HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, December 2, 1954.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Sir Robert Nicholls) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

PRICE CONTROL.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Did the Premier notice the report in this morning's *Advertiser* that yesterday the Bill to extend price control in Victoria was defeated in the Victorian Parliament and that as a result price control will cease there on the 31st of this month. The report includes a statement attributed to New South Wales Ministers to the effect that with the discontinuance of price control in Victoria it is possible that price control in New South Wales will also be discontinued except on a few essential items. Has the Premier had time to consider this question and can he indicate to the House what impact the result of the discontinuance of price control in Victoria will have on the continuance of price control here?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I did notice the report mentioned but I have not had time to consider the implications of the decision of the Victorian Parliament or the effect it will have upon our laws. Obviously there will be some effect because in respect of a number of items Victoria was the investigating State, particularly concerning items manufactured there. It is rather premature to make a statement upon the Victorian decision because Cabinet has not had an opportunity of examining the matter.

Mr. DUNKS—Did the Premier notice that the report stated that price control was costing Victoria £180,000 annually as compared with £85,000 in South Australia? Did he also note that the members of the New South Wales Cabinet said that "joint application of price control by Victoria, New South Wales, and South Australia was essential for its success"? Does he know that Tasmania has also discontinued price control? Did he notice that Mr. Vine, President of the Victorian Chamber of Manufactures, said "Experience in other countries had proved that this had not resulted in overall price rises"? If price control is discontinued in South Australia will the Premier consider using the £85,000 that will be saved in subsidizing price levels?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Nearly all of the matters mentioned by the honourable member were covered in the Leader of the Opposition's request for a statement. The only exception is the question relating to the cost of the Victorian department. I have no knowledge of that. Obviously the Victorian department would be much larger than the South Australian department because not only is there a much larger volume of trading in Victoria but to a greater extent Victoria was an investigating State. I would not like to comment on whether the annual cost of £180,000 in Victoria was excessive. As to whether the amount spent on our Prices Department—the honourable member mentioned £85,000, although I think the figure is now nearer £70,000—could be used to subsidize price levels in this State, I point out that quite recently I was able to show that the savings on one item alone as a result of the activities of the Prices Branch amounted to many hundreds of thousands of pounds, so obviously that £70,000 would have little effect in subsidizing prices.

CIVILIAN ASSISTANCE TO POLICE.

Mr. HUTCHENS—Yesterday one of my constituents, displaying great courage, went to the assistance of a police officer who had been attacked when questioning certain people. As a result my constituent suffered a broken leg and other injuries, including the loosening of three teeth, and he is in a sorry plight. Can the Premier indicate whether persons who go to the assistance of police officers, whether voluntarily or upon request, and suffer injury will be compensated for the injury or any loss resulting from such injury?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I saw the press report of the incident mentioned. I think it is essential that citizens should be encouraged to render assistance to police officers in times of emergency, as in the incident mentioned. Too frequently members of the public side against the police. We must remember that the police force was established for the maintenance of law and order and the protection of the community as a whole and it should receive all possible assistance. I applaud the brave act of the person concerned in assisting the police officer and I will certainly take the matter up with the Chief Secretary to see that appropriate action is taken.

CHILDREN ATTENDING ALICE SPRINGS SCHOOL.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE JENKINS—People who live in the outback and far outback have many disabilities in educating their children. Some of my constituents who live near Odnadatta, in order to educate their children, must send them to the Alice Springs school. In the Northern Territory the Commonwealth Education Department pays a boarding allowance of

£70 a year in respect of children resident within the Territory. However, that does not apply to people who come from outside the Territory. I understand that the State Education Department makes an allowance of £20 a year when a child has to board away from home, though I am not sure of the conditions applying to that. Will the Minister consider making that same allowance to children when they are being educated at Alice Springs as though they were going to a South Australian school? My second point is in relation to concession fares on the railways. As there is only one passenger train a week from Alice Springs, which usually leaves a day or two before the start of the holidays, concession fares are not obtainable because the holidays have not started. This means that at the ordinary inter-term holidays, if the children wish to take advantage of the concession fare, they cannot travel for some days after the end of the term, and when they arrive home it is nearly time to return to Alice Springs. Will the Minister discuss with the Commonwealth Railways the issuing of concession fares to children, when the train arrangements necessitate it, a day or two before the holidays start?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have great sympathy for these children and I am sure the Government will do everything in its power to assist them. As I understand the position, both the matters mentioned by the honourable member have, in the past anyway, been Commonwealth problems, but I will see whether the regulations under the Education Act should be amended to comply with the honourable member's first request. I shall be pleased to take up immediately with the Commonwealth authorities his second request and endeavour to let the honourable member have a reply to both questions before Parliament prorogues.

BULK HANDLING OF WHEAT.

Mr. STOTT—It has been reported to me that the wheat silo at Ardrossan yesterday received a record of 145,000 bushels from farmers' waggons. This wheat came from surrounding districts and as far away as Lochiel and beyond. Farmers' trucks were queued up for a quarter of a mile and the deliveries so alarmed the Wheat Board that it may have to consider refusing to take any more bulk wheat. There is already a demand from another place for building a bulk wheat silo at Wallaroo. The problem has reached alarming proportions because of the growing demand for a bulk handling system. This year the Wheat Board made available £3,500,000 to build additional emergency wheat storages. Of that sum £1,700,000 went to Victoria, £1,300,000 to New South Wales, and only £300,000 to South Australia, which has an outmoded bag storage system. With 230,000,000 bushels probably to be delivered to the board this season the board may have to approach the Commonwealth Government for additional loans to build further emergency storages in other States, and particularly in South Australia. There is no recognized bulkhandling authority in South Australia to receive the allocations of money from the Commonwealth Government to build modern bulk storages, and I ask the Premier whether he will place the matter before Cabinet and stress the urgency of considering calling a special session of Parliament to deal with bulk handling?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yesterday I answered a question on this topic. I am informed by my colleague that the Wheat Board is urgently attempting to get an additional ship to meet the position at Ardrossan, and the Government will give any support it can to that end. I pointed out yesterday that we are awaiting a report from the Public Works Committee, which has been promised within the next few days. It would not be proper for the Government to anticipate that report by making a decision on it.

CHRISTIES BEACH CAMP.

Mr. TEUSNER—As a Government representative on the National Fitness Council, together with the member for Semaphore, I have received a request which I wish to put before the Premier. I understand that ever since the National Fitness Council has had a camp on the site called Parmanga at Christies Beach North, efforts have been made by it to have the camp connected with the Electricity Trust's electricity supply. I am informed that a high tension cable has now been installed between the South Road opposite the Emu Hotel, Morphett Vale, and the Christies sandpits. This current is available within a half mile of the camp and the cottages nearby. To have it available at the camp would be of considerable benefit and would be greatly appreciated as the wind generated power at present used is not sufficient to supply all the light and power required at the Camp. I have been asked to ascertain whether the camp could be connected at an early date with a feeder line from the aforesaid high tension electricity main.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I will have that matter examined.

ENFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS—On May 5 I wrote to the Minister of Education requesting the provision of some protection from the sun for the imported prefabricated primary school at Enfield. The Minister has visited this school and he will probably remember that although it is an excellent school it has large windows which let the sun in and make the classrooms hot. I received a reply from his secretary on September 20, which states:—

> The Architect-in-Chief has recently inspected all imported aluminium schools with a view to devising a satisfactory method of shading them from excessive sunlight. A report is being prepared and will be submitted to our department for consideration.

I do not know whether that report has been submitted or the result of the investigation, but the classrooms are still unprotected from the sun and in the hot weather they are almost uninhabitable. Will the Minister take up this matter with some urgency now that the summer is here, as protection is necessary?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—At my request the Architect-in-Chief made an inspection some time ago and last week I approved of the protection by means of blinds of the schools of the type referred to. I have not the docket before me at the moment, but I shall be pleased to bring it down next week and let the honourable member have particulars. Requests from the honourable member and other persons interested in similar schools have been acceded to and, although it will be impossible to install the blinds this year they will be installed by the beginning of the next school year.

MANNUM WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. WHITE—Last year I introduced to the Minister of Works a deputation representing the Mannum Council and residents of that district. At that time those people were concerned about the implementation of a water supply scheme for the Murray flats. That scheme had been dealt with by the Public Works Committee and approved before the major project, the Mannum-Adelaide main, had been devised. On Tuesday last I was again approached by some of these people and asked to make further representations to the Minister. When he met the deputation the Minister said that nothing could be done on the scheme until the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline had been completed, but, as those people have read reports and heard rumours of other schemes being constructed they are anxious to have from the Minister some assurance that their just claims for the Murray flats scheme will be considered now that the Mannum-Adelaide main is operating. Can the Minister give that assurance?

The Hon. M. McINTOSH—So far as it is competent for a Minister to commit either his Cabinet, or more particularly Parliament, I assure the honourable member that no departure has been made in the general conception of things. The first essential, as I stressed when meeting the deputation, was that we must catch our hare—get the water here—and thereafter the order of priority of proceeding with the spur mains would be determined in the light of existing circumstances. I stressed to the deputation, however, that the sincerity of the Government regarding the scheme was evidenced by the fact that it had referred to the Public Works Committee a scheme to reticulate water to the hundred of Finniss. At that time that scheme was estimated to cost about £95,000, but its present-day cost would be £239,000 and there is no money on the Estimates, even if the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline were completed (which it is not), to enable that project to be undertaken. The other spur mains referred to by the honourable member include one to the Onkaparinga River, but that project will be financed from the fund reserved for metropolitan water supplies, as it is not a country scheme. The extension to the Warren comes within the category of country water supplies, the total grant for which has already been appropriated. We have no appropriation for the scheme referred to by the honourable member. The policy of the Government has not changed in regard to it, but when, how, and in what order of priority it will proceed must depend on the circumstances existing at the time, the sum of money allocated by Parliament to the various projects, and their relative urgency. I am not prepared to commit Cabinet or subsequent Ministries or Parliaments to one particular line of action. The Public Works Committee has recommended the scheme and the Government has not changed its order of priorities except in the cases I have mentioned, which, for the reasons given, in no way affects the commencement of the hundred of Finniss scheme.

INTERSTATE ROAD TRANSPORT.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—Yesterday, in reply to a question by the honourable member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) on the control of interstate road transport, the Premier, in referring to his earlier views on this matter, said:—

I must confess, however, that during the past 24 hours I have had to modify these views. Firstly, one interstate company has already declared war on the Government and demanded a refund of the petty licence fees that have been charged in this State.

As Government departments have taken from interstate road transport operators considerable sums, does the Premier think that the words "declared war" represent the true state of affairs when, in fact, all those companies propose to do is get what the law says they are entitled to? The Premier continued:—

Secondly, we have received reports through the Chief Secretary from police officers, who were instructed to investigate the conduct of interstate road transport under the new system, that over the week-end 16 grave cases of speeding with heavy loads and 14 grave cases of heavy loading were detected. Therefore, I have asked the Minister of Railways to examine the position with a view to ascertaining whether legislation will be necessary.

Does not the present law provide penalties for overloading of and speeding by that type of transport?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Yes, but there have already been cases where the law has been violated and vehicles ordered off the roads because of overloading, but the drivers have said, "We don't mind paying the fine; we will continue." Whether the law must be strengthened remains to be seen, and the Crown Law Office has been asked this morning to examine that position. On the question of a refund of licence fees, for many years transport operators from other States have had the privilege of using South Australian roads without having to pay any motor registration fees, only a nominal permit fee on their load carried within this State. The Government will require interstate freighters to pay the same fees for the use of our roads as are paid by South Australian freighters. Today I will give notice of a Bill to deal with these matters.

Mr. Macgillivray—Are you going to declare war on them now?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—No, merely to protect organized society, our roads and the assets of the State.

SALISBURY HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. GOLDNEY—In reply to a question I asked on Tuesday the Minister of Education intimated that the Education Department had purchased an area of 10 acres at Salisbury. Can he say whether the department had previously purchased land in that district for school purposes? Can he indicate the number of enrolments at the Salisbury Consolidated School and the Salisbury North School? In the event of high school accommodation being provided at Salisbury will students who live further north of Salisbury as far as Bowmans be accommodated at that school instead of their having to come to the city as at present?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The 10 acres to which I referred on Tuesday were additional to what the department already owns. I have received a report concerning the proposed high school at Salisbury as follows:—

An analysis of present enrolments at the primary schools at Salisbury and Salisbury North indicates that provision should be made for the establisment of a high school to serve this district. The South Australian Housing Trust has a programme of 1,100 houses at Salisbury North and almost all of these have been completed. In addition to the residential area in the town of Salisbury, a number of houses have been erected inside the Long Range Weapons Establishment at Penfield. The present enrolment at Salisbury Consolidated School is 681 and at Salisbury North 702. It is expected that the housing at Salisbury North will provide a considerable increase in the number of children at present attending this school, and the department proposes to erect an infant school there. Work has recently begun on the new satellite town between Salisbury and Smithfield, but it is proposed to provide a separate secondary school in the limits of that town.

The department owns an area of 10 acres in Farley Grove, Salisbury North. Originally this land was purchased as a site for the Salisbury North primary school, but it was found to be not central enough for that purpose. Recently Cabinet approval was given to the purchase of 10 acres adjoining the southern boundary of this site. The primary enrolments at the Salisbury Consolidated School and the Salisbury North School are such that I consider it will be necessary to ask for approval to include the construction of a new high school on this site in the next building programme. If this approval is given and the school is begun towards the end of 1955, it should be ready for occupation not later than the beginning of 1958. It may perhaps be possible to use a portion of this school earlier.

NOXIOUS WEEDS ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Mr. HAWKER—Can the Minister of Agriculture say on what authority the Noxious Weeds Advisory Committee is constituted;

how members are appointed; who the members are and whether they represent any particular bodies?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—The Noxious Weeds Advisory Committee is not a statutory body but is purely advisory and is appointed by the Minister. The committee was last reconstituted in 1948. The present members are the Director of Agriculture, Dr. A. R. Callaghan (Chairman); Professor J. A. Prescott, the Director of the Waite Agricultural Research Institute; Professor J. G. Wood, Professor of Botany at the University of Adelaide; and Mr. O. H. Heinrich and Mr. H. N. Wicks, members of the Advisory Board of Agriculture. Mr. P. F. Pollnitz, secretary to the Minister of Agriculture, is secretary to this committee. Mr. H. E. Orchard, who is the research officer on weeds in the Department of Agriculture, attends all meetings to report on departmental activities and to advise on any technical matters.

TAXICAB INVESTIGATION.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Has the Premier received a report from the Prices Commissioner following on investigations conducted by the Prices Branch into certain aspects of the taxicab industry in South Australia? Further is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the legislation on the Notice Paper relating to the control of taxicabs in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—The reply to the first question is "Yes" and to the second "No."

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Were any factors disclosed by the Prices Commissioner's inquiries that would merit some further policing of control or is anything contemplated as a substitute for the passing of the excellent Bill introduced by the Premier earlier in this session?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—When the Bill was before the House it did not seem to be so excellent and it is now at the bottom of the notice paper. The Prices Commissioner's report is a far-reaching one. He delved deeply into all matters associated with the control of taxicabs. The report disclosed that it is necessary to take certain action in this matter and that there are a number of factors that need attention. It suggests that the authority controlling taxicabs could be helped in many ways by an advisory committee consisting of representatives of metropolitan councils and the Adelaide City Council. The Government has examined this aspect and approached municipal authorities and the city council, and it seems that this suggestion is acceptable. I believe that allowing such an advisory committee to function for a few months would enable a proper decision to be made on the questions before the House. I am getting from the Prices Commissioner a somewhat abbreviated report that would not infringe the secrecy provisions of the Prices Act. If that can be done I will be able to let the honourable member have details of the matters under consideration.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. MACGILLIVRAY—In view of the multiplicity of new Bills of which the Premier today gave notice and the measures remaining on the Notice Paper, I fear that this session may extend into the New Year. In the event of that happening will the Premier see that a week's vacation is provided during the Christmas-New Year period?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I am sure that this session can conclude satisfactorily on Thursday next if we have the honourable member's co-operation.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: HUNDRED OF BARUNGA.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the resolution transmitted by the House of Assembly.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

JOHN MILLER PARK BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from December 1. Page 1655.)

Clause 6—"Grounds upon which approval is to be withheld."

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—I move—

At the end of new section 12a to insert the following new subsection:—

(3) If a plan of subdivision does not comply with the requirements of paragraph (*j*) of subsection (1) but otherwise complies with this Act the committee may approve the plan if the committee is satisfied that the applicant has paid or has entered into binding arrangements to pay to the council of the area in which the land shown in the plan is situated such amount as is deemed reasonable by the committee but not exceeding five per centum of the value at the time the plan was submitted for approval of the land shown in the plan. All moneys so received by any council shall be paid by the council into a separate account and shall be applied by the council towards the purchase of land to be held as reserves for public gardens and public reserves which, as far as possible, shall be in the locality in which the land shown in the plan of subdivision is situated.

This is one of the amendments sought by municipal authorities. Paragraph (*j*) of subsection (1) of new section 12a enacted by clause 6 provides that, when considering an application for approval of a plan of subdivision, the committee is to consider whether the plan provides for reasonably adequate public reserves having regard to existing reserves which will be available for the use of persons residing on the land subdivided by the plan. The amendment is similar in principle to New Zealand legislation and provides that, if a plan does not provide for the reserves required by paragraph (*j*) the committee may approve of the plan, if the subdivider pays or makes binding arrangements to pay to the council such amount as the committee deems reasonable but not exceeding five per centum of the then value of the land proposed to be subdivided. Amounts received by a council in this manner are to be paid into a separate account and are to be applied towards the purchase of public reserves which, so far as possible, are to be in the same locality as the land included in the subdivision in question. Thus, the effect will be that, where a subdivision should make provision for reserves, that provision can be insisted upon. Where it is not appropriate to make such provision in a subdivision, the subdivider can be required to contribute to a pool which is to be used by the council for the provision of reserves elsewhere.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7—''Appeal.''

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move:—

In subsection (1) of new section 13 to strike out ''The Minister shall once at least in any year lay before Parliament all such reports received by him during the preceding twelve months''; and after proposed subsection (3) to insert the following new subsection:—

(4) Every such report shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament and may be considered by a joint committee appointed for the purpose by both Houses of Parliament in pursuance of the Joint Standing Orders. The joint committee shall consider the plan of subdivision and the report of the committee and any other matters deemed relevant by the joint committee and may after consideration thereof approve the plan, in which case the plan shall be deemed to be approved for the purposes of this Act, or may uphold the decision of the committee

Clause 7 provides that if the committee refuses to approve of a plan of subdivision, the person submitting the plan may require its re-consideration by the committee.. If upon reconsideration, the committee still refuses its approval, the committee is to report its reasons to the Minister and the Minister, at least once in every twelve months, is to lay before Parliament all such reports made to him by the committee. The Municipal Association has suggested that there should be an appeal from a decision of the committee refusing approval to a plan of subdivision. The amendments therefore provide that where the committee, on reconsideration of a refusal to approve a plan, still adheres to its decision, the report to the Minister now provided for by clause 7 is to be laid before both Houses. It is then provided that both Houses may appoint a joint committee to consider the matter and the joint committee may, after investigating the matter, approve of the plan of subdivision or may uphold the decision of the committee refusing approval. Thus, in effect, there will be an appeal to a joint committee of Parliament in any case in which Parliament deems it desirable to appoint a joint committee. The appointment of such a joint committee will, of course, be governed by the Joint Standing Orders relating to joint committees.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9—''Enactment of sections 26 to 32 of principal Act.''

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD— I move—

In subsection (1) of new section 26 after ''area'' first occurring to insert ''For the purpose of preparing the plan the committee may consult with any council the area of which is within the metropolitan area, any public authority and any body corporate by which any of the public services referred to in paragraph (*d*) of subsection (1) is provided.''

Clause 9 provides that the committee is to prepare a plan for the development of the metropolitan area. The amendment provides that, for the purpose of preparing the plan, the committee may consult with any council in the metropolitan area, any public authority or any body corporate supplying any of the essential services to the community such as electricity, gas, etc. The Municipal Association has requested that provision be made in the Bill for consultation with councils as councils are obviously vitally concerned with what may be proposed by the developmental plan. Obviously, the committee will find it necessary to consult with these various authorities in order to ascertain many of the facts upon which it will base its conclusions.

Amendment carried.

Mr. TRAVERS—I move to delete paragraph (*d*), which does not fit into the scheme of things and does not make sense. We must examine some of the other clauses to ascertain its true meaning. When read with the caption it states:—

The committee shall, as soon as may be, make an examination of the metropolitan area and an assessment of its probable development and for that purpose shall have regard to the following matters:—(*d*) Whether in the interests of the community, the subdivision of any land within the metropolitan area should be prohibited or permitted only subject to conditions.

Let us see what happens when an examination and an assessment are made. The committee is required to make a plan and subsequent provisions of the Bill indicate that in certain eventualities it becomes law unless disallowed by the House. This committee must inquire about any subdivision of any land in the metropolitan area. Clause 2 defines the metropolitan area as meaning "the area comprised within the municipalities of Adelaide, etc." This paragraph therefore requires inquiries and investigations to be made within the city of Adelaide. One of the regulations under the Town Planning Act requires that no allotments shall be less than 7,500 sq. ft. None of the new buildings that have been commenced will be of that size. Section 3 of the principal Act states that the Act does not apply to the city of Adelaide. Where does all this get us? In the principal Act we are told the Act does not apply to the city but in the definition clause of the Bill we are told that the metropolitan area includes the city of Adelaide. Under this paragraph the committee has power to make laws instead of Parliament, and its power extends to the city of Adelaide. I do not know which law the landholders in the city are expected to obey. I am a member of the board of a company which is about to build on an allotment much smaller than 7,500 sq. ft. Is the company to abide by the Town Planning Act which provides that it does not apply to the city of Adelaide or is it to wait until a plan is introduced and automatically becomes law? It seems to me that the only sensible thing to do is to delete this paragraph. The definition clause could remain without doing any damage. We are providing in two parts of the same Act that it shall not apply to the city of Adelaide and that it shall apply if this paragraph is accepted.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Paragraph (*d*) states:—

Whether in the interests of the community, the subdivision of any land within the metropolitan area should be prohibited or permitted only subject to conditions having regard, in particular, to the provisions of public services such as sewers, water supplies, electricity supplies, gas supplies, public transport services and the like and whether the cost of providing any of such services to the land would be other than advantageous or economical.

The honourable member's reason for suggesting that the paragraph be deleted is that the principal Act provides that the city of Adelaide is excluded but that in this Bill it is not excluded. The paragraph relates to the provision of services and the honourable member will realize that all these services are already provided in the city of Adelaide, so paragraph (*d*) could not possibly affect it. The paragraph is designed to deal with places not subdivided and where there are no sewers, electricity or water supplies. It relates to the question of whether those services can be provided advantageously or economically. In one instance the State, in providing deep drainage, was put to the expense of having to construct a drain no less than 14ft. deep in treacherous country. The drain had to be timbered for its entire length and the workmen had to work in water up to the waist. That drainage system was to serve a small uneconomic unit. That is what we are trying to avoid. The committee will take into account the cost of providing the services so as not to involve the State in high expenditure in providing uneconomic services. The preparation of a realistic plan will also ensure that people will not purchase blocks on the assumption that services can be provided when in actual fact they cannot be provided economically.

Mr. TRAVERS—Day by day my admiration of the dexterous footwork of the Premier

increases because he has not dealt with the matter I raised but with something else. There are two matters contained in this paragraph, one with which I dealt and the other with which the Premier dealt. The first matter relates to subdivisions in the metropolitan area which may be prohibited. That is the matter I am concerned with. The Premier referred to the second matter, namely, that a subdivision may be permitted subject to the provision of certain services. I am not the least interested in the part relating to the provision of services but with the part relating to the prohibition—without grounds being stated—of subdivisions. It is useless to suggest that because the city of Adelaide is already subdivided the paragraph will not apply to it. It will apply to any area. By definition it applies to Adelaide whether subdivided or not. The fact that a place is once subdivided does not mean that it cannot be further subdivided. We must either be realistic about this or be "yes" men. I know the way I will approach the matter. I shall approach it in a way that would give it some practical and sensible meaning and not in the capacity of a "yes" man. This clause gives the power to prohibit people in King William Street from utilizing land for which they have paid a large sum, but it will not be necessary to give any reason for that prohibition. We should at least use a little common sense about this clause and I appeal to the committee to reject it.

Mr. SHANNON—I do not agree with Mr. Travers' remarks. We are now dealing with a principle similar to that on which the committee has already made a decision. Previously we were considering the position of the Engineer-in-Chief and dealing with services that came within his purview. Now we are considering matters to come within the purview of a special committee, but there is a greater safety factor in this case. It will not be a matter of one man's decision. Further, an appeal by any person aggrieved can be made to the Minister.

Mr. Travers—There can be no appeal under this provision.

Mr. SHANNON—I thought there could be an appeal in any instance. I thought the Minister would be the final court of appeal, but I may be wrong. In the event of any injustice there is always someone in this House prepared to air a grievance of any person feeling aggrieved. If we deny the authority to be set up the right to supervise the subdivision of land the legislation will be so emasculated that it will be valueless. The services provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department must be considered when making subdivisions. Mr. Travers' amendment would nullify the effectiveness of the measure.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—Mr. Travers seems to fear that this clause makes it obligatory to get approval for a subdivision in the city of Adelaide, but it does not do that. It deals with the question of providing a master plan. Actually, the city has already been surveyed and established, and a master plan of the metropolitan area could not conceivably re-establish Adelaide on any other principle.

Mr. Travers—You do not suggest that you could not subdivide any allotment in Adelaide?

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—This provision does not alter the present law with regard to getting permission for subdivisions. It provides for an overall plan to be prepared of future development in the city and surrounding areas. As development has already taken place in the city it is assumed that the planning committee, when it produces its overall plan, will put down King William Street where it is at present. However, it will try to bring some order into development taking place in outside areas so that they will be most effectively available to citizens and so that services can be provided at a reasonable cost and in a proper manner.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—It seems to me that the Town Planning Committee will not be the final arbiter in the production of a master plan. The plans will have to be submitted to the Minister and laid before Parliament. They might even be sent back to the committee.

Mr. Travers—But they cannot be amended by Parliament.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—If they have been re-submitted to the committee as the result of a resolution passed by either House they can still be disapproved by Parliament. As the whole purpose of this provision is to protect posterity and bring about a more orderly development of our metropolitan area it is necessary to pass this clause.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

At the end of new section 26 (ii) to insert the following words:—

For the purpose of preparing the plan the committee may consult with any council the area of which is within the metropolitan area, any public authority and any body corporate by which any of the public services referred to in paragraph (*d*) of subsection (1) is provided.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

In new section 27 (2) to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty-eight."

Amendment carried.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

In paragraph i. of new section 28 (1) to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty-eight."

Amendment carried.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD moved—

In new section 29 to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty-eight."

Amendment carried.

The Hon. T. PLAYFORD—I move—

After new section 33 to insert the following new section:—

33a. As soon as may be after the plan or any alteration or variation thereof is laid before Parliament, the Minister shall supply a copy thereof together with a copy of the committee's report thereon to every council the area of which is within the metropolitan area. This will give the council more time to scrutinize plans.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

STOCK AND POULTRY DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon A. W. CHRISTIAN (Minister of Agriculture)— I move—

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to confer on the Governor powers to make regulations for the purpose of preventing the introduction or spread of foot and mouth disease and other diseases of stock. Foot and mouth disease occurs in the United Kingdom and has an alarming incidence in Europe. It is widespread throughout the continents of Asia, Africa and South America but, so far, Australia has been free from the disease. The quarantine provisions of the Commonwealth are rigorously enforced with the object of preventing the introduction of this and other diseases into Australia but the Commonwealth Department of Health has expressed the view that no form of quarantine can be a sufficient guarantee against the introduction of the infection of such a disease as foot and mouth disease and has suggested that plans should be formulated with a view to dealing with any occurrence of the disease in Australia.

The matter has been considered by the Australian Agricultural Council and, in view of the disastrous effects an outbreak of foot and mouth disease would have on the livestock industries and export trade of Australia, it has been agreed that, in the event of the disease occurring in Australia, concerted and drastic action should be taken by all States affected to eradicate the disease. The action considered to be necessary is the slaughter of affected stock with the greatest possible speed. In order to enable immediate and drastic action to be taken as soon as the disease occurs, it is considered that legislative power to take these measures should be enacted and thus enable appropriate authority to take speedy action as the occasion arises.

The present provisions of the Stock and Poultry Diseases Act provide a variety of powers which are available to deal with the outbreak of disease, including the power of quarantine, but it is considered that these powers do not extend far enough to deal with a disease such as foot and mouth disease. The Bill accordingly provides that the Governor shall have additional powers to make regulations for the control of foot and mouth disease. The Bill also authorizes the making of regulations providing for remedial measures to be taken in respect of any other disease proclaimed by the Governor as a disease to which the Bill will apply. There are exotic diseases such as rinderpest, swine fever and blue tongue, an outbreak of which could also have far-reaching effects, and it is considered that the regulation-making power should extend to measures to control such diseases. The Bill empowers the Governor to make regulations upon a number of topics.

Provision may be made for the immediate notification of disease and the duty of notification may be placed on the owner of the stock, the proprietor of the land in question and on any veterinary surgeon or other person by whom the stock are treated. Regulations may be made for the quarantine of stock, land, fodder, etc. which has been exposed to infection or an inspector suspects may be affected with disease or may have been exposed to infection and for the disinfection of any such fodder, fittings, etc., and of any persons exposed to infection. The regulations may prohibit the removal of stock, fodder, etc., from any quarantined area, may prohibit the entry of persons into any quarantined land, and may prohibit persons leaving such land. The feeding of stock may be controlled by regulation and the taking of specimens from disease affected stock may be prohibited.

The most important regulation-making power is one which will enable the Chief Inspector of Stock, with the approval of the Minister, to

order the destruction of any stock quarantined by reason of disease or which has been exposed to infection with disease and of any farm produce or fittings which are infected with or have been exposed to disease. A further power will enable the Chief Inspector, with the approval of the Minister, to destroy any wild animals or birds for the purpose of preventing the spread of disease. Thus, the Bill will enable regulations to be made so that, if foot and mouth disease or any comparable disease occurs in South Australia, the necessary remedial action to deal with the disease can be taken with the greatest possible promptitude and without the delay which would perhaps make all the difference between stamping out the disease or not. All regulations made under the Bill will be subject to the ordinary rules relating to subordinate legislation and will be laid before Parliament in the usual way and be subject to disallowance.

Foot and mouth disease particularly affects all cloven-footed animals, and the mortality rate is generally greater than 20 per cent. Another serious consequence of the disease is that the stock lose condition and production returns are adversely affected. The introduction of this type of disease and some of the other exotic diseases to which I have referred has been made easier by modern transport facilities such as the aeroplane, and unless luggage and other goods entering the country are strictly examined the virus of the disease may be introduced into and spread throughout the country. Present-day quarantine regulations, however, make it difficult for such diseases to be introduced as the customs officials thoroughly examine luggage and parcels of goods entering the country.

Recently an outbreak of foot and mouth disease was introduced into Canada on the clothing of a migrant who had been a dairy hand in Europe, but Canadian authorities were able to stamp it out very quickly. Prompt action is necessary because the disease can spread rapidly and possibly involve millions of pounds' worth of stock. In Western Australia there was an outbreak of rinderpest not long ago. It was introduced by means of a load of manure taken from a ship and spread in somebody's garden, and it was not long before all the animals in the Fremantle area had to be quarantined and slaughtered to prevent its spreading. Such an outbreak can be very costly because of the large numbers of stock which may have to be slaughtered.

This matter was discussed at the last meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council in July, following on which the Commonwealth Government agreed to provide 50 per cent of the finance necessary to combat an outbreak of the disease; the States are to provide the balance. More recently officers of the various State Departments of Agriculture met and agreed on the proportions in which the States should contribute towards the total amount; the South Australian share will be about 10 per cent of the balance of the 50 per cent required. It is proposed to use that money in stamping out outbreaks of disease and in providing compensation for the owners of stock in the State where the disease may occur. For instance, if an outbreak occurred in Queensland South Australia's contribution, as well as the contributions of other States, would be used to deal with it.

Mr. Stott—If a farmer buys affected sheep in a saleyard, what steps can he take subsequently?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—As soon as it is discovered that the sheep are affected they will be quarantined.

Mr. Stott—Can he apply for compensation?

The Hon. A. W. CHRISTIAN—That is one of the purposes of the fund to which I have referred. Another purpose is the financing of any eradication campaign considered necessary.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ASSENT TO ACTS.

His Excellency the Governor intimated by message his assent to the following Acts:—Anatomy Act Amendment (No. 2), Appropriation (No. 2), Cattle Compensation Act Amendment, Renmark Irrigation Trust Act Amendment, and Stamp Duties Act Amendment.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

COMMONWEALTH AND STATE HOUSING SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1553.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Goodwood)—The schedules to the Bill are most important. The purpose of the Bill is to enable tenants to purchase homes erected under the Commonwealth and State Housing Agreement. Homes which were constructed for letting purposes will become available for purchase by tenants. I think it can be assumed, from the Premier's remarks, that the only homes which will become available are timber houses. When

originally purchased I understood the timber homes would be sold for between £2,500 and £2,750. The Bill provides for rents to be regarded as part of a tenant's deposit. There will be some difficulty in deciding what amount of the rent paid by a tenant is to be regarded as part of a deposit. Will interest on capital outlay, council and water rates and maintenance charges be deducted from the amount of rent regarded as part of a deposit? Will a certain percentage be deducted in respect of payments made in providing roads, footpaths and other services. If those matters are taken into consideration very little which can be regarded as a deposit will remain. For many years the Government was not a party to the housing agreement. I wonder whether the Government would have been a member today if it had had the assurance that it could continue to obtain sufficient finance at 3 per cent to enable it to maintain its housing programme through the Housing Trust.

In his second reading speech the Premier indicated that the trust would continue to build homes for sale and would extend finance for second mortgages. Quite apart from that, however, there will be little opportunity for persons to obtain anything but timber homes as a result of this legislation. I think the Government should admit that it made a mistake when it purchased so many timberframe homes. It is now endeavouring to dispose of them and tenants will be able to purchase them on a low deposit, if any deposit. In this second reading speech the Premier said:—

> As to whether the scheme for the sale of houses will apply to future houses will depend upon the form of any future housing agreement. The present agreement expires at about the end of 1955 and, when consideration is given to its possible continuance, the question of the sale of houses built under the agreement will obviously need to be taken into account.

I think that indicates that he is not particularly concerned with the continuance of this housing agreement. He is only concerned with disposing of these timber houses so that the Housing Trust will not be responsible for their maintenance. Quite apart from the possible life of these homes the maintenance involved can be extremely costly. There is also the question of added insurance to be met on timber houses, so the general upkeep on them is more costly than on a home of solid construction.

I wonder how much money will be used by the Housing Trust under the terms of this agreement, particularly on the homes to be built in the satellite town near Salisbury. This Bill will enable more people to purchase their own homes, but there is no guarantee that the rate of interest will remain at 4½ per cent. If interest rates go higher there will be greater hardship on home purchasers, particularly if they put down only a small deposit. If they buy timber homes their maintenance costs will be higher, and their commitments will be greater than they appear on paper. In the past I have asked several questions about the maximum advance allowable under the Advances for Homes Act, and I was particularly interested in the reply given by the Treasurer yesterday to the question asked by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Dunks). The Treasurer said there was only a limited amount of money available to the State Bank for advances for homes and that if the maximum advances were increased fewer applicants could be accommodated. Why cannot Parliament make more money available to lending institutions in order that they can make higher advances? Recently I made representations to the State Bank for an advance for a home purchaser. Admittedly the application was not in respect of a new house, but it was for one of solid construction. It is time the Government considered increasing the maximum advance. At present many people have to borrow money on a second mortgage, but that is not desirable.

Mr. Quirke—Where can the State Bank get more money?

Mr. FRANK WALSH—That is not for me to say.

Mr. O'Halloran—If we had greater co-operation between the Commonwealth and State Governments this problem could be solved by the issue of more national credit.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—If the Commonwealth Government make available £2,750 for the purchase of timber homes it is high time the maximum advance of £1,750 under the South Australian Advances for Homes Act was raised. However, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Schedule.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia will be parties to this agreement. Can the Minister of Lands, in the absence of the Treasurer, say whether it is likely that Tasmania will enter the agreement?

The Hon. C. S. HINCKS—The Tasmanian Government was not represented at the conference and there has been no indication of whether Tasmania intends to come into the scheme.

Schedule passed.

Title passed. Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2) (SICK LEAVE).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1554.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I believe that every member will approve of this Bill because it extends a measure of leniency hitherto not permitted the Government in dealing with difficulties that occur from time to time regarding the recurring illnesses of some public servants as a result of their service during either the first or the second World War. Under the existing Act the Minister may, on the recommendation of the Public Service Commissioner, grant 16 days' sick leave on full pay or a proportionately longer period on half pay in any one year. The practice in these cases has been to grant leave whenever required at a rate of pay that was ascertained by adding to the war service pension a sum to give a total equal to the public servant's rate of pay. The limit of 16 days, however, has resulted in some cases of hardship, and a discretionary power is to be given so that extended sick leave with pay may be granted in such cases. This provision is to be made retrospective to January 1 of this year.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1555.)

Mr. JOHN CLARK (Gawler)—I support the Bill. It may only appear to be a minor matter to some members, but for many years the teaching profession has sought retrospectivity of salary awards. This Bill should help in the recruitment of teachers and to offset what I am afraid may be the adverse effect of increases in the rents of houses occupied by some country teachers. In reply to a question I asked last week the Minister of Education told members about the local recruiting drive for teachers, but he said he was disappointed to learn of the lack of success of Mr. Nietz' recruiting campaign in England. I was particularly happy to hear of the good quality of local recruits. Some young people have a habit of changing their minds regarding their choice of a vocation, but I hope these recruits will not do so. I especially commend the work of Inspector Jones and his recruiting group who visited high schools in an effort to interest scholars in a teaching career. The headmaster and staff of the Gawler High School, which had the honour to receive the group's first visit, were particularly impressed by the way the members of the group applied themselves to their task.

This Bill will help make the teaching service a happier one. At present there are some bones of contention that disturb the smooth running of the department, but this Bill should result in the burial of at least one such bone. The Teachers Salaries Board was established in 1945, and that was probably the best thing that ever happened to the teaching profession in this State, for it has proved a great boon to teachers. At the time of its inception the Board's powers were largely modelled on those of the Public Service Classification and Efficiency Board. At that time neither board had power to make retrospective awards, but today, with conditions more complex than ever before, the finalization of salary claims takes much longer. Indeed, in 1948 the Public Service Board was given the power to make its awards retrospective; but the Teachers Salaries Board has had to wait another six years before being given that power. Teachers generally believe that the incorporation of this principle in the Act is a step forward, and I am glad that the Government agrees with them in that regard. The work of the Teachers Salaries Board takes longer than it used to, but I do not criticize the Board for that: it is merely a sign of the times. The effect of its delay in dealing with business will be cushioned somewhat by its power to make its awards retrospective. If a claim is just when originally made, the increased salary awarded as a result of that claim should be paid from the date it is lodged. Can the Minister of Education say whether clause 3 gives the power to make retrospective any future decision on a claim that is now before it? I hope it does.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

NURSES' REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

AMUSEMENTS DUTY (FURTHER SUSPENSION) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 1550.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—This is another Bill to which I offer no opposition. It does two things. Firstly it removes the age limitation imposed on board members. At present they must retire on reaching 70 but that limitation is removed. This will bring the Act into line with the conditions Parliament established for other boards under the Public Service Act as recently as this session. I approve of this provision because it can be visualized that, had the old provision remained, many worthy members of the board who were capable of rendering valuable service for several years would have automatically retired at 70. It is obvious that no appointments can be made in respect of persons over that age.

The second matter involved is the appointment of district advisory committees. Electricity services are being extended into country areas and persons with local knowledge may be appointed to advisory committees. Their advice and knowledge will be extremely valuable in assisting officers of the trust in carrying out the necessary work of extending and providing services in country areas. Furthermore, the local boards will be of value to persons in the areas they serve. Section 43 of the Act provides that under certain circumstances the trust may grant assistance to municipalities and other people in sparsely populated areas to provide further or improved electricity supplies. I know of one case where people in a sparsely populated area had no knowledge of this provision until I told them. Had there been a board in that area they would have been able to ascertain that knowledge from a member of the board and would probably have received some assistance in having their claim for consideration investigated. When I approached an officer of the trust recently he indicated that he had no knowledge of this provision. It is obvious that persons with local knowledge would be valuable members of such boards.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—It is my intention to refer to the reticulation of electricity supplies in country areas. I have no fault to find with the Bill but it does not go as far as I would like. Groups of people in various outlying districts frequently agree to pay a certain surcharge for an electricity supply but in many cases the agreements presented to them for signature by officers of the trust are not sufficiently understood. The wording of the agreements is rather involved. There is no doubt that the effect of an agreement is that the more electricity a person consumes the more he is penalized in the way of a surcharge on that group. Let me provide an example. A group of people decided to obtain an electricity supply and subsequently two farmers joined the group. Apart from the farmers the other persons used the electricity solely for household purposes—lighting and heating—and did not consume large quantities of current. The farmers sought a supply in order to harness their farm equipment—to pump water and to operate chaff cutters. They used far more electricity than the other members of the group. The position is that under the agreements the persons who use most electricity in effect enable the small consumers to obtain electricity very reasonably. It would be a logical approach to this matter to provide that the more current a person uses the less it should cost him for each unit of current. Unfortunately that does not apply. In these days of labour shortages it is of great assistance to a farmer to be able to utilize electricity but under the present system it can become quite costly. I know of at least two cases where farmers adopted the use of electricity for pumping water but at the end of 12 months they discovered that their costs of pumping had increased steeply and they decided to revert to the use of diesel engines. My view is that these agreements should provide a fairer basis so that the large consumers do not have to support the small consumers. At present the penalty charges for a group are decided upon the amount of current used by its members. The man who uses £50 worth of electricity pays 50 parts of the surcharge whereas the man who only uses £5 worth pays 5 parts. I have taken this matter up with the Treasurer but have not seen any sign of action yet. If there is a tendency for people to revert to the use of diesel power instead of electricity on the score of economics, surely the trust can do something about it. I support the second reading.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS (Stirling)—I support the second reading. Particularly do I favour the suggestion of advisory committees

being set up in the country. During the past few years and during the next few years my district will be changing from the old diesel method of supplying electricity through private contractors to the taking over by the trust of supplies. Having been associated during the last four or five years with the matter of electricity supplies to some towns in my district, I feel sure that the appointment of these advisory committees will fill a long-felt need. To overcome problems of supply in country districts we must have close liaison between local people and the Electricity Trust. The advisory committees will be able to explain these problems to the trust. The matter mentioned by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) in regard to the surcharge—

The SPEAKER—That is outside the scope of the Bill.

Mr. WILLIAM JENKINS—Very well, Sir, but I strongly support the appointment of advisory committees.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

LEIGH CREEK NORTH COALFIED TO MARREE RAILWAY AGREEMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.52 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 7, at 2 p.m.