

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.**

Tuesday, May 10, 1960.

The SPEAKER (Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

**QUESTIONS.****FORBES PRIMARY SCHOOL.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—At the fire that occurred at the Forbes Primary School last Friday night, when both the Minister of Education and I were present at some time, I noticed the great effort made by people in the neighbourhood, possibly parents of children attending the school, but adults in particular. They rendered yeoman service in helping to remove furniture from some of the school buildings. In addition, I pay a tribute to the Marion Corporation for its offer to assist the department to clear debris resulting from the fire. The fire brigade, under the direction of the Fire Chief, rendered a real service in trying to save some of the buildings. Can the Minister of Education say what assistance will be offered in the replacement of books and personal equipment of both the teachers and children, in addition to meeting any losses sustained in connection with articles purchased with departmental assistance? Can he say when it is likely that the classrooms will be replaced and whether the Government is prepared, even at the eleventh hour, to consider replacing the destroyed buildings with solid construction classrooms of brick or other material?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—With the honourable member I had the doubtful pleasure of witnessing the fire last Friday night, and I join with him in expressing praise and appreciation of the expedition and efficiency of the work of Chief Officer Patton and other members of the Fire Brigade, the members of the Police Force, the headmaster (Mr. Cochrane), some members of the staff, members of the school committee, parents and friends of school children, and other residents of the Forbes district. It was heartening to see such an outpouring of voluntary service on the part of so many people when we needed it most.

Yesterday, after receiving a report from the Director of Education, I referred to Cabinet the question of reimbursement for personal possessions and school property lost in the fire. Cabinet approved of:—

(a) Payment to teachers for loss of teaching aids and personal property;

- (b) Payment to children for loss of possessions other than school books (except in the case of articles left at the school contrary to school rules);
- (c) Replacement of children's school books lost in the fire;
- (d) Replacement of school library books;
- (e) Replacement of school equipment originally purchased on subsidy.

The head master, staff and students at the Forbes primary school will be asked to prepare a detailed list of loss under each of these headings with a statement of the replacement cost of each item. I will then authorise the Education Department to take the necessary steps to make the appropriate payments and replacements.

The Director of Public Buildings (Mr. Slade) and the Works Manager of the department's Finsbury Works Branch (Mr. Bermingham), acting with great expedition, have already commenced the work of repairing the damaged classrooms and the replacement of the destroyed rooms. Most, if not all, of the damaged rooms will be repaired and available for use again at the end of the May vacation. It is estimated that the replacement of the completely destroyed classrooms will be effected in stages. The first four new rooms will be available two weeks after the beginning of the next term, four others after two weeks more, and so on. All classrooms should, therefore, be replaced within two months or thereabouts.

As to whether at this late stage the destroyed classrooms can be replaced with solid construction rooms, I think that would be impracticable at present, in view of the very great urgency of accommodating the 700 children again as soon as possible so that they do not lose the benefit of their schooling at the same school, in the same classes, and with the same teachers. As the honourable member knows as the member for the district, we have just completed and opened a magnificent new solid construction infant school, which is one of the best, if not the best, in the State. I agree with the honourable member that with a school of the size and importance of Forbes primary school, the largest primary school in the State, it is to be hoped that as soon as possible a large number of prefabricated classrooms will be replaced by a solid construction school, as is happening at present with other schools. This very large new solid construction infant school will, I hope, be the first instalment of the plans to make the school one of which the honourable member and the residents of Forbes will be justly proud.

## PORT PIRIE RAIL SERVICE.

Mrs. STEELE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about amenities on the Port Pirie rail service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague the Minister of Railways advises that the question of whether fans could be installed in the compartments has been carefully investigated, but for technical reasons it is regretted that this is impracticable. The Commonwealth Railways have advised that the time table of the West-East trans-continental train from Perth will be altered towards the end of May to provide for an earlier arrival of their train at Port Pirie Junction. This will make it possible to provide for a stop at Bowmans for refreshments. Arrangements are in hand to have this done when the new time table for the Commonwealth train comes into operation.

## ALSATIAN DOGS.

Mr. TAPPING—Has the Premier a report concerning my recent question about Alsatian dogs?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received the following report:—

As the attack on the child took place on the premises of the owner of the dog, no police action could be taken. Mr. and Mrs. Tyson have been advised that, if they desire to take civil action, they should seek legal advice. The Alsatian dog owned by Mrs. Luizia Moro was destroyed by a member of the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals on April 12, 1960.

The full report is available for the honourable member.

## TOD RIVER RESERVOIR.

Mr. BOCKELBERG—As a result of the beneficial rain that has fallen on Eyre Peninsula, has there been any appreciable intake into the Tod River reservoir?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Figures I have here show that the intake into the Tod River reservoir was 20,000,000 gallons which, though helpful, was not very substantial. Intake into the South Para reservoir was 222,000,000 gallons and into the Warren reservoir was 165,000,000 gallons, making a total in that group of country reservoirs of 387,000,000 gallons. The total intake into the metropolitan reservoirs was 550,000,000 gallons up till yesterday morning.

## WINE INDUSTRY.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the report of the Prices Commissioner on the inquiry into the wine industry been tabled in Parliament; if not, does the Government intend to table it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not believe there is any objection to the report being tabled in Parliament. However, I will check on that because, as honourable members know, the Prices Commissioner is under an oath of secrecy. Whether the report contains any information that may be confidential as far as any particular interests are concerned I am not quite sure, but I do not think it does. I believe the Prices Commissioner issued two reports, one containing the secret information and the other containing the general results of his investigation, which, incidentally, was complete. There is no reason why the report should not be tabled, from the Government's point of view. If what I have said is the case, I will have the report tabled.

## VISIT OF WAR SHIPS.

Mr. JENKINS—Has the Premier any information about the possibility of the United States war ships visiting Victor Harbour?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have received a telegram that will be a disappointment to the honourable member for it reveals that it is not possible for the ships to put into Victor Harbour because their schedule does not permit. However, apart from that, they would in any case pass Victor Harbour in the middle of the night. I will give the honourable member the telegram I have received in connection with it.

## URANIUM WORKERS.

Mr. MCKEE—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the medical examination of workers in the uranium plant at Port Pirie?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not believe that reply is yet available. The authorities' works are outside direct Ministerial control and it usually takes some time to get a reply from them. However, I hope to have a reply for the honourable member this week before the House adjourns.

## CROSSING OF TRAINS.

Mr. HARDING—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the crossing point of the Melbourne to Adelaide and South-east expresses?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Railways Commissioner, through the Minister of Railways, reports:—

Although it would be preferable to cross the "up" *Overland* and the "down" night train to Mount Gambier at a station other than Bordertown, the present path of the South-East passenger train is the only practicable one because of the close working of the *Overland* trains in both directions, and the fast interstate freight movements.

**WHYALLA TO PORT AUGUSTA ROAD.**

Mr. LOVEDAY—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the Whyalla to Port Augusta road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the completion of this short length was unavoidably delayed as the contractor to whom the crushing contract was let was unable to supply stone for some considerable time. Supplies are now available, however, and it is expected that the base course construction will commence within a week or two.

**HOUSING.**

Mr. HALL—I believe that soon in this State a conference will be held of delegates from all over the Commonwealth and from the Commonwealth Government with regard to housing. In the Address in Reply debate last year I said:—

I believe that the provisions applying to assurance and superannuation that allow a saving or investment of up to £300 a year to be tax free should be extended to allow up to that much saving each year to be tax free for a home.

Later, I said that there would have to be an arrangement whereby the sum so saved could be withdrawn for other purposes after the tax had been deducted. Will the Treasurer have this matter investigated at the forthcoming conference? Perhaps some scheme may be devised whereby housing bonds could be purchased under the present set-up of loans from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This matter does not readily fall within the ambit of a housing conference. It deals directly with Commonwealth taxation, whereas the housing conference will deal mainly with two topics—the building of houses and the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, which is one of the sources from which money is made available for housing. However, I shall have the honourable member's suggestion forwarded to the Federal Treasurer for consideration.

**SOUTH-EASTERN RAIL SERVICE.**

Mr. RALSTON—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to my recent question relating to unoccupied sleeping berths on the 8.50 p.m. train leaving Mount Gambier for Adelaide on April 14 and the applications made for sleeping berths on south-eastern trains, especially at peak periods?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister of Railways advises that all 20 berths on the 8.50 p.m. train from Mount Gambier to Adelaide on Thursday, April 14, had been booked

but on that day two cancellations were made, leaving one berth in each of two compartments. The other berths in these compartments were booked to male passengers. All those on the waiting list were allotted seats except one couple and one lady and none of these, for obvious reasons, could be allocated the spare berths. The names of all passengers' seating accommodation were recorded except for a few passengers who, upon inquiring the position during the last few days before the due date, intimated that they would make other arrangements for their journey.

**STATEMENTS BY MR. CAMERON, M.H.R.**

Mr. QUIRKE—Recently I read a report of statements alleged to have been made by Mr. Clyde Cameron, M.H.R., about conditions in South Australia, and the Premier's name was mentioned. I approach this not on a political basis but from the point of view of an elected representative of South Australia making untrue statements in the Federal House. Mr. Cameron said no State had worse roads than South Australia, but anyone who travels interstate knows that that is not correct. He also said that the Housing Trust areas did not get roads until 10 years after the homes were built; but, although there have been difficulties in connection with roads in district council areas, in Elizabeth and other places roads are built before houses. Mr. Cameron also said that sewerage takes another five years. I am in a position to hear some of the evidence given—

The SPEAKER—The honourable member must not debate the question.

Mr. QUIRKE—Very well, Sir. In South Australia sewerage is provided in most houses before they are occupied. Will the Premier state whether there is any way in which these statements, which are damaging to the prestige of South Australia, can be refuted?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I have often considered the question the honourable member asks because, for some reason or other, a damaging statement will always receive very much more publicity than a favourable statement. I do not know whether that is because of its news value, or what the reason is. At the moment Adelaide is 95 per cent sewered. The nearest to this percentage of any other capital city in Australia is Melbourne, which is 80 per cent sewered. The percentage in Sydney is very much lower, in Brisbane it is lower still and in Perth very much lower again. As a matter of interest, in Sydney a population greater than the total Adelaide metropolitan population is

unanswered. I turn now to the matter of roads in new housing areas: Recently complaints have been made that roads have been constructed so far ahead of building construction that they have deteriorated because houses had not been built within a reasonable time. That shows that the attacks referred to are completely unwarranted. I believe they were made for political purposes and that the politics behind making such statements will rebound adversely on the people making them, as they do not meet with the approbation of the people of this State. Any member of this House who deliberately runs down his district will find that in due course his district will quickly dissociate itself from him. I am certain that any member who in the Federal Parliament makes disparaging and untruthful remarks about his State will in due course have to answer for them in his electorate, and that is probably the best way to deal with the matter.

#### WILD LIFE.

Mr. LAUCKE—Last week it was announced that a wild life section would be set up within the Fisheries and Game Department. Has the Minister of Agriculture any details concerning this proposed section?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—The wild life section will consist of four persons. There will be a senior wild life warden, probably a University graduate capable of directing research, two other wardens under his supervision, and a junior who will probably be a boy of Leaving standard and not long out of school. The aim of this section is two-fold: firstly, to carry out inspections to see that the laws relating to wild life are observed and, secondly, to carry out research on various features of fauna in South Australia. I think that both those needs are strongly felt. Particularly in the duck-shooting season, those inspectors will be useful for supervising the shooting of ducks. At the same time they will be asked to carry out research into the habits and movements of ducks and several other kinds of fauna, and they will no doubt work with other Commonwealth and State organizations. The purpose of this scheme is to conserve wild life in the way it should be conserved. As everyone knows, the loss of vegetable cover throughout this State has probably contributed more than anything else to the reduction of bird life in this State, and we should therefore take careful steps to see that what bird life now exists shall be taken only under properly controlled conditions. One good reason for this is probably that it will be

an economic benefit if we take steps to see that wild life is looked after. On the other hand, I believe another good reason is simply that wild life exists and many people in the State wish to see it properly conserved, if for no other reason than that they like it, and I think that is reasonable. Those are the outlines of the work of the section, and we shall be looking to fill these positions very shortly.

Mr. NANKIVELL—Many protected birds and animals are being wantonly shot by people new to this country and unfamiliar with the identification of protected and native species of birds and animals. Will the Minister therefore consider incorporating in the activities of this newly-formed group a provision whereby instruction in the identification of birds and animals could be given to these people, either through schools or through their local community groups?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—Yes, I will consider that matter.

#### APPOINTMENT OF QUEEN'S COUNSEL.

Mr. JENNINGS—As the House knows, Queen's Counsel in this State are appointed on the recommendation of the Chief Justice, and in this respect, as in so many others, South Australia differs from all other States. Can the Premier say whether it is a fact that the son of the Chief Justice was recently appointed, although many counsel of much greater experience and prominence were overlooked? Is it also a fact that Mr. Astley has been appointed, when, even though his practice is considerable, he is almost unknown to the South Australian public as he acts primarily as a solicitor and not as a barrister? Could it possibly be a reason for Mr. Astley's appointment that he resigned from the council of the Law Society at the height of the Stuart Royal Commission, when the council refused to adopt his motion expressing faith in the impartiality of the Royal Commission?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am not in a position to express any views regarding some matters raised by the honourable member. For instance, I do not know whether Mr. Astley resigned from the Law Society, nor have I ever had any knowledge of that matter. Regarding the appointment of Queen's Counsel, the procedure for many years in this State has been that Cabinet considers a recommendation of the Chief Justice. That procedure has always been adopted in this State, as far as I know. I am not sure if it has happened in all cases, but it has certainly been the recent practice of the Chief

Justice to consult his brother judges regarding recommendations. In this case the recommendations came from the Chief Justice with a statement that he had consulted his brother judges and the two retiring judges regarding the appointments, and that they had all concurred in the recommendations, but, as at that particular moment the Chief Justice was becoming Lieutenant-Governor and was administering the Government of this State, the matter was not proceeded with until Sir Herbert Mayo, acting perhaps in a semi-official capacity as the Chief Justice, forwarded recommendations. The recommendations have therefore come on with the assurance that they are supported by the Supreme Court Bench. Acting on those recommendations, as is and as has been the custom, Cabinet has approved the appointments. I do not think anyone in this State is qualified to argue the relative merits of various eminent legal men in this State. I believe we have highly qualified legal practitioners in this State. Although other States have a different procedure, there has been no recommendation for a different procedure to be followed here, as far as I know. If there were such a request, it would be examined.

#### VETERINARY OFFICERS' SALARIES.

Mr. DUNSTAN—My question relates to the appointments of and salaries paid to veterinary officers in the Agriculture Department. I understand that some difficulty is experienced in getting such officers and that recently an appointment was made of one with a starting salary of £1,590 per annum, which was subsequently reduced to £1,100, and then increased slightly, but was not restored to anything like the starting figure. If the officer had remained at the starting figure, and then had the 28 per cent increase applied to his salary, the figure would now be more than £1,700. I have heard concern expressed by officers about this matter, and there is much puzzlement as to why it should be so. Can the Minister of Agriculture give me any information on the matter?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I will get a detailed reply if the honourable member requires it, but, in general, the starting salary of a graduate from the veterinary school in Sydney was set at £1,590, about £500 more than would be paid to a graduate from the Adelaide University if he had a Bachelor of Agriculture Science degree or had undertaken a course of that nature. I have to speak in round figures because I have not got all the details with me, but the salary of the Sydney

graduate is very much higher. As the honourable member knows, the matters of appointments and salaries are handled by the Public Service Commissioner and the Public Service Board. They considered that the starting salary was too high and accordingly reconsidered the matter. They lowered the salary to the starting salary of the Adelaide University graduate, but not at any time was that meant to be the final figure. I understand that since then another decision has been made and now these officers are paid a salary between the two starting salaries. It is recognized that veterinary officers are required for the full development of South Australian agriculture and, because of that, the State has taken considerable measures to get them. It has offered cadetships at universities in other States that have the veterinary course. The Sydney University handles veterinary science and the New England University has an animal husbandry course. They are the universities to which we send cadets, and the Government pays their fees. In return the Government is assured of some service from the graduates. If the honourable member wants exact figures I can get them, but I understand that the Public Service Board has now settled the matter with the graduates concerned.

#### BRIQUETTES.

Mr. JENKINS—Is the Premier aware that substantial quantities of briquettes are being imported from Victoria and sold in country areas at about £15 a ton? Has the waste and dust coal at Leigh Creek been examined for its suitability for manufacture into briquettes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Leigh Creek coal is not a brown but a semi-bituminous coal and does not readily lend itself to briquetting. It is only possible to briquette Leigh Creek Coal by putting in a binder, which would be an expensive process. Experiments show that Leigh Creek coal briquettes are all right at the outset, but as soon as they get damp, or there is a change in the weather, they disintegrate, and are not by any means satisfactory. Briquettes are a convenient form of fuel, but considering heat value the price of the briquettes is higher than the price of coke and other similar fuels. Under the circumstances I feel that there will be only a limited use of briquettes in South Australia, and the demand can be satisfactorily met by Victoria.

#### BRIDGE OVER STURT RIVER.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to the question I

asked recently about the calling of tenders for the construction of a new bridge over the River Sturt?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Minister of Roads advises that it is expected that tenders will be called for the construction of the bridge over the River Sturt on Marion Road within two weeks.

**WOOLLEN SHIRTS.**

Mr. HARDING—In today's *Advertiser* there is an article headed "Wool now to be dry cleaned," and in it there is a reference to the opening today of the new processing plant by the Premier. I do not know whether that has yet taken place, but perhaps the Premier might mention it in his reply. I am perturbed about a question that was asked in this House on this matter recently. Quite unintentionally it could be a deterrent to the purchase of woollen shirts. The questioner mentioned a price of £5 19s. 6d., which is a correct price. The questioner also said that the price was beyond the means of Parliamentarians, let alone rank and file people who want to buy the shirts. Four types of woollen shirts have been specially treated, and they are drip-dry, non-shrinkable, and made from desirable material. There are various weights of material and various prices, which range from £3 16s. 6d. to £5 5s. and £5 19s. 6d. The Premier was asked whether the shirts were subject to price control and he said they were not. Men's woollen underwear is subject to price control and if it is warranted in the case of shirts, will the Premier see that their prices are controlled?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will have the matter examined.

**SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about the calling of tenders for the construction of work on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Local Government, advises that Cabinet has recently considered submissions from the Commissioner of Highways for the appointment of a constructing authority and it has decided that it shall consist of four members, of whom Mr. F. D. Jackman, the Commissioner of Highways, will be the chairman, Mr. W. M. Anderson, Deputy Engineer-in-Chief, will be deputy chairman, and two other members, one a town clerk and the other an engineer, representing the corporations concerned. Steps have already been taken to implement these appointments. In the meantime, tenders have been received for the construction of drain No. 21 in the scheme, off the Marion district road, and it is anticipated that the tender will be let within the next few days. The cost of this first portion will be between £40,000 and £50,000. That tender was dealt with yesterday, I think, in Cabinet.

**RADIOGRAPHERS' SALARIES.**

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—What is the annual salary paid to the senior radiographers at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital, respectively?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The top positions of radiographers at the two hospitals are classified as follows:—

	Queen Elizabeth Hospital.	Royal Adelaide Hospital.
Chief Radiographer . . . . .	£1,340/1,525, on £1,525	£1,460/1,655*
Senior Radiographer . . . . .	£1,030/1,170, on £1,030	£1,225/1,400, on £1,280

\* This position was regarded previously as over-classified. Consequently the board reduced the classification to what it regarded as the correct level as from April 1, 1959. In accordance with the usual practice, the salary of the holder of the position was not reduced. He is at present receiving £1,816 per annum.

**DEPUTY MATRON'S QUALIFICATIONS.**

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—

1. Was there any applicant with nursing qualifications superior to those of the person appointed to the position of Deputy Matron of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

2. Did the Deputy Matron at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital complete a post graduate course?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. The office of Deputy Matron is a purely administrative post and there was no applicant who held a superior qualification in the realm of nursing administration.

2. The person appointed to the post of Deputy Matron has completed a post graduate course, being doubly qualified with General and Midwifery Certificates, the latter being the result of post graduate training.

In making this appointment, the Board's intention was twofold, viz.—

(1) to bring about an internal rearrangement of the nursing staff in view of both maternity and general sections of the hospital now being almost fully functioning;

(2) to give assistance to the matron and in so doing to ensure that the person appointed was conversant with both sections of the hospital. The individual appointed had those qualifications, having been previously in sole nursing administrative charge of the maternity section.

#### **PATHOLOGICAL DEPARTMENT.**

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice)—

1. What was the total cost of laboratory equipment in the Pathological Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

2. When was the installation of equipment completed?

3. When will staff be supplied for the Pathological Department of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

4. Will services from the Pathological Department be available to private doctors when it is operating?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. The total cost of the laboratory equipment was £11,603 19s. 1d., made up as follows:—

	£	s.	d.
Scientific equipment . . . . .	7,216	8	0
Filing equipment . . . . .	481	10	0
Refrigerating equipment . . . . .	1,944	8	11
Mobile trolleys . . . . .	841	3	0
Furniture and furnishings . . . . .	1,120	9	2

Total . . . . . £11,603 19 1

In addition to the above, approximately £5,000 has yet to be expended on glassware, initial stocking of re-agents, etc., and certain specialized equipment.

2. The main installation was completed at the end of May, 1959. Some equipment, such as glassware referred to above, has yet to be installed and will be so co-incident with the staff taking post. The specialized equipment also referred to above will not be ordered, however, until key men take up their duties in order that they may be given an opportunity of stating preferences or modifications.

3. Posts have been created and staff has been and is being advertised for. Appointments to some key posts have been made although those appointed have not yet taken up their duties.

4. The services of the Pathological Department will be available to private doctors on payment of appropriate fees when their patients are being treated as in-patients in the hospital.

#### **MARNE ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.**

Mr. BYWATERS (on notice)—When is work likely to be commenced by the Electricity Trust on the proposed electricity supply to the Marne Valley?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If sufficient funds are available, the electricity extension to the Marne Valley will be included in the 1960-61 works programme, but this programme is not yet fixed and no firm commitment can be made about the starting date for the extension.

#### **NORTHFIELD MENTAL HOSPITAL.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Is it anticipated that savings will be effected in the cost of maintaining the Northfield Mental Hospital for the present year?

2. If so, on what items have savings been effected?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The replies are:—

1. It is anticipated that a saving of approximately £10,000 will be effected in the cost of maintaining the Northfield Mental Hospital for the financial year 1959-60.

2. It was anticipated that the new blocks at Northfield Mental Hospital would be ready for occupation during the year, but as they were not completed the saving has been effected because new equipment has not had to be ordered and the anticipated intake of additional new patients has not eventuated.

#### **RAILWAY SLEEPERS.**

Mr. O'HALLORAN (on notice)—

1. Has a large consignment of sleepers for use in the permanent way of the Eyre Peninsula railway system been purchased in Western Australia?

2. Will these sleepers be transported by road?

3. If so, what will be the cost of such transport?

4. What will be the total cost of these sleepers to the Railways Department?

5. Is there any timber available on Eyre Peninsula which either with treatment or untreated would be suitable for railway sleepers?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Railways Commissioner reports:—

1. Yes. (25,000.)

2. Per rail to Port Augusta thence by Lee transport to Kimba. It should be explained that the contract was originally for delivery c.i.f. Thevenard and Port Lincoln, but as the contractor was unable to obtain shipping he agreed to send the sleepers by rail to Port Augusta and from there by road to Kimba, all costs of transport Western Australia to Kimba being met by the contractor.

3. Two shillings and four pence (2s. 4d.) per sleeper to be paid by contractor under terms of delivery.

4. £1 2s. 9.4d. each.

5. Yes, and contracts have been awarded to all applicants providing species are suitable for railway sleepers.

### SUPPLY BILL (No. 1).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution:—That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act (1934-59), Land Settlement Act (1944-59), Payment of Members of Parliament Act (1948-58), Public Works Standing Committee Act (1927-55), and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I move:—

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The measure provides for increases in Parliamentary salaries and allowances and its justification is found in the increases which have been made throughout the Commonwealth in almost all salaries and wages over the last few years. The last occasion upon which the salaries and allowances of members, other than Ministers, were altered was towards the end of 1958 while in the case of Ministers of

the Crown the last adjustment was made as long ago as in 1955, when the salaries of the Chairman and members of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation were also last adjusted. It was also in 1955 that the last adjustment was made in salaries of certain officers of the two Houses, while the Chairman and members of the Land Settlement Committee are still receiving salaries that were fixed in 1951.

Having regard to the facts I have mentioned, the Government decided to appoint a small independent committee to consider what adjustments of salaries, allowances and special Parliamentary appointments might be warranted. The committee consisted of Sir Edgar Bean, the former Parliamentary Draftsman, Mr. W. P. Bishop, the former Auditor-General, and Mr. G. Seaman, the Under-Treasurer. Sir Edgar Bean had other special qualifications in that he had been chairman of the Teachers' Salaries Board since its inception and for a considerable number of years had been a member of the Public Service Board, which fixes salaries for all Public Service officers. He also knew intimately the Parliamentary duties of members and was long associated with Parliamentary practices of this House.

The committee made its report and recommendations to the Government only a few days ago. It reported that it had paid particular regard to the rates obtaining in other States including the time and manner of their determination, recent increases in professional and other salaries throughout the community and increases in salaries for public appointments in this State since the last revision of Parliamentary salaries and allowances. The committee took as a comparable basis the determination of basic salaries in Victoria 12 months ago, which provided for metropolitan members a total of £2,550 including electoral allowances. The committee reported that the comparable metropolitan figure in Queensland and Western Australia was about five per cent higher, significantly higher in the New South Wales Assembly, but much lower in the Council in New South Wales and both Houses in Tasmania. The committee suggested that the basic salary of members in this State should be raised from £1,900 to £2,000 and the metropolitan electorate allowance from £250 to £550, giving a total increase of £400 on the present combined South Australian rate of £2,150. This increase was considered to be fairly equivalent to the adjustment in professional and administrative salaries of public appointments which have been made since the last variation in Parliamentary salaries in December, 1958.



The committee reported that the existing electoral allowances (£250, £300 and £325 according to location) did not provide for such an extent of variation between the metropolitan and most outlying areas as is the practice in other States, nor did it allow for a justifiable variation. It accordingly suggested that if the new basic metropolitan electoral allowance of £550 were accepted, the intermediate rate should be £700 and the outlying rate £800.

With regard to Ministerial salaries, the committee reported that the provision had over the years fallen back proportionately to ordinary South Australian Parliamentary salaries and Ministerial provision in other States. The committee further recommended that the practice be adopted, following most other States, of providing that Ministers' remuneration should be in addition to the normal Parliamentary salary, some reasonable proportion of the increase to be provided as an expense allowance. It accordingly suggested that a pool of £17,200 be provided instead of the present £28,750 but this, of course, takes account of the fact that ordinary Parliamentary salaries and electoral allowances of Ministers would be separately provided. For the information of members, although the Bill will merely provide for a pool figure, I would point out that the committee's suggestion was that the Premier should be allocated £2,850, of which £750 might be provided as an expense allowance; the Chief Secretary £2,350, of which £500 could be provided as an expense allowance; and the remaining six Ministers £2,000, of which £400 should be provided as an expense allowance. In accepting these broad recommendations it has been decided that the expense allowance for the Premier should be £600, the allocation for salary remaining as recommended. This means that the total amount in the pool will be reduced by £150 to £17,050. As to electoral allowances for Ministers, the Government also decided that these should not vary according to locality, but that Ministers should be prepared to accept the ordinary metropolitan allowances of £550 in all cases. The committee recommended other increases, which would accord broadly with the general increases, as follows—Speaker and President of the Legislative Council, from £850 to £1,050; Chairman of Committees, from £350 to £425; Leader of the Opposition, from £700 to £850 (plus £200 by way of an expense allowance); and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, from £250 to £300. Following on the general criteria already set

out the committee recommended the following increases in relation to Parliamentary committees:—

1. Public Works Committee:—  
Chairman . . . . from £600 to £750.  
Members . . . . from £400 to £500.
2. Land Settlement Committee:—  
Chairman . . . . from £250 to £300.  
Members . . . . from £200 to £250.
3. Committee on Subordinate Legislation:—  
Chairman . . . . from £200 to £250.  
Members . . . . from £100 to £125.
4. Industries Development Committee:—  
Chairman . . . . from £250 to £300.  
Members . . . . from £200 to £250.

No statutory amendment is required in the case of the Industries Development Committee, since the relevant legislation provides for the fixation of salaries by His Excellency the Governor. The committee lastly recommended that separate statutory provision be made for the Government Whip to receive £250 and suggested that an amount of perhaps £150 might be provided for the Opposition Whip.

The Government has accepted all of the recommendations of the committee with three exceptions. Two of these I have already mentioned: namely, a reduction of £150 in expense allowance for the Premier and a fixed electorate allowance for Ministers (at the metropolitan rate) irrespective of locality. The other departure relates to the Chairman of Committees: the Government felt that, having regard to the amount of work performed by this officer and the nature and importance of his duties, the suggested figure of £425 was too low as compared with other recommendations and is accordingly raising this figure to £525.

I think all honourable members realize that the Chairman of Committees has a great amount of extra work to do. I felt that the amount provided for the Chairman of Committees fell below what was reasonable, considering the heavy extra work he had to undertake. Honourable members will see that the Government has not accepted all the recommendations of the committee, as it has made two slight alterations regarding Ministerial salaries and one slight alteration in the amount provided for the Chairman of Committees. The Government felt that Ministers' district allowances placed them at an advantage over other members of Parliament, as they were provided with transport in the course of their Ministerial duties. Ministers' allowances are now being based on metropolitan district allowances, and that was the reason for the departure from the recommendation made by the committee. With those three exceptions—two of them reducing the amount slightly and

the other increasing the amount slightly—the Government has accepted the recommendations of the committee in their entirety. The present Bill is designed to give effect to the decisions. Clause 2 covers the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, while clause 3 provides for Ministers of the Crown, in which connection it will be noticed that the basis hitherto adopted has been altered—see clause 5 (a) and (b) of the Bill. Clause 4 covers the Chairman and Members of the Land Settlement Committee, while clause 5, in addition to altering the basis of Ministerial salaries as already indicated, provides for the general increase in the case of all members (subclause (c)) and for electoral allowances according to locality (subclauses (d), (e) and (f)). Subclause (g) increases the electoral allowance for Ministers. Clause 6 provides for the various officers of the Houses, including both Government and Opposition Whips. Clause 7 covers the Public Works Standing Committee. Clause 8 provides that all the amendments shall operate from the first day of the present month. As I have remarked on other occasions, the Government does not generally favour the making of retrospective payments, and there does not seem to be any special reason for dating back the increases beyond the date mentioned. Clause 9 of the Bill covers the payment of arrears.

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—I do not seek the adjournment of this debate as I have had an opportunity of studying the report on which the various alterations to salaries and allowances provided in the Bill are based. With one or two exceptions that I shall mention later, I think these alterations are justified by all the circumstances and all the conditions that can possibly be applied in order to test their adequacy and justice. I am fully aware that some criticism will inevitably be levelled at the Parliament for increasing members' salaries and allowances. Already we have seen one or two statements in the press that members should not fix their own salaries, but that they should be fixed by an outside body such as the Arbitration Court, but in the final analysis members of Parliament have to make the Constitutional provision for any increases they may be awarded, as they have to do for certain highly paid officers in the Government service.

Regarding the question of an outside inquiry, I do not think we could have a more competent body of gentlemen to conduct an inquiry into every facet of the matter than

Sir Edgar Bean, Mr. Bishop, and Mr. Seaman. As the Premier stated, those men had an opportunity to consider every aspect of the case. I think it was wise that—recognizing that salaries and allowances in this State were well below those paid in the other mainland States—they should take a State like Victoria, which probably provided a happy medium between the much higher salaries in some States and the not quite so high salaries, compared with the Victorian rate, in other States. I point out that the Victorian rates, which formed the basis of the committee's recommendations, were fixed last year, I think by a tribunal on which Sir Frank Richardson was the deciding authority. In taking Victorian rates as the bases, the committee therefore had the advantage of knowing that those bases had been adopted as the result of an exhaustive inquiry in another State.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford—I think one thing the Leader is overlooking is that the committee took the Victorian recommendation regarding salaries but not allowances.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I was coming to that. In Victoria a sitting allowance is provided in addition to the electorate expense allowance, and I am happy that the committee did not recommend that feature in this State. I think it is something that would be difficult to administer equitably, and therefore I think members generally will be happy to accept the electorate allowances as being near (I do not think they are completely adequate) the cost of the unavoidable expenses incurred in effectively representing an electorate. I point out that the sitting fees provided in Victoria are in addition to electorate allowances, which are slightly higher than those provided in the Bill.

Mr. Lawn—£150 higher.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—I think most critics overlook the part members' wives play in the representation of an electorate by the member himself. They have to take telephone calls.

Mr. Bywaters—They are unpaid secretaries.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—They have to arrange appointments with constituents who desire to interview their member. I frequently have telephone calls from my wife drawing my attention to some matter a constituent has mentioned to her, and when I get home at week-ends—which by virtue of my being Leader of the Opposition is about the only time I can get home—I have a long schedule of appointments and queries to attend to. I think the same applies to most members. In effect, as the member for Murray very properly

interjected a moment ago, the wife of a member of Parliament is an unpaid secretary. In other Parliaments, particularly the Commonwealth Parliament, every member is provided with a secretary.

As mentioned by the Premier, the Bill provides that the base salary is to be increased by £100, so the total base salary will now be £2,000 compared with the £1,900 previously provided. Some inner country districts, for the purposes of determining electorate allowances, are classified the same as metropolitan. I think the member for Gawler represents one of those districts, and I think there are other similar cases. I am not sure about Onkaparinga.

Mr. Shannon—I am afraid that I qualify for the inner amount.

Mr. O'HALLORAN—Yes, and there may be other members in a similar category. It is proposed to increase those members' allowances from the present £250 to £550, and the outer country and intermediate country districts will have various increases on a *pro rata* scale. When we look at the size of some electorates in South Australia we realize that the cost of representing those electorates, particularly the outer electorates, is considerable indeed. I represent a constituency five times the size of Tasmania, and other country members represent constituencies not very much smaller than mine. Finally, I have never opposed increases in salaries and wages. I am satisfied that the proposed increases are fair and just, and I support them.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling)—I rise solely to make my attitude to this Bill known to this House and to my constituents. As the Leader has mentioned, there has already been some criticism of this Bill. Mr. Verco, the President of the Taxpayers Association, said that there should have been an independent body or tribunal to make these recommendations. I think there could not have been a better selection or a better tribunal than Sir Edgar Bean, Mr. Bishop and Mr. Seaman, three very capable public servants or former public servants who were thoroughly acquainted with all the conditions attached to the recommendations they were called upon to make. I understand they were given no instructions whatever as to how their recommendations should be arrived at, and I think that is one good thing about it.

Unlike public servants' salaries, the salaries received by Parliamentarians are not actual salaries, because at least £1,400 is mortgaged before members receive their salaries. Country members in electorates such as mine have to

spend much money travelling around their constituencies. The total of this expense and the amounts taken out for superannuation and other things, together with donations, is easily £1,300 to £1,400 a year, and by the time other incidentals are taken out, any member with an electorate such as mine receives less than the basic wage. I say that without any fear of contradiction, for I have kept records and I speak from experience in that regard. I support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I never let this legislation pass through without voicing my opinion on it, and I say here and now that I heartily support it. Every person has to be given credit for his opinion, but I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that a certain type of person who writes to the newspaper finds out how many days Parliament sits, divides that number of days into the salary and then says, "You get so much a day." He usually is the one who makes a person work all day on Sunday. It is not the number of days that we sit in Parliament that counts, because it is a seven days a week job, particularly for a country member, and Sunday is not necessarily the easiest day of the week. I do not blame the constituents, because a country member is often away from home during the week and the weekend is the only time when he can be approached. Yesterday's *News* contained some information supplied by one Liberal and one Labor member of Parliament about their expenses, and they are very similar to mine. For 52 weeks of the year I get a Parliamentary salary of £1,900, plus allowance of £300, but there is a big deduction for superannuation and taxation. If I take 6d. a mile as the cost of running a motor car (and surely no-one can run it for that) it represents £500. After meeting other expenses I am left with £625 or £12 a week, less than the basic wage. Fortunately I am not entirely dependent upon my Parliamentary salary, and I am also a member of the Public Works Committee. However, this does not apply to some other members, and the member who has no other income than his Parliamentary salary must have a very thin time indeed. If the proposed increase in salary will change the colour of the ink on my bank statement I shall be pleased.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa)—I feel that members of Parliament are placed in an invidious position when it is incumbent upon them to set their own level of remuneration. I appreciate that Parliament is a supreme body

and as such should not delegate any power over itself to an outside body with lesser authority, but in the matter of Parliamentary salaries that delegation of power should be made. I am pleased that it has been done in this instance in order to get advice on a fair salary for a Parliamentarian. I hope this will be a permanent feature in the determination of salary. If the independent arbiter had as the first term of reference that the salary and allowances should be at a level not higher than would enable a member, not having any other income, to discharge the duties required of him by his electorate, and at the same time give him and his family a reasonable living standard, I feel that we would have a background and a foundation for an easy determination of what is a fair return to a member. On this basis no-one would be precluded from Parliamentary service, and, in addition, respect for the institution of Parliament by the general public would be maintained and furthered. As things now stand, many members are on the horns of a dilemma in this matter. Many enter this place without any concern for or knowledge of the remuneration, because they are imbued with the desire to be of service to the electorate and to the State. They have no thought of monetary gain. It follows that they are loth to support any increase in their remuneration.

Some members have told me that as they have no other means of income their Parliamentary salary is insufficient to meet current costs in attending to their duties, and, to be fair, one must give credence to this. One must be frank in matters of this sort. The institution of Parliament (and respect of the public for it) is a matter of vital importance. It transcends all other considerations.

Parliament is the basis of democracy, and I believe that the salary paid should have some measure of sacrifice in it. If that sacrifice becomes too great for some, it should be the democratic right of any individual who aspires to membership of Parliament to have a level of income available that will enable him to discharge his duties as a member. With this thought in mind I will not oppose the Bill, but I hope that future revisions of the salary shall be referred to an authority independent of Parliament which should decide what is a fair and reasonable determination. It should not be left to the members themselves to fix their salary.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is this a constitutional amendment and will it be necessary

to have an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House to carry the second reading?

The SPEAKER—I have considered the matter, and it is covered by Standing Order No. 294. It has been done previously, and I think it is quite in order for us not to have a constitutional majority on this occasion.

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

#### METROPOLITAN TRANSPORT ADVISORY COUNCIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from May 5. Page 412.)

Mr. O'HALLORAN (Leader of the Opposition)—On Thursday last I obtained leave to continue my remarks because copies of the Bill were not available to members. Since then I have had ample opportunity to study the measure and I give qualified support to it. It does not give full effect to some amendments that the Opposition desires, and for which we have been contending for a considerable time, but it represents agreement by the committee on some important points. I understand that the representatives of the Trades and Labor Council on that committee pressed for certain other amendments, but the committee was not able to agree to them. Therefore, they are not contained in the Bill. But, as the main provisions of the Bill are remedial, I am not prepared to hammer it in passing or to seek amendments on behalf of the Opposition at this stage.

The maximum lump sum compensation provided for in the Bill is increased by £250 to £3,000. This corresponds roughly with the wage increases that have been granted by various tribunals since the last amendment of the Workmen's Compensation Act by this House two years ago. Other amounts fixed in the Act are being increased to correspond with the increase in the maximum allowance. Maximum weekly payments for workmen who, unfortunately, are injured (with dependants) are increased from £13 10s. to £14 5s., and for workmen without dependants from £9 5s. to £9 15s. The Act defines "workman" as being deemed to be a person earning less than a certain weekly wage. The old amount was £35 a week, which is now proposed to be increased by this Bill to £45 a week but, for the

life of me, I cannot understand why there should be any limit at all. Many executives in big industries earn salaries or wages that preclude them from being covered by the Workmen's Compensation Act, yet many are prone to injury the same as workmen under their charge who receive less than the maximum provided for in the Bill. I cannot see any virtue in a limit. All those engaged in occupations, particularly as some executives are engaged in somewhat dangerous occupations, should be covered by workmen's compensation legislation, irrespective of salary or wages.

One desirable amendment in the Bill deals with the exclusion of members of an employer's family living at home, which has been the law for many years. That is to be struck out of the Act, so once the Bill is passed, the members of an employer's family living at home will be entitled to compensation the same as any other employee. And so they should be—there is no argument about that.

Another proposal in the Bill is that, in cases of accidents not provided for in the schedule, the injured workmen, in addition to being entitled to compensation on a weekly basis, shall, if the injury proves to be a permanent disability, be entitled to a lump sum compensation according, I take it, to the disability suffered, without any deduction of the weekly payments he receives prior to the lump sum being determined. There was some doubt as to whether this was provided for in the old Act. I understand that employers generally recognized the justice of this position and did not attempt to take advantage of any legal doubt that might have existed. According to the Premier's explanation, the committee was unanimous as regards this proposed amendment, that provision should be made placing the position beyond legal doubt so that the person meeting with an injury not mentioned in the schedule should be placed in the same position as the person whose injury was covered by the schedule—namely, that he should be compensated to the extent of his disability as the person meeting with a scheduled injury would be. However, I understand there is some legal doubt about the wording of the amendment. Personally, as a layman, I think it covers the point but, if it does not, I have no doubt that the Government will be pleased to amend it subsequently. In the meantime, we shall have expressed our opinion that Parliament believes that this amendment should be enacted and made operative.

I have consulted on this matter with leading officers of the Trades and Labor Council, which is charged with caring for the interests of workers, particularly in matters of this nature, and I find that, whilst they, like the Opposition, are not completely happy about the restricted scope of the amendments, they are completely satisfied that the Bill should be accepted because of its beneficial provisions—namely, the increase in the maximum compensation, the increase in weekly payments, and the *pro rata* increases in all other amounts at present fixed by the Act. So that workmen who may be unfortunate enough to suffer injury shall have the benefit of this cover as soon as possible, I support the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—I support this measure. I have had the privilege, as have many others in this House, of working under this legislation for many years. It is a necessary benefit in our day-to-day avocations, however we earn our living, especially for those connected with factory production, because, without this type of legislation, many families would be hard hit. In fact, without it, many injustices could occur in our factories. Be that as it may, workmen's compensation has been with us for many years and this measure seeks to amend certain financial clauses to bring them into line with recent adjustments in our wage structure. I am particularly pleased that after a little lapse of time the committee that functioned quite well for some years has now come together and brought forward a recommendation upon which this amendment has been based. Since I have been in this House at least, I recall that this committee did lapse for a year or two. Previously, it had functioned very well.

Mr. Fred Walsh—It did not lapse.

Mr. CUMBE—We did not get a recommendation from that committee. There was no unanimity on that committee and we did not get a correct recommendation to this House.

Mr. Fred Walsh—But the committee did function all the time.

Mr. CUMBE—No; there was a withdrawal from the committee, as the honourable member knows. I am pleased today to see that this committee has brought forward a recommendation with its full backing. I welcome the adjustments that have been made in this regard. Two matters are worthy of note. One is that the Bill increases the compensation payable upon the death of a workman. In the case of a workman dying and leaving dependants, the amount has been increased from

£2,500 (plus £80 for each dependant child) to £2,750 (plus £90 for each dependant child). That is very important, in view of the number of industrial accidents that occur from time to time. Secondly, the amount has been increased for the weekly or daily allowance to a workman when injured. This is important and applies generally, for it is the small amounts that affect the weekly earnings coming into the home. I am glad that amount has been increased and that this Bill has the backing of the trade union movement, as has been explained by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside)—I want to make a contribution to the debate while these amendments are before us. I apologize to honourable members if I seem to be mounting my hobby-horse, which already in the past week appears to have had a preliminary canter. But this seems to be too good an opportunity to miss, just at a time when much prominence has been given to physically handicapped people, amongst whom are included people who are injured in employment and so are eligible for compensation under this Act.

I refer to the advisability of establishing a rehabilitation centre or rehabilitation centres at one or more of the main hospitals. I should like, for the information of honourable members, to explain what medical rehabilitation and medical rehabilitation centres are. Rehabilitation is positive action, the aim of which is to get the patient and his relatives in a healthy, optimistic state of mind and his body functioning as well as possible, so that the attention given brings him back into the community as a producing, independent, creative member. I stress that rehabilitation is a team job designed to restore the whole man to independence and usefulness. To set up rehabilitation centres there must be teamwork between the medical profession, nursing profession, occupational therapists, physiotherapists, social workers and, as I mentioned before, the patient and the patient's family. Rehabilitation centres, if allowed to evaluate the patient from the earliest hours of his accident or illness, can produce results that in many cases considerably reduce the cost of compensation.

As far as I can see on reading through the Act no reference is made to either vocational or medical rehabilitation and in this respect I refer to what has been done in England and America. In both countries medical rehabilitation has been written into workmen's compensation legislation and these problems have been ironed out. Committees representing

insurance companies, employers, employees, trades unions and medical directors of centres have spent much time considering the legal requirements of rehabilitation and employment of the disabled, leading in Britain to such documents as the Piercy Reports and in the United States of America to the President's report on the employment of the handicapped. In various parts of Australia rehabilitation centres have been set up in the past few years and with the co-operation of employers and insurance companies, to whom such centres present places where they can send cases to have the advantages of rehabilitation treatment, they are paying handsomely both in getting a man back to work and in reducing the amount of compensation paid. To set up these centres surveys were made of the districts in which it was felt centres could best be established. These surveys consisted of finding out how many industries and how many employees were in the districts which such a centre could serve. On the basis of what has been done elsewhere, undoubtedly South Australia's industrial expansion would support such a centre or centres. The Royal Adelaide Hospital, in the central city area, and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, in the centre of a growing western industrial district, could warrant centres.

If the Government would consider investigating the centres operating so successfully in other parts of the Commonwealth with a view to establishing such centre or centres at hospitals in the metropolitan area and at one or more major country hospital, it would be taking a lead in appointing a committee to investigate this matter. I sincerely commend this to the Government. I can suggest people who are actively interested in the welfare of people disabled as a result of injury or accident who would be well able to advise on such matters.

Mr. Fred Walsh—Would the honourable member support coverage to and from work?

Mrs. STEELE—I do not think that comes into the matter. I am bringing this matter up because, if rehabilitation centres were established and insurance companies were able to refer to them people injured in accidents, compensation would be considerably reduced as people would be back at work much sooner than at present. I support the second reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I have pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill and I should like to say one or two things

in commendation of the Workmen's Compensation Advisory Committee. The personnel of this committee changes from time to time, as members know. The chairman is the present Parliamentary Draftsman, Dr. Wynes; I believe the other members are Mr. Bishop and Mr. Moxom Simpson. As we saw from the second reading explanation, the committee is not always unanimous in its recommendations nor does it always accept the proposals put forward by one of its members. I think the committee does an excellent job and I believe it takes out of this legislation a lot of politics that would otherwise enter into it and which, I think, would be undesirable. I think the present set-up is good and that the committee is working well.

I support all the amendments to this Bill. From time to time, of course, in our economy it is necessary to alter various Acts to bring them into line with the current value of money. In raising the maximum amount under this legislation from £2,750 to £3,000 we are in fact only acknowledging the circumstances in which we find ourselves today. In raising the limit above which a man is not a workman under the Act from £35 to £45 I think we are also only acknowledging fact. An amendment that I know will give much pleasure to people, especially in the country, is the deletion of section 7 (1) (c) relating to a member of an employer's family living in his house. I know in some quarters this will be a particularly popular amendment.

Mr. Coumbe—It will also benefit people in the metropolitan area.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Yes. I wish to make one respectful suggestion to the Government and, through the Government, to the advisory committee. I suggest that there is one gap in our present Act. Where a workman employed in South Australia is sent to another State by his employer and is injured there, a problem arises of whether or not he is able to claim compensation under our legislation.

Mr. McKee—He would be better off if he could claim it in another State, wouldn't he?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—That may be so, but I am not dealing with that aspect at the moment. I think I am right in saying that there is no explicit enactment in our legislation to cover this matter and it therefore becomes a question of fact in each case of whether he can claim under our Act or the legislation of another State. The position is (and perhaps the member for Norwood with his wealth of legal knowledge will support me in this) that the test was laid down in an English case, *Tomalin*

*v. S. Pearson & Son Ltd.*, which was decided in 1909. This case dealt with a workman employed in England who was sent out to Malta to assist in the construction of a breakwater. He was killed there and it was held by the English courts that he was not entitled to compensation under the English legislation because he had been continuously employed in Malta for a period of more than 12 months, even though the employer was an English company. The test at present is how long has the employment out of the State lasted. If it is simply an incident of the employment lasting a day or so the Act applies; if, on the other hand, it is a continuing employment in another State, probably the Act does not apply. The point I am making is that there is some doubt about it and I respectfully suggest that it could be cleared up as it has been cleared up by section 7 of the Victorian Workers' Compensation Act, which provides:—

Where any employer who resides or has a place of business in Victoria employs in Victoria a worker—

- (a) whose employment is partly carried on in Victoria and partly in some other State or territory of the Commonwealth of Australia; or
- (b) whose employment is wholly carried on in Victoria but whose place of residence is in some other State or territory of the Commonwealth of Australia—

then if any such worker suffers personal injury occurring in such other State or territory under such circumstances that, if the injury had occurred in Victoria, he or his dependants would have been entitled to compensation under this Act, the worker and, in the case of the death of the worker, his dependant, shall subject to this Act be entitled to compensation in accordance with this Act.

That is a simple enactment that gets over the problem I have raised—the problem that arises in each case when these circumstances are present. I suggest that this matter is one that should properly be looked at, and I can see from the beam on faces opposite that members of the Opposition are prepared to support me.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—“Amount of compensation when workman dies leaving dependants.”

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

After “(a)” to insert “by striking out the words ‘eighty pounds’ first occurring in subsection (1) thereof and inserting in lieu

thereof the words 'ninety pounds' and''

This is a consequential amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Lump sum in redemption of weekly payments."

Mr. DUNSTAN—I am in full accord with what is aimed to be done by the clause, but in some doubt whether the draft will achieve that aim. I understand the idea is that where a man has suffered an injury that is not in the schedule and he is permanently disabled, when any negotiation for a lump sum settlement takes place that settlement shall give him the lump sum appearing as the maximum amount in the schedule without the deduction of previously made weekly payments; but I doubt whether the clause will achieve this result. Section 28 of the Act provides for a redemption of foreseen weekly payments by a lump sum. This may be by negotiation outside the court. Nothing in the section prevents an agreement for the redemption of foreseen weekly sums. I do not think the proposal before us is the best way of getting what the committee has wanted, but I believe that by far the best way of doing what was aimed at would be to provide that where the injury has occasioned permanent disability and is not an injury appearing in the schedule the workman should get the full amount appearing in the schedule. This gets away from all the difficulties into which we run by including the clause as drafted. I feel that the result will be to achieve precisely nothing because of the proviso and because section 28 is aimed at agreement for redemption of weekly payment. It is not a section designed to provide a lump sum payment in the case of permanent disability from a non-schedule injury. I understand that the Draftsman had considerable difficulty in finding the best way to do what the committee wanted, and fear he may not have done it. As the committee and the trades union movement asked for this Bill to be accepted as it stands, I am prepared to vote for it, but I fear we may have to have another look at it later.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I am anxious to have the Bill passed through the House today so that it may be dealt with by the Legislative Council before the adjournment at the end of the week. I will have the honourable member's remarks analysed by the chairman of the committee and if it appears that a further amendment is necessary I will have it inserted when the Bill is in the Council.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (9 and 10) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Its main object is to place in the hands of Local Boards of Health a greater measure of control in regard to the construction of drainage, ventilation and sanitary works in buildings within their districts. By subsection (1) of section 123 of the principal Act all buildings erected or rebuilt after commencement of the Health Act Amendment Act, 1959, in municipalities or townships within district council districts or of any parcel or allotment of land of not more than five acres in area are required to have such drains, means of ventilation and sanitary requirements constructed of such materials and in such manner as the local board may prescribe. By subsection (2) of that section plans and specifications showing the proposed drains, means of ventilation and sanitary requirements are required to be submitted to and approved by the local board before the erection or rebuilding of the building is commenced. But subsection (4) of that section provides that the section does not apply within any part of the State to which the Building Act applies.

The Building Act, however, only requires "the mode of drainage of water from the roof of the building and the mode of disposal of nightsoil and sullage waste water from the building" to be approved in writing by the council without specifically requiring plans and specifications of proposed drains, means of ventilation or sanitary arrangements to be submitted and approved before building operations are commenced, and therefore the provisions of that Act could not be relied upon to ensure the payment of adequate attention to health requirements so far as drainage, ventilation and sanitary works are concerned. Furthermore, the provisions of the Building Act are administered by building surveyors without assistance from board of health officers. It is felt that local boards as such should have a greater measure of control over the construction of drainage, ventilation and sanitary works in buildings within their areas. Clause 3 of the Bill accordingly repeals subsection (4) of section 123 of the principal Act. The



effect of the repeal is that subsections (1) and (2) of that section would have to be complied with in district council districts whether the Building Act applies in those districts or not. This would ensure that proper plans and specifications relating to drainage, ventilation and sanitary works are submitted to and approved by the local board before their construction is commenced and that the construction is carried out with such materials and in such a manner as the local board prescribes, thus avoiding the necessity, where inadequate or unsuitable conditions of drainage and sanitation are found, for boards to declare such conditions as insanitary and invoke the provisions of Part VI of the Health Act to require their correction.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—The Bill will provide authority for local boards of health in respect of drains, ventilation and sanitary requirements in buildings, particularly in unsewered areas. Up to the present, these boards have not had an opportunity to insist that certain standards of sanitation be provided. Anything that provides for the protection of the public health must meet with our support. I therefore support the Bill.

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

#### LAND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

Its objects are—

- (1) to protect purchasers and prospective purchasers of subdivided land from false representations and other unlawful acts by vendors and persons acting on behalf of vendors of such land; and
- (2) to confer on authorized persons power to inspect the books and other documents of land agents which relate to moneys received by them on behalf of other persons in the course of their business as land agents or which contain information as to whether any such business is carried on in partnership with others.

Subsection (2) of section 65 of the principal Act provides that any person who, in connection with the selling of any subdivided land

or any interest in such land, knowingly makes a false representation which is likely to induce another person to buy such land or interest, shall be guilty of an offence. Subdivided land is defined in subsection (1) of that section as any one or more vacant allotments of land shown on a plan of subdivision deposited in the Land Titles registration office or the general registry office at Adelaide, or any part of such an allotment. In order that a prosecution under subsection (2) might succeed it would therefore be necessary to show that the false representation was made in connection with one or more vacant allotments of land shown on a plan of subdivision, and that the plan was in fact deposited in the Land Titles registration office or the general registry office.

Cases have recently come to the notice of the Government where persons have offered for sale land shown on a plan of sub-division which, though submitted for the Town Planner's approval, had not in fact been deposited in the Land Titles registration office or the general registry office as required, and any false representation in respect of such land would not be punishable under subsection (2) of section 65 because, for that reason, the land would not come within the definition of subdivided land. Clause 3 of this Bill accordingly amends subsection (1) of section 65 by widening the definition of subdivided land to include land shown on a plan of subdivision or of re-subdivision submitted for approval under the Town Planning Act, whether or not such approval has been granted.

Section 33 of the Business Agents Act empowers a person authorized in writing by the Attorney-General to inspect documents relating to trust accounts and the like in the custody or control of licensed business agents, and wilful obstruction of a person so authorized and failure to produce such documents for inspection when required by such a person is an offence. The Commissioner of Police has recommended that similar provisions be inserted in the Land Agents Act, as occasions have occurred in the course of police inquiries where production, when requested, of documents and books of account relevant to those inquiries have been sought to be avoided, and the inquiries consequently delayed and obstructed. Clause 4 of the Bill amends the principal Act by inserting a new section 77a conferring on persons authorized in writing by the Attorney-General a power of inspection similar to that contained in section 33 of the Business Agents Act. The

penalty prescribed for a breach of the new section is the same as that prescribed for a breach of section 33 of the Business Agents Act, with the exception that the new section does not prescribe a penalty for a continuing offence. The Bill seeks to prevent undesirable practices in connection with the selling of land which could have serious consequences, particularly for the small investor.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Edwardstown)—I do not desire to go into any lengthy discussion of this Bill, which came from another place after being scrutinized there. I therefore see no reason why the business of the State should be delayed on this occasion. However, the Bill deals with important matters. Anything that will assist people who desire to purchase subdivided land in the hope that one day they may be able to build a home on that land must meet with the approval of this Parliament, and people who make that investment should receive all the consideration and protection that legislation can provide.

It has been proved, according to certain publications, that people have subdivided farmlets of about five acres and then tried to sell that land, although the plan of subdivision had not been deposited with the Lands Titles registration office. It is Parliament's function to provide for the licensing of agents and to control the right of people to subdivide, but, with all due respect to the legal profession in this or any other State, it seems that the legal mind (and, I might add, the non-legal mind, too) is often centred on the means of finding loopholes and evading legal requirements. As the Bill is designed to further control land subdivisions and is a deliberate attempt to safeguard people wishing to acquire land for home-building purposes, I support it.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.43 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, May 11, at 2 p.m.