 1978. Clause 3 amends section 11a of the principal Act by providing for the new maximum and minimum amounts of the deduction that may be made under that section from pay-rolls before monthly or other periodic returns of pay-roll tax are made to the Commissioner.

Clause 4 amends section 13a of the principal Act by providing for a new definition of the amount of the annual deduction that may be made from a pay-roll liable to taxation. The formula set out in new subsection (2) provides for the annual deduction for the financial year ending on June 30, 1978, by averaging the present annual deduction based upon the maximum of $48 000 and minimum of $24 000 and the new annual deduction to have effect from January 1, 1978, based on a maximum of $60 000 and a minimum of $27 000. The same formula also provides for financial years subsequent to this financial year and for the two financial years preceding this financial year which are presently dealt with by subsections (2) and (2a) of the section.

Clause 5 amends section 14 of the principal Act to require an employer to register under the Act when his pay-roll exceeds $1 150 instead of the present $900. Clause 6 amends section 15 of the principal Act by removing the requirement that returns for pay-roll tax be made in triplicate. Clause 7 amends section 18k of the principal Act by providing for the new annual deduction in respect of pay-rolls of grouped employers. New section 18k corresponds with respect to grouped employers to section 13a amended as proposed with respect to single employers.

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

BARLEY MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to *(a)* arm the Australian Barley Board, established under the principal Act, the Barley Marketing Act, 1947, as amended, with the necessary powers to

engage in the "statutory marketing" of oats; *(b)* grant the board power to market other crops but without any powers of compulsory purchase; and *(c)* grant the board certain additional powers to borrow money under a Treasury guarantee. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 formally amends the long title to the principal Act. Clause 4 repeals the Oats Marketing Act, 1972. This measure was never brought into operation and will no longer be required if the amendments proposed by this measure are agreed to. Clause 5 amends the definition section of the principal Act by inserting such additional definitions as are necessary. It is felt that these definitions are self-explanatory, but I would draw honourable members' attention to proposed subclause (2), which is consequent on the definition of "proclaimed produce" and would emphasise that the new function of the board in relation to proclaimed produce does not carry with it any right to acquire that produce. Clause 6 inserts a new section 8a in the principal Act, and this section provides for the licensing of receivers of oats. This section corresponds almost exactly to the present provision relating to licensed receivers of barley. If other amending legislation is agreed to, the principal licensed receiver will be the Co-operative Bulk Handling Company.

Clause 7 amends section 9 of the principal Act, which sets out the general function of the board by arming the board with the statutory marketing powers adverted to above. In addition, the capacity to receive a guarantee by the Treasurer against liabilities arising from borrowings is provided under these amendments. Clause 8 amends section 10 of the principal Act by extending the inspectorial powers of the board to matters relating to oats. Clause 9 amends section 12 of the principal Act to provide for the keeping of accounts in relation to oats. Clause 10 is formal. Clause 11 inserts a new section 14aa in the principal Act. This clause confers the statutory marketing powers in relation to oats and is the prime function of the measure, especially at subclause (2) which is commended to honourable members' particular attention. Further, it is pointed out that this provision is, as it were, dormant until the "appointed day", as to which see subclause (3), is fixed. Present indications are that that day will be fixed so as to encompass oats of the season 1978-79. Clause 12 amends section 14a of the principal Act to extend the regulating powers of the board to cover oats.

Clause 13 amends section 15 of the principal Act to cover the receiving of oats by licensed receivers, and clause 14 is consequential on this provision. Clause 15 inserts a new section 17a which relates to oats and almost exactly corresponds to section 17 as it, at present, applies to barley. Clause 16 inserts a new section 18a in the principal Act and this clause, together with new section 19a, inserted by clause 17, sets out the scheme for the marketing of oats and exactly follows the existing scheme for the marketing of barley. Clause 18 makes some drafting amendments to section 20 of the principal Act and, in addition, extends by six months the time within which prosecutions may be brought for offences against the Act. Clauses 19 and 20 are, it is suggested, self-explanatory. Clause 21 extends the life of the principal Act: *(a)* in relation to barley until the season 1982-83; and *(b)* in relation to oats for five seasons from and including the season 1978-79.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND AND BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to rectify an apparent anomaly in the principal Act that has recently become evident. A number of persons who applied to be registered as land salesmen under the old Land Agents Act were registered under the provisions of the present Act just after it came into operation in 1974. A question has been raised as to whether such persons are "entitled to be registered" within the meaning of the principal Act as they do not have the qualifications now required of land salesmen. It is the Government's intention to make it quite clear that these persons are, and always have been, entitled to be registered under the Act. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that this Bill shall be deemed to have come into operation on the day that the principal Act came into operation. Clause 3 provides that a person who was an applicant for registration under the repealed Act immediately before the commencement of the principal Act is entitled to be registered under this Act. The provision relating to the registration of an applicant for registration (as opposed to an applicant for renewal of registration) is put into this section. Clause 4 provides for the renewal of registration upon payment of the prescribed fee. An applicant for renewal is not obliged to establish again that he is entitled to be registered. Clause 5 repeals section 28 of the principal Act. The substance of this section is now contained in the two previous sections of the Act as amended by this Bill.

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

BULK HANDLING OF GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for amendments of the principal Act, the Bulk Handling of Grain Act, 1959-1966, that are consequential on the amendments of the Barley Marketing Act, 1947-1973, provided for by the Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill, 1977. The Barley Marketing Act Amendment Bill, 1977, provides for the extension of the statutory marketing powers of the Australian Barley Board to the marketing of oats. This Bill extends all the powers, rights and duties of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited in respect of the

handling of barley to the handling of oats. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the measure is to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by applying the definition of "warrant" to "grain" instead of wheat only. Clause 4 amends section 12 of the principal Act to extend the exclusive right of the co-operative to the bulk handling of wheat and barley to the bulk handling of oats. Clause 5 amends section 14 of the principal Act and is consequential on the amendment provided for by clause 4. Clause 6 extends the right of the co-operative to be a licensed receiver of bulk wheat and barley to bulk oats. Clause 7 amends section 30 of the principal Act and is consequential on the amendment provided for by clause 6. Clauses 8, 9 and 10 are also of a consequential nature only.

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

MOUNT GAMBIER ROAD SAFETY INSTRUCTION CENTRE

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Mount Gambier Road Safety Instruction Centre.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.39 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, November 29, at 2.15 p.m.