

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, November 17, 1960.

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

QUESTIONS.**BUILDING SOCIETIES.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH—In this morning's *Advertiser*, under the heading "S.A. Building Societies Undeveloped" appeared the following statement attributed to Senator Spooner, the Minister for National Development:—

If they had developed in the same way as in other States, South Australia would have had a better development of home building than by using other methods of finance.

Does the Premier agree with that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This State has had terminating building societies, but for some reason due to our law non-terminating societies have never been established here. As far as I know, what Senator Spooner said was more or less a lot of "hooley". A certain sum is made available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. The State itself nominates how much of its Loan programme shall be used under that agreement. For the money we get a slight concession in interest rates, but, on the other hand, we have to make 30 per cent available to the home builders' fund. Members will see that if this money were taken from the State Bank and the Housing Trust and handed over to terminating building societies, the only effect would be that there would be another link in the chain without actually adding anything to its length. I believe our authorities are spending the money more effectively and getting more value for it than the authorities established as terminating building societies in other States. Taking it away from the Housing Trust or the State Bank and handing it over to terminating building societies would not add to the total. In any case, we are gravely concerned that we have to give 30 per cent away in order to get a one per cent interest reduction. The Leader will see it is a big price to pay for a one per cent interest reduction. If any further amount were to go from it, South Australia would cease to operate under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. We cannot prefer to have the money under our own control and spend it as we saw fit, and as Parliament approved.

PRIVATE SAWMILLS.

Mr. HARDING—I understand it has been Government policy to farm out to private sawmills up to 50 per cent of the milling timber each year. Can the Premier say whether there is much inquiry from private enterprise for milling timber, and whether it is getting its full requirements?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—True, it has been Government policy to encourage the supply of Government timber to private sawmills, as well as to Government sawmills, but one or two other factors need to be considered. The Government is very jealous of the quality of the products that it puts out from the forests, and unless a sawmill has proper equipment to handle the timber, particularly to see that it is seasoned, we naturally do not desire it to go on the market to get the *pinus radiata* a bad name. Secondly, the forest type sawmills, of which there have been many in the South-East over the years, have been strongly condemned by the local government authorities, because they always leave a large heap of sawdust and other rubbish. They have no permanency and have been strongly criticized by landowners because of the fire risk created by these large sawdust heaps. Those heaps inevitably catch alight, and every hot day they can be a source of spreading fire. Under those circumstances the Forestry Board does not now automatically make timber available to everyone that applies for it. I assure the honourable member that if he has a worthy application that he desires considered, I will place it before the Forestry Board.

NEXT YEAR'S SITTINGS.

Mr. HUTCHENS—This year Parliament departed somewhat from what is usually a long continuous programme by meeting in what might be termed two sessions, namely, from March to May, and then from August onwards. In order that members may make arrangements for the new year, can the Premier say whether Parliament will hold two sessions again next year?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Some members have approached the Government and asked that, if possible, the two sessions should not be arranged next year. They point out that in their opinion that practice has been neither conducive to better legislation nor more convenient to members. However, I cannot give an undertaking that two sessions will not again be held, because at a time such as this important and urgent legislation might

easily be required at any time. I will inform honourable members as soon as possible what the Government believes should be the programme next year. We want to meet the convenience of members and we want legislation considered in an orderly way without an excessive programme which undoubtedly tires the House. Two or three aspects this year, I believe, could be bettered if we considered them. I will notify the Leader and other honourable members as soon as a decision is made.

MALLALA-BALAKLAVA ROAD.

Mr. HALL—Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question concerning the main road from Mallala to Balaklava?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has informed me that suitable stone has been located. Investigations will be made with respect to the capabilities of the district councils of Mallala and Owen to ascertain if it is practicable to call tenders for the crushing of approximately 50,000 cub. yds. of stone, which is the requirement for this road, as the crushing of small quantities is uneconomical. If it is practicable for the councils to carry out this work and complete it within a year or two, a contract could be let for the crushing of the whole of the material.

ELIZABETH WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CLARK—During the last few weeks I have received complaints from people living in Elizabeth, particularly from the Elizabeth Ratepayers' Association, regarding the discolouration of water from the Elizabeth mains. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from the Engineering and Water Supply Department on the reasons for the discolouration? Also, as the opinion has been expressed to me that the water may not be hygienic, will he obtain a report on its quality?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I cannot comment offhand on the discolouration but I assure the honourable member that, regarding the quality of the water from a health point of view, he need have no fears. Tests of the water are made frequently to ensure that the bacteria count is negligible and that the quality of the water from a health point of view is strictly maintained. However, I will ask for a report on the discolouration to which the honourable member refers.

TEA TREE GULLY WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LAUCKE—On October 12 I asked the Minister of Works a question relating to a water supply for the Tea Tree Gully and Modbury districts, where subdivision has been completed in certain portions and a water supply would give a major fillip to house-building. What are the current prospects of a water supply in these areas?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The Engineer for Water Supply has examined proposals for this district which will require provision of a large trunk main leading off the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline to supply a high level area in the Tea Tree Gully-Yatala Vale-Golden Grove area where many new subdivisions have taken place. This can be done only when additional water is made available by completing the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline to the terminal storage. That part of the programme will, I hope, be completed soon, within a month or two. The project is being examined by the Engineer-in-Chief and I expect shortly to have some indication from him as to when the work can be put in hand. As soon as this has been determined and considered by Cabinet I will advise the honourable member by letter.

KAROONDA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. STOTT—Some months ago a deputation introduced by myself from the Murray Valley area waited on the Minister of Works regarding a water scheme from Bowhill to connect with Karoonda. When the scheme announced in this morning's *Advertiser* (from Taillem Bend to Keith) was also mooted, it was suggested that the department should consider either running a spur line from Bowhill to Karoonda and to Keith or, if it came off the Taillem Bend supply, running a spur line from that project down to Keith and up to Karoonda. I ask the Minister of Works whether the department, in view of today's announcement, has considered running the main from Taillem Bend to Karoonda?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—At the time that the honourable member introduced his deputation (a considerable time ago), the route of the Taillem Bend to Keith pipeline was still not determined. It was considered then that it might be advisable to extend the first leg of the pipeline from Taillem Bend in a comparatively easterly direction and well north of the railway line which, had it been the case, would have taken the route of the trunk main closer to Karoonda. It was, therefore, not possible at the time to consider what

would be the best means, if any were to be provided, of taking water to Karoonda.

The deputation, I believe, canvassed two alternatives—one from the proposed Tailern Bend to Keith pipeline, and the other from the Murray River at a point north of Bowhill. I told the deputation at the time that I could not take the matter any further then and that we would soon be able to electrify the pump at the Karoonda bore to ensure a more reliable supply to that town. That has been done and, so far as I am aware, no breakdown has occurred, the supply for Karoonda being satisfactory. I have not heard any comment to the contrary. The programme of works before the department is extremely heavy and I cannot give any undertaking at the moment, much as I should like to, regarding a further supply for Karoonda, over and above what is available from local sources at present. I suggest that this matter be deferred for a little time until the works programme of the department has been carried forward another stage or two. We have some large projects, together with small ones, on our hands and I regret that I cannot give the honourable member the assurance of an alternative supply for Karoonda at the moment; but the matter will be kept in mind, with other requests.

CREAM PRICES.

Mr. NANKIVELL—As the recent report on the dairy industry shows that the price and consumption of whole milk in South Australia are comparable with those of other States, can the Minister of Agriculture say why the retail price of table cream is so much higher in South Australia than in other States? I quote the prices as they apply in the States: the retail price of cream in South Australia is 8s. 9d. a pint, in New South Wales 7s. 2d., in Western Australia 6s., in Queensland 5s., and in Victoria 4s. 8d.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—A number of obvious factors, mostly geographical, spring to mind immediately but, rather than make a detailed comment, I will get a report from the Director of Agriculture and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. RALSTON—Can the Minister of Education give me any information about toilet facilities and change rooms at the new Mount Gambier high school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Following previous questions by the honourable member

I have received the following report from the Director of the Public Buildings Department:—

A firm of private architects has been engaged to prepare the working drawings, specifications, etc., for the construction of the major additions at the Mount Gambier high school, which includes the provision of change rooms and toilets for girls at the playing fields. The architects have advised that they will complete the working drawings and specifications by March, 1961. It is anticipated that tenders for the work will be called about June, 1961. It is not considered expedient to have the change rooms and toilets taken out and treated as a separate contract, as, due to pressure of work on other school requirements, no appreciable saving of time would result in the erection of these buildings. If required, arrangements can be made with the successful contractor, after tenders have been called, to erect the change rooms and toilets as the first part of his work.

WATTLE PARK BUS SERVICE.

Mrs. STEELE—Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked on November 8 about extending the Erindale bus service?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I referred the question to the General Manager of the Tramways Trust, who now reports:—

About 12 months ago the question of additional transport facilities in the Burnside district was examined in conjunction with the Burnside Council, which was subsequently informed that the economics of the propositions submitted weighed heavily against their implementation. Recently the position was again reviewed, and, although it reflected very much the same picture, the matter was held over for re-investigation pending the receipt of a detailed survey being made by a body of residents in the Wattle Park area. I will advise you of the outcome.

As the General Manager has undertaken to keep me informed, I will keep the honourable member informed as soon as I get a further reply.

BREAD DELIVERIES.

Mr. MCKEE—I have received the following letter from the Port Pirie Trades and Labor Council:—

At the November meeting of the above body it was decided to protest to the Prices Commissioner regarding the delivery price of bread where more than one loaf is delivered to a household. As you know 2d. is charged on each delivered loaf, and where more than one loaf is delivered we maintain that 2d. overall should be the delivery price charged, and not 4d. or 6d., depending upon whether two or three loaves are carried into the household.

I also consider that this is an excessive price for the delivery of bread and people are justified in protesting. An overall charge of

2d. would be reasonable. Apparently large families and bigger customers pay more for the bread that is delivered to them. In view of this unfairness, will the Premier take up this matter with the Prices Commissioner to see whether some reasonable charge cannot be arrived at?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The cost of delivering commodities to houses is causing the Government great concern. Since the war many services that were previously available to the housewife have been curtailed or the cost made much steeper. For instance, the delivery of meat in the metropolitan area has been virtually discontinued, except in special cases. An application by the union, which was supported, I believe, by the bakers, provided for a relatively costly employee to deliver bread. As far as I know, there is no logical reason why such an employee should deliver bread instead of a man under 21 years. The Arbitration Court award governing the type of person who may be used for delivering bread is one of the reasons for the high cost, particularly when a distance is involved. I will refer the matter to the Prices Commissioner, who will see whether any adjustment can be made in favour of the community. The basic trouble, in my opinion, is that the award adds unnecessarily to the cost of delivery.

GEORGETOWN POLICE OFFICER.

Mr. HEASLIP—Recently the police officer at Georgetown was transferred because the police residence was condemned. Following his removal I received a request from the Georgetown district council to see whether a police officer could be stationed, if not at Georgetown, at Yacka, south of Georgetown. For 40 miles between Gladstone and Clare, on the Main North Road, no officer is available. If an accident or any trouble has to be reported it is necessary to travel to Clare or Gladstone or to divert from the Main North Road to Brinkworth. The request was not acceded to because of the expense of transferring an officer to Yacka. I have received a communication from the Georgetown Returned Soldiers' League sub-branch, asking me to again take up the matter. Will the Premier, representing the Chief Secretary, ask whether reconsideration could be given to stationing a police officer somewhere between Gladstone and Clare?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I will take up the matter with the Chief Secretary to see whether a police officer can

be used effectively in the area. I point out that since the days when we had mounted police in country areas we have now a mobile police force and 30 miles today is probably not as far, in point of time, as 10 miles was then. I will have the matter examined.

UMEWARRA MISSION.

Mr. RICHES—The Aborigines Department is to be commended for the experiment it has conducted in providing, in progressive stages, better housing at the Umeewarra Mission, and for its programme of assimilating the people into the township itself. The houses are good and the tenants are proving excellent citizens. However, I am concerned at the conditions under which children are being taught in the school at the mission. The lack of a building and the increasing numbers are causing grave concern. The Minister of Works visited the mission 12 months ago and has some knowledge of the requirements. The situation is more urgent now than it was then. Can the Minister supply information on the possibility of getting a new school building at the mission?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I appreciate (and I am sure the Aborigines Department will appreciate) the honourable member's commendation of the work done at Umeewarra. I feel that the sisters in charge at Umeewarra also deserve our sincere commendation because they are carrying out an extremely fine service to the community, particularly to the aboriginal people in that area. From my own observations there I feel that they are worthy people doing a fine job. The department has provided on the commonage to the north of the mission some cottages to which the honourable member referred. Yesterday, the Secretary of the Board (Mr. Bartlett) conferred with me about this matter and said that he was pleased with the project and the people occupying the cottages. We also discussed the school buildings at Umeewarra. I think the honourable member will appreciate that neither the Aborigines Department nor the Education Department is responsible for the provision of buildings. That is the responsibility of the mission and, so far as I can ascertain, up to the present the mission has provided the buildings or has paid for their provision. Notwithstanding that, both the Education Department and the Aborigines Department have far exceeded their actual liabilities in respect of assistance to the mission. The Aborigines Department has recently renovated existing buildings, including lavatories, improved the water supply, and

done other work there. It has provided a vehicle to convey children from the mission to the Port Augusta school and, as I think the honourable member will appreciate, it has done much more than it is directly responsible for in assisting this worthy mission. Although I undertook to endeavour to find an unoccupied school building that could be moved—possibly one rendered redundant by moves involving other schools—and to make it available, if possible, to mission authorities, I have not so far been able to find one.

I have always hoped that the children from the mission will, as far as possible, go to the Port Augusta school. Several have been attending that school and the district inspector has reported that they have fitted in extremely well with the school and the children, that they have done well in their studies, and that the experiment has been successful. He reported that in his opinion there were, I think, four more children from the mission who could be taken to the school, and I hope that they have begun attending the school. He reported that there were some other children who were, perhaps, not so well fitted to go to the Port Augusta school because their standard of education was behind that of the average white children and therefore they would be over-age for the grades in which they would have to be placed. I hope that this will not be considered too great a barrier to their integration at the Port Augusta school. I hope that some risk will be taken on the positive side of integration and assimilation of these children and, from my observations of native children attending schools where predominantly white children attend, I am sure that there is no problem regarding the children, so I always hope that children will go to Education Department schools wherever they can be accommodated.

I inquired yesterday of the Secretary of the Aborigines Department about the movement of population at the Umeewarra mission and the adjacent settlement, and he told me that it fluctuates considerably from time to time because, when families come down from the north to Port Augusta for medical treatment, they may be accommodated in the cottages for some time, when their children are available to attend school, but they do not stay long before moving away again, so the population tends to ebb and flow substantially. I imagine that the general tendency is for the total numbers to increase, as the honourable member said. I cannot promise the honourable member when I shall be able to

find a building but, notwithstanding that it is not the department's responsibility, I will try to find one.

Mr. Riches—They are opening a new dormitory tomorrow and that will bring more children.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I realize that.

COURT OF DISPUTED RETURNS.

Mr. SHANNON—Yesterday I asked the Minister of Education to refer to the Attorney-General a question relating to the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), whose name appears as a member of the Court of Disputed Returns, following his acting as scrutineer in the Frome by-election count. In any hearing of the Court of Disputed Returns that may follow the completion of the Frome recount, will action be taken to ensure that the scales of justice will not be unfairly weighted?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I referred the question to my colleague, the Attorney-General, who furnished the following reply:—

In the opinion of my advisers it is very undesirable for a member of the Court of Disputed Returns to participate actively in the proceedings relating to the scrutiny or investigation of the validity of votes at an election which may become the subject matter of an inquiry before that court. Such action could lead to the member's right to sit on the court in the event of such proceedings being challenged.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—Are certain matters relating to the Frome by-election *sub judice*? If they are not, can the Minister of Education comment on section 86 of the Electoral Act, which provides that the returning officer shall produce unopened all envelopes bearing the postal vote certificates? Does that mean that a postal ballot paper can be delivered to a polling booth at any time up to 8 o'clock on the day of the poll, and that an envelope bearing a postmark that indicates that it would have been posted before 8 p.m. the time of the closing of the poll, can be accepted? Would postal votes posted later be counted?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Yesterday, in reply to questions by the members for Onkaparinga and Hindmarsh I said I should be pleased to refer their questions to my colleague, the Attorney-General, who is the ministerial head of the legal department of this State. I did so, and I shall be only too pleased to refer the Leader's question also to my colleague.

Mr. LOVEDAY—As the question of the eligibility of the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) to sit on the Court of Disputed

Returns has been raised, will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in this House, ascertain from his colleague whether you, Sir, the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) and myself, who are also members of the Court of Disputed Returns (two of us having taken an active part in the Frome by-election campaign, and you yourself indirectly) are also eligible to sit on the Court of Disputed Returns? If not, why is there such a subtle distinction between ourselves and the member for Norwood?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—Once again, I shall be only too pleased to pass on to my colleague the request of the honourable member who asks such an interesting question.

WARREN TRUNK MAIN.

Mr. HUGHES—Once again we are approaching the summer and the farmers in my district who are served by the Warren trunk main will be faced with a shortage of water for their stock. I know that the Minister of Works and his department are endeavouring to cope with the serious position, but will the Minister outline the progress made and say whether some obstacles, such as the shortage of steel plate for the various sizes of pipe, have been overcome?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I regret that I am unable to assure the honourable member that shortages of steel have been overcome although so far, as I have been advised by the Engineer-in-Chief, our work has not been unduly delayed because of the shortages. However, I think that unless the position improves somewhat we may not be able to progress as far as we would like. The Engineer-in-Chief has recently seen a new type of reinforced concrete rubber-jointed piping now being manufactured in Australia. This appears a successful and promising development and mains that would normally be laid in steel may in future be laid in reinforced concrete. I cannot say to what extent that will alleviate the present steel shortage, but I hope that it will have at least some effect. My advice is that at present much steel is being imported from overseas by private firms for their own purposes and that before long, although we fortunately had reasonable stocks of steel plate in hand before the shortage occurred, the shortage must affect our undertakings. We are making all possible haste to continue the work on the Warren trunk main. The existing pipeline, inadequate though it may be, will be maintained in a

workable condition, but I know that it does not deliver all the water that the people on the top of the Hummocks require. I can only assure the honourable member that we will do our best to see that they are kept supplied. I cannot give him any assurance beyond that.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS.

Mr. KING—On perusing the Advances to Settlers Act I find that that Act excludes people living in Crown irrigation areas. When this provision was first made, facilities existed for advances to be made by the Government under another Act. Will the Treasurer examine the Act to see whether that exclusion is still justified?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Yes.

MURRAY BRIDGE ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. BYWATERS—Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the painting of the Murray Bridge road bridge?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has informed me that the preparation of a specification for the painting of the bridge is in hand. Further investigations with respect to the treatment of the steel work below the deck are being carried out before the correct treatment can be specified. It is expected, however, that tenders will be called soon.

MILLICENT PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN—Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of Tuesday regarding a site for the new Millicent primary school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have additional information but I am afraid I cannot take the matter much further. When I replied to a question from the honourable member on this matter several weeks ago, I said that Cabinet had approved of negotiations for the purchase of an alternative site for the new Millicent primary school and that after a report on its suitability had been received from the Public Buildings Department negotiations would be opened up with the owner of the land. The present position is that the approach has now been made to the owner of the land, but so far a reply has not been received. I shall be pleased to advise the honourable member as soon as the matter has been finalized. I repeat that I, too, am most anxious for negotiations to be concluded in order that construction of the school may be started as soon as possible.

EGG SIZES.

Mr. LAUCKE—My question concerns the possibility of the Egg Board introducing a new grading of eggs covering eggs weighing more than two ounces. (I will call them "king size", that being the appellation given in Victoria to this grading in the discussions at present taking place on this matter.) If no premium is offered for king size eggs, the production trend will be more towards numbers, and less regard will be paid to their size, which could ultimately adversely affect our export prospects. Would the Minister of Agriculture investigate the possibility of this further grading of our eggs?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—I shall be pleased to refer that question to the Chairman of the Egg Board; I will also ask the Director of Agriculture to comment upon it. For myself, I do not think there is the danger that the honourable member envisages. My understanding of the position in South Australia is that, due largely to the efforts of the Department of Agriculture, and in particular of Mr. Anderson (Chairman of the Egg Board) who used to be the poultry adviser to the department, and to the efforts of the producers themselves, the standard of eggs in South Australia is high. Without having the complete facts before me, I believe that the South Australian egg is at least as good as any other egg and is of considerable weight in proportion to its size.

SALISBURY SCHOOL SITES.

Mr. CLARK—On September 21, following some remarks I made during the debate on the Loan Estimates about sites for new schools south of Salisbury, the Minister of Education was kind enough to tell me in reply to a question that consideration had already been given to the purchase of suitable sites for primary schools at Salisbury Downs, Salisbury West, Salisbury Heights and Brahma Estate, amongst others. The Salisbury district council would be assisted in its plans for the development of this area if it knew the sites. Is information available that could be given to me to convey to the council? If it is necessary for the information to be regarded as confidential, I shall not ask the Minister to give it to me now.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am pleased to comply with the honourable member's request, having regard to his proviso that the information would be treated as confidential or semi-confidential, because I have received similar requests from other honourable members, with the best of intentions and some-

times at the instigation of their local authorities; but it is difficult for me to comply with them because we are purchasing land ahead of immediate requirements in anticipation of future (sometimes very distant future) needs. If it is noised abroad to all and sundry that we have purchased land in a particular location, then subdividers will use that knowledge in their various advertisements, saying that the Education Department is to build schools here, there and elsewhere. Pressure is then brought to bear on us to build a school there soon, whereas we have no present intention of building it there; we are merely planning ahead of requirements. With that proviso, I shall be only too pleased to supply the information in confidence, knowing that I can rely on the honourable member not to use that confidence in any other way than to assist the council.

TESTING OF USED CARS.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I quote from an article in this morning's *Advertiser*, which states:—

Queensland looks like tightening its laws to provide for compulsory pre-sale checks on all used motor vehicles. If so, there will not be too many critics. Snap inspections of 35 dealers' yards over the past three months produced evidence which has surprised even the inspectors. The checks covered 128 vehicles, of vintages ranging from "bombs" to near-new. And it worked out that ordinary people had only a 39 per cent chance of getting a thoroughly safe, roadworthy vehicle. Highest rate of inefficiency was in hand brakes—32 per cent of those inspected. But steering was faulty in 29 per cent and foot brakes in 16.4 per cent.

Then the article deals with road tests. Can the Premier say whether the practice of inspecting used cars, offered for sale by dealers, for roadworthiness or otherwise obtains in South Australia? If not, will it be considered and, if necessary, will suitable legislation be introduced?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Provision is made in the Road Traffic Bill now before us to empower the police to inspect any vehicle that they think it is necessary to inspect for its safety. I answered a similar question not many days ago regarding the Government's inspecting every secondhand car. If the Government now inspected every secondhand car, it would have no time to do anything else. One has only to visit some districts, particularly the district of the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), to see how great the problem would be. Also, these cars would be sold and it would be said

that the Government had inspected them, so they would be sold as being satisfactory from the point of view of Government inspection. Under the provisions of the Road Traffic Bill a police officer will be enabled to inspect any car at any time if he has reason to believe it is not roadworthy. That, I think, is a much better provision than the one the honourable member mentioned in relation to Queensland. If the honourable member reads that article again he will see that only a handful of cars out of possibly several hundred thousand was inspected.

TEACHERS TRAINING COLLEGE.

Mr. CUMBE—Can the Minister of Works indicate what progress is being made with the planning for the new Teachers Training College at Kintore Avenue and can he say when the project will be commenced?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The work of planning has suffered somewhat because of resignations from the Public Buildings Department, which have reached serious proportions in the last four or five months. Efforts have been made to obtain more staff. Indeed, Mr. Malkin (Principal Architect) is at present in Europe recruiting staff. He has met with some success, but not to the degree we had hoped. He has done as much as he possibly can and expects to return to South Australia within the next week or two. Urgent as the Teachers Training College is, I have regard for the feelings of my colleague (the Minister of Education) in this matter. I believe that he feels that the provision of primary and secondary school accommodation must be programmed. I do not suggest that the planning of the Teachers Training College has been delayed by that in any way. Every human effort is being made by the department to get this project completed to the stage when tenders can be called. I cannot, from the information I have at present, tell the honourable member any precise dates. I will consult with the Director of Public Buildings tomorrow morning and if any further information is available I will communicate with the honourable member by telephone or by letter.

CHILDREN IN BEER GARDENS.

Mr. HUGHES—Recently, in reply to a question I asked about children being banned from beer gardens, the Premier said that he had received a deputation at which 10 religious bodies were represented requesting that children under 16 years be prohibited from entering beer gardens. He said that Cabinet was con-

sidering the matter. He also said that this matter was being examined. Am I to infer from his reply that Cabinet was considering the question referred to him by the 10 religious bodies and, after Cabinet came to a decision, did the Premier, before introducing the Licensing Act Amendment Bill, notify the leader of the deputation of the decision?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—Cabinet considered the matter and decided not to introduce legislation this session. I am not sure whether the leader of the deputation has yet received a communication. Members know that at this time of the year Ministers are extremely busy, and the reply may not yet have gone out. If it has not, I will apologize for the discourtesy when I send it.

MARANANGA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LAUCKE—Some months ago pipes were delivered to the Marananga district for the proposed water scheme. Can the Minister of Works indicate when the main laying for this scheme will commence?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—As soon as the main laying at Truro is completed the department will go ahead with the laying on the Marananga scheme. I hope that that will be during the first or second week of December.

COUNTRY SEWERAGE RATES.

Mr. RALSTON—I understand that the Minister of Works has a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the sewerage rate applying at Naracoorte and Port Lincoln.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—The country sewerage rate applies throughout the State. I am not sure why the honourable member is interested in Naracoorte, but I know that the Mount Gambier scheme is coming along soon. Yesterday, in debate, reference was made to the country sewerage rate of 2s. 6d. prescribed in the Act. That rate did apply in the country. In 1959-60 the rate was 2s. 6d.; in 1960-61 it will be reduced to 2s. 3d.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS.

Mrs. STEELE—Yesterday I asked the Premier about the general dearth of trained occupational therapists, and not specifically about those who would be required at the proposed centre for alcoholics, although the establishment of this centre has again highlighted their scarcity. A fully-qualified occupational therapist is a necessary and valued member of any hospital rehabilitation team, whether mental or physical, and members of the medical profession know how essential they

are, but except at Northfield and Parkside none of our public hospitals has one on its staff. People in this State have the prerequisite qualifications to undertake the three-year course but are prevented, for financial reasons, because the only training schools are at the Sydney and Melbourne Universities. Can the Premier say whether the Government will investigate the possibility of offering scholarships to suitable students because, being residents of South Australia, there would be a better possibility of retaining their services on graduation and also of ensuring a continuity of trained therapists in future?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Government offers scholarships to people who are needed for the Government services and who, for some reason or other, have to be trained out of the State or are not able to undergo the training without assistance. The Agriculture Department, for instance, offers scholarships for veterinary cadets to go to Sydney to train in veterinary courses. That practice is much less expensive than would be the establishment of a veterinary chair at the Adelaide University for the few persons who would use it. Incidentally, on that topic, at present at the Adelaide University there is a disappointingly small number of students in some of the faculties, particularly in the dental faculty. That is causing much concern. I do not know whether the department would deem it necessary to provide scholarships for occupational therapists. I believe that we would treat this matter as more urgent than that. I think that we would depend more upon attracting these persons to South Australia by the type of work that is available here, which will be, incidentally, extremely interesting. Although we have been short of medical officers in many Government services, I can mention that since I announced that this centre was to be established I have received a most promising offer from a medical officer who wants to be associated with it. The centre will have an attraction because of the interesting work that will be undertaken. I will submit the honourable member's question to the Minister of Health under whose authority this activity will operate.

LOXTON ROADS.

Mr. STOTT—Has the Premier a reply to my recent question concerning the possible damage through flood to the roads between Loxton and Berri and between Kingston and Cobdogla?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—My colleague, the Minister of Roads, has received a report from the Commissioner of Highways to the effect that a bank has been constructed on the upstream side of the Kingston ferry to Cobdogla Road. If the river does not rise beyond its expected peak, it is anticipated that this road will remain open to traffic. It is not practicable to construct a bank adjoining the Berri-Loxton Road, but it is expected that the river will not rise sufficiently to close the road, as only a few inches of water should cover the pavement. In any case, the river should be high for only a very short period.

CREDIT RESTRICTIONS.

Mr. HALL—Does the Treasurer believe that the operations of the credit restrictions imposed by the Commonwealth Government will have any effect on the decisions made by the Industries Development Committee?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I do not believe that they will have any effect. Many of the industries assisted, after a report from the Industries Development Committee, are financed from the State Bank. In most instances the Government provides the actual money. As far as that is concerned, the measures that have been taken by the Commonwealth Government will not affect the State Bank in carrying out those duties. The effect on any outside bank would be different, but I have had no difficulty at present with these matters.

ELIZABETH ELECTRICAL SERVICE.

Mr. CLARK—Recently concern has been expressed by owners and purchasers of houses at Elizabeth over the fact that the Electricity Trust has notified them that it has discontinued the servicing of hired electrical appliances in their houses. Can the Premier ascertain from the trust the reason for this, and whether this decision could be reconsidered?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—This is not a recent decision. It arose out of the extremely high cost of servicing this hired equipment. In some instances the cost amounted to more than the hire obtained from the equipment. It was a decision not of the Government but of the trust, and I think it was given two or possibly three years ago.

Mr. Clark—They have only recently had letters about it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—If Elizabeth has been receiving special privileges I am not aware of it.

FARMERS' CLUBS.

Mr. NANKIVELL—As the Minister is no doubt aware, farmers' clubs have been established successfully in many States, particularly Western Australia. Although I do not reflect on the services given by officers of the Agriculture Department in providing advisory services, I believe these could be considerably improved upon. Therefore, will the Minister of Agriculture consider the establishment of such clubs as a basis for building up a new and improved agricultural advisory service in this State?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—If anyone wants to start a farmers' club I have no doubt that he will let me know before long, and he will certainly get as much encouragement as I can give him.

HOTEL AUSTRALIA CHARGES.

Mr. McKEE—Has the Premier obtained a reply to a question I asked on November 9 regarding dinner charges at the Hotel Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—The Superintendent of Licensed Premises (Mr. Pope) has furnished the following report:—

The licensee of the Hotel Australia, North Adelaide (or any hotel licensee with permit under section 198) may sell/supply liquor with meals from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m. on any evening to any person having a *bona fide* meal in the dining room. The tariff rates supplied to me for dinners (*table d'hote menu*) at Hotel Australia are (in respect of Matthew Flinders dining room and Colonel Light dining room) 35s. a head, but, of course, charges for liquor would be extra. Persons in a case such as this dine and drink liquor with meals under a permit to supply liquor with meals which remains in force so long as the licensee remains the licensee of the premises. No fee is chargeable to the diners for this permit. The ordinary casual diner (apart from an excepted person) who is not included in a special occasion permit function is not allowed to be supplied with or to consume liquor in the dining room after 9 p.m.

Upon application being made by any person, a permit for a special occasion function may be granted to that person for any period between 6 p.m. and 12 midnight authorizing the sale, supply and consumption of liquor only to and by persons present at and taking part in that function in such room as specified in the permit. The fee for this type of permit is 30s., and must be paid to the Police Department when the application is lodged and ultimately paid into revenue. In practice, the person desiring to hold the function arranges with the licensee of the hotel to lodge his application, pay the 30s. fee, and, if necessary, attend the Police Court for the hearing of the application for permit. That 30s. is then recovered from the person who is giving the function and to whom the special occasion permit has been granted.

Referring to the extract from *Hansard* of November 9, 1960, I should think what probably occurred was that special occasion permits were granted, maybe for several small functions or parties, and that the fee of 30s. previously paid to the Police Department was being recovered. Of course, if every individual in a party was charged 30s. fee, or if anyone who had not applied for a special occasion permit was charged 30s. fee for permit charge, it would be improper.

ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE, PORT AUGUSTA.

Mr. RICHES—Is the Minister of Education able to tell me whether progress has been made in planning a new adult education centre at Port Augusta? Representations have been made over a long period for a new centre, and the suggestion by the Director of Education that a new building might be erected on the school's oval site, with a frontage opposite the cathedral, met with general approval.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I have received a report from the Director of Education which reads, *inter alia*, as follows:—

There is no doubt that ultimately a new building will be required for the Port Augusta adult education centre. I feel, too, that the best position for this building is on the high ground overlooking the oval across the road from the high school buildings. This new building, when fully completed, will provide all facilities required not only for adult education work in Port Augusta but also for the development of apprentice training. At the same time, I feel that there is no need to proceed immediately with the provision of this new building. Apprentice training is being conducted in buildings which have been specially provided within the high school grounds and the work of the adult education centre is also being carried on effectively in these and in the high school buildings. As the numbers enrolled at the adult education centre increase, and as new classes are established, and, more particularly, as the number of apprentices requiring training increases and additional trade courses are established, the need for separate buildings for the centre will have to be met. When they are built, some at least of the apprentice courses will be transferred to them. As soon as it seems likely that these increased facilities are required, further consideration will be given to the provision of the necessary buildings. I am afraid that I cannot take the matter any further at the moment.

BURDETT, ETRICK AND SEYMOUR WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS—I was pleased to see a report in this morning's *Advertiser* about a water supply to the South-East to cost £3,700,000. I have a real interest in the scheme as I was the one who introduced the original deputation to the late Sir Malcolm

McIntosh (then Minister of Works) before the scheme became the enlarged scheme that it is now. I am pleased that the scheme has reached a point at which it will be submitted to the Public Works Committee, and many people in my electorate will be pleased to receive water from this pipeline, which will go for a fair distance in my electorate before going into the Albert district. I noticed that the route suggested will be running away from another scheme (the Burdett, Ettrick and Seymour scheme) which has been postponed for some time because of this scheme. On previous occasions the Minister has referred to this scheme in conjunction with the Burdett, Ettrick and Seymour scheme. As the route has been established, will the Minister say whether water could be directed to serve the Hundreds of Burdett, Ettrick and Seymour?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—Not long ago—I am not sure just how long—the honourable member asked a similar question and I said it seemed almost certain that the route of the Taillem Bend to Keith line would go south of Taillem Bend and it would therefore not be of much use in serving the Hundreds of Burdett, Ettrick and Seymour. There is a possibility of utilizing the pumping station at Taillem Bend if it is necessary to take water from that town. However, the thinking of the department at the moment is that these hundreds would be more conveniently served from Murray Bridge. At least part of the area to which the honourable member refers would be more easily served by an extension from that town, and it would be necessary to enlarge the pipeline across the bridge. That can, and I think will, be done. I cannot give the honourable member a firm reply regarding the part near Taillem Bend; it will depend on the relative cost of taking water from the new scheme compared with taking it from Murray Bridge.

BUSH FIRE DANGER.

Mr. HALL—Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply from the Minister of Railways to my recent question regarding the use of diesel-electric locomotives to minimize fire danger on days of high fire risk?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—My colleague, the Minister of Railways, has informed me that Mr. Fitch (Deputy Railways Commissioner), Mr. Rogers (General Traffic Manager), and Mr. Wilkinson are at present giving the matter careful consideration, but there are not sufficient diesel locomotives to entirely replace steam locomotives. The increased use of oil-

fired engines is being examined to minimize fire risk. A further report is anticipated from the department within the next few days.

TANTANOOLA HOUSING.

Mr. CORCORAN—In July, 1959, the matter of housing at Tantanoola was discussed. Tenders were to be called at that time for many houses at Millicent, and representations were made by the District Council of Tantanoola for that town to be allotted a share. As new mills were being constructed by Apcel, and houses were needed at Tantanoola for employees of that company, it was agreed that 12 double-unit houses would be built at Tantanoola, but only five have been built and the builders have moved to Millicent. I approached the managing director of the company and was referred to the manager, who told me that although the mill wanted these houses they were not erected. The people of Tantanoola and I are anxious to have the balance constructed. The manager of Apcel is prepared to give the Housing Trust an undertaking that employees of his company will in due course either buy or rent these houses. Houses went up in Millicent, but they were not available in Tantanoola. I have nothing against Mr. Ramsay, with whom I discussed the matter, and I know that holding post-mortems on the past will not do much good. Mr. Ramsay has assured me that his officer in Millicent will co-operate with the company's housing officer, and try to see that these houses are built. I do not doubt that Mr. Ramsay will carry out that promise, but will the Premier assure me that he will give his full support to see that these houses are built?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I shall be pleased to take up the matter with the Housing Trust. Frankly, I did not know that there had been any disruption in the programme, and I do not know what the reason for that disruption would be. I will have the matter investigated.

PORT PIRIE WEST PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE—Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made regarding the construction of new toilet blocks at the Port Pirie West primary school?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—No, I have not that information, nor in the ordinary course of events would I have the information because the work is carried out by the Public Buildings Department. I shall try to ascertain the present position and let the honourable member know by letter.

HENLEY HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRED WALSH—I understand the Minister of Education has some information concerning the proposed additional playing area for the Henley high school.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—The honourable member is aware that the Henley high school grounds comprise only 15 acres, which is below the requirements now generally associated with high schools. I know the honourable member and members of the high school council are, and have been for a long time, anxious for the department to obtain additional areas, particularly for extra playing fields, and the department is equally anxious. We had been endeavouring to obtain extra land, but unsuccessfully, until finally the Housing Trust informed us that it was prepared to accede to our request and set aside six acres for an additional playing area, but it pointed out that it could not make known to us the exact location until the whole area was planned. It is hoped that the site will be facing Cudmore Terrace and immediately opposite the northern portion of the existing high school land. As soon as the Housing Trust is able to confirm that opinion I will let the honourable member and the members of the high school council know.

WATER RATE NOTICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—This morning I was interviewed by a lady of the Brighton area who is receiving Commonwealth benefits and who received an account for water rates for £27 10s. to be paid on or before December 10 this year. She points out that in January this year she paid rates which were due in February and complains that she has to pay, in the one year, two lots of water rates, one of which is at the increased rate. Although these accounts obviously refer to separate financial years, she wonders why she is called upon to pay two lots of rates in the one calendar year, and she queries whether it is because the Government might be running short of revenue.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON—I think the Leader and the person concerned will both appreciate that the cost of providing services cannot remain constant at a time when the cost of everything else is increasing. Regarding the due dates for payment, I think the answer is that the notices are not sent out in strict rotation or on the same dates in each financial year. It so happened, apparently, that the lady received her notice in January, 1960, and paid promptly (which is appreciated), and that

the notice for 1960-61 was received a little earlier than usual this year, namely, in November. That, of course, can easily happen because the rates are due and payable at any time in the financial year. If a question of hardship is involved, the ratepayer can call and see the Revenue Branch, where I am sure the matter can be adjusted to meet her convenience. Alternatively, if the Leader will give me the name of the person concerned I will have an investigation made by my office.

WATER CONCESSIONS.

Mr. RALSTON—Yesterday the Premier, in the course of his reply to my question concerning special tariff rates for electricity, said:—

On occasions we have supplied water under special conditions to enable an industry to function. One of those industries, incidentally, is in the honourable member's district.

What industry in my district receives water under special conditions, and what are the special conditions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—It is not usually the policy of the Government to make public the affairs of individual companies, but I shall be pleased to give the honourable member the information privately.

WAIKERIE BOUNDARIES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH—I understand the Premier has a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the District Council of Waikerie boundaries.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—When the Leader raised this matter previously I informed him that it was not the Government's usual policy to make available the reasons for a magistrate's report in a matter such as this. However, as this is a matter upon which the Leader desires some information, I am willing to show him the report. The reasons are, in fact, stated in the report, and I am willing to make it available for the Leader's perusal.

HECTORVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE—Parents of Hectorville primary school students have expressed some concern to me at what could be the future position regarding teaching staff at that school. It has recently become a Class I school, and in consequence the headmaster is being transferred to another school and his place is being taken by a headmaster coming from, I think, Largs Bay. At the same time, three senior teachers, namely the senior infant mistress, the senior assistant, and a senior woman assistant,

do not have the special qualifications for teaching at a Class I school and have, therefore, received notification that they are transferable. I should be glad if the Minister of Education could indicate whether these transfers have been confirmed, so that I can inform the parents of the school children what the future position will be.

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I am not aware, on the spur of the moment, of any provisional recommendations for transfers of those in the lesser positions being confirmed, but I have a vivid recollection that the Director's recommendation to me of the transfer of the headmaster from, I think, the Largs Bay primary school to Hectorville was confirmed. The Director assured me then that the Hectorville school would have stability in its headmaster for a minimum of three years and possibly a maximum of six years. I sympathize greatly with the persons who have communicated with the honourable member, because of the many promotions that have taken place and are about to take place at Hectorville and at many other primary and technical schools due largely to the endeavours of the members of the Teachers' Institute who have requested me to make many new promotional positions. This gives satisfaction to the profession, but the result is that when the new promotional positions are created applications are made by persons with qualifications for those positions and this causes a rapid turnover in staff throughout the State. I hope that from the beginning of next year onwards the position will be consolidated and that the personnel, particularly in the senior division in both primary and secondary schools, will remain fairly constant for a few years to come. That will be better for the children in the schools, for their parents, for the teachers themselves, and certainly for the economy of the State.

PORT AUGUSTA SALT LEASES.

Mr. RICHES—On November 3 the Premier replied to my question concerning the development of salt leases near Port Augusta. The Premier will recall that the Japanese agents were recently in Port Augusta asking for information as to the possibility of Port Augusta supplying Japan with large quantities of salt. The Premier stated that he had had discussions with Mitsui and Mitsubishi over a lengthy period, and that the Japanese were not prepared to enter into long-term agreements. They explained to us that that is the policy of the Japanese Government. The Government issues import licences of short tenure,

but the Japanese buyers of our wool and importers of our salt would be operating under similar conditions.

The Premier went on to say that this had been referred to the Industries Development Committee and that that committee did not bring in a favourable report. In fact, the application was not proceeded with by the committee because the owners of the lease were going to reorganize the South Australian company and the application was held up pending further advice from that company. Then the Premier said he had heard that agreement had recently been reached between the owners of the leases. He hailed that as good, as we all do, for these valuable leases should be developed in the interests of the State. Will the Premier ask the company that has the rights over these leases whether it would be prepared to let him know if it had any claims for further development in future, and if the State could be advised of those claims because of our firm conviction that the leases should not remain idle if a market was available?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—As far as I know, I have not had any complaints from the Director of Mines about that. If the honourable member will look at the Mining Act, he will see that the amount of labour required to be upon the leases is very small indeed, and the operation of the mining equipment does to a large extent satisfy that requirement. Therefore, as far as I know, there is no ground upon which the Government can take any action against the owners of the lease.

Mr. RICHES—I didn't want it put on that basis.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I understood that. Even if the terms of the leases are not being complied with, the Government in its own right has no power to curtail them under the Mining Act. What actually happens then is that anyone wanting to can file a plaint, pointing out that the leases are not being complied with and he can apply for them himself. That does not apply to the Government. I will find out if I can from the company what its plans are. It has no application before the Government at present. I do not know the terms upon which the agreement was reached, but one of the principals in the dispute did inform me that they had reached agreement. However, I will let the honourable member have the information as soon as possible.

HIRE-PURCHASE INTEREST RATES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (on notice)—Is it the intention of the Government to introduce legislation to set maximum interest rates which may be charged on hire-purchase transactions?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No decision to this effect has been made.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FROME
BY-ELECTION.

Mr. DUNSTAN—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. DUNSTAN—During my absence yesterday and again during today certain reference has been made in this House to the fact that I have been an authorized scrutineer for a candidate in a current by-election to fill a vacancy in this House, and that I am also nominated by this House to sit on a Court of Disputed Returns when that court is called together, if it ever is. It has always been the practice of the law that when any person sits on any judicial or quasi-judicial tribunal, if he has in any way prior to the time of his so sitting been personally involved in any matter that comes before that tribunal for decision, he disqualifies himself. That is what I would do if that position ever arose, as would any judge of the Supreme Court or any magistrate if he had to determine any matter which he had before him and in which he personally had been involved. I may say, Sir, that the despicable and slanderous imputations that I had in any way acted contrary to the etiquette or ethics of my profession—an imputation which, if it were uttered outside this Chamber, I should take action about immediately for slander—I have referred to the Law Society of South Australia for its opinion and advice.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Naracoorte Sewerage System (Modified Scheme).

Police Department Office Building.

Vaughan House Girls Training School (Additional Buildings).

Ordered that reports be printed.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 1879.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—Superannuated employees and widows of former public servants need assistance to get by on their meagre pensions. The policy of setting an operation date for any legislation always creates anomalies. However, if the present Government is not prepared to grant a general increase in pension benefits, some date must be chosen, and December 1 has been selected as the appropriate date. As I understand, one of the amendments in the Superannuation Amendment Act, 1958, was to give widows of pensioners $\frac{4}{7}$ ths of the pension which was payable to a contributor. It was also accepted by the Government that pensioners who retired prior to January 1, 1949, were affected by the stringent years in the 1930's, and were, in many cases, contributing for a small number of units. Therefore, it was agreed to treat these pensioners as special cases and they were granted a unit pension of £1 as against other contributors being given a unit pension of 17s. 6d.

In my opinion, if pensioners of this period were considered to be in dire circumstances by the Government then the position is aggravated should the pensioner die. In cases such as these the widows of these pensioners would receive only one-half of the benefit of their late husbands instead of the $\frac{4}{7}$ ths proportion which was intended. It may be argued that, by operating under the present method, all widows receive a 10s. per unit benefit and therefore it is reasonable, but I say that, if the Government accepted that pensioners who retired prior to January 1, 1949, were entitled to a unit pension of £1 because of special circumstances, then the widows of those pensioners, by the use of the same arguments, should be entitled to $\frac{4}{7}$ ths of this benefit. The same position applies with the Superannuation Act Amendment Bill at present before us because it is mainly a machinery Bill which extends the £1 unit pension benefit to officers who retire prior to December 1, 1960.

I am in agreement with the increase in benefit but I am not in agreement that the increase is sufficient, and I shall have more to say on this at a later stage. I shall also seek permission for an amendment so that widows of pensioners affected by the period January 1, 1949, to December 1, 1960, will be entitled to receive $\frac{4}{7}$ ths of the benefit received by the

contributor. There is considerable dissatisfaction among contributors to the South Australian Superannuation Fund over contributions and benefits. Perhaps the true test of fair treatment is a comparison with other funds provided by the Governments of the other States and the Commonwealth. Contributors to the South Australian fund do not expect fantastic generosity but they do expect to receive treatment that compares favourably with that provided by similar funds for similar workers in this State and in other parts of Australia. Contributors to this fund pay higher contributions for the same amount of pension or get a smaller pension for the same contributions than their counterparts employed by other State Governments and the Commonwealth Government. I will give only one example but others I have examined have revealed a comparable difference. In the Commonwealth Government a contributor at age 20 years next birthday contributes £1 16s. 10d. per annum for a pension of £45 10s. per annum at 65 years of age. A contributor of the same age for the same amount of pension in the South Australian Superannuation Fund would have to contribute £2 8s. per annum. When this matter was raised in 1958, the Treasurer gave one of his usual explanations, which would not hold water, but evidently the Government members were convinced by his wizardry with figures. However, no matter how many figures are quoted, the fact still remains that a contributor to the Commonwealth scheme pays only £1 16s. 10d. whereas a contributor to our State scheme has to pay £2 8s. per annum in order to qualify for the same pension. Recently, the Government Actuary reported on the South Australian Superannuation Scheme and said that additional benefits were not practicable, but he was only reporting on the present state of the fund and the present basis of contribution by the Government. As the contributors in this scheme are paying more than those in other comparable State schemes and the Commonwealth scheme, there is only one nigger in the woodpile who is not playing the game, and that is the present Government.

I am expecting to hear of the large proportion paid by this Government but, in view of the fact that contributors in this State have to pay so much more than comparable contributors in similar schemes and the Government Actuary has reported that the present fund cannot stand increased benefits without increased contributions, I say

that the statements I am expecting to hear from the Treasurer are without foundation. If he does not make these statements, I shall be prepared to apologize, but he is forced to make these statements if he is not prepared to make any additional contribution from the Government to the South Australian Superannuation Fund.

When the matter of the South Australian Superannuation Fund was before the House several weeks ago, I mentioned several anomalies that the Government should look into when it was considering any future amendments to this Act. They were: If a contributor dies and leaves a widow and children, the widow receives $\frac{4}{7}$ ths of the pension for which her husband contributed and 10s. a week for each child under the age of 16 years. In many cases widows have a hard struggle to make ends meet. Orphan children fare badly; they are entitled to receive only £1 a week each until reaching 16 years of age, when they receive the balance of contributions.

In this Bill I see that nothing has been done on these matters. My final point is that there is no provision that the Government is to bear the cost of the additional benefits provided by the present Bill. If the Government recognizes that there are anomalies in superannuation benefits, particularly relating to widows, it has the opportunity now to remedy them. Obviously money values have fallen. I realize that I cannot move an amendment now, but will the Treasurer consider my suggestions?

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens)—I warmly welcome this Bill, as do many of my constituents who are retired public servants and who did not benefit from the 1958 amending legislation. The Bill provides that those persons who have retired since 1949 shall receive an added benefit. Many have expressed appreciation of this provision. The Leader of the Opposition criticized some provisions, but he referred to the general subject of superannuation, which is not within the scope of this Bill. Yesterday the Treasurer said he would be prepared to review the general subject of superannuation before the next session. We are now considering increasing the pensions of those public servants who have retired since 1949 and it is important to consider their present position. In 1955 the unit value was increased from 15s. to 17s. 6d., but when many of these now retired public servants contributed for benefits in 1949 the living wage was £6 1s., whereas in 1955 it was £11 11s. Today it is £13 11s.

These figures emphasize the plight in which many of these people find themselves.

A married couple, both age pensioners, can receive £10 a week and earn an additional income of £7 a week, giving them a total of £17 tax free, whereas the retired public servant has to pay tax, if it is applicable, on his pension. He is, therefore, at a disadvantage compared with other persons in the community. In 1955 the maximum units for which an officer could subscribe was 20, but now it is 36, whereas former public servants could not avail themselves of the opportunity to subscribe for additional units. The salaries paid in the Public Service before 1945 were low when compared proportionately with present salaries and the person who retired in those days has had a cumulative disadvantage.

We should examine the state of the Superannuation Fund to determine whether it is able to meet the increases proposed in this Bill. The average rate of interest earned by the fund in 1954 was £4 3s. 11d. per cent. In 1959 it was £4 17s. 11d. per cent. The increase in the fund last year was £1,066,589, making the total available in the fund £10,774,684. The number of contributors increased by 321 to 13,593. From an interest-earning viewpoint, with the accumulation of funds, the fund can meet these increases. Actuarially this Bill is sound. It will be well received and it is long overdue. It is proposed also to increase the benefits paid to widows and that, too, is warmly welcomed. I look forward next session to discussing on a broader basis the general subject of superannuation.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside)—I rise with pleasure to support this Bill. Many public servants and retired public servants who live in my electorate have communicated with me since the Bill was introduced yesterday and intimated their appreciation of it. The Bill improves the benefits paid to officers who retired after January 1, 1949, and other provisions affect the widows of pensioners. On Tuesday the Government introduced a Bill to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, providing increased benefits to members of Parliament. I believed that many public servants and retired public servants were unhappy at that move and I did not feel particularly happy myself. It was with relief that I heard the introduction of this Bill.

Over a long period the Public Service Association has asked this Government to adjust the benefits from the South Australian Superannuation Fund and although some adjustments have been made from time to time, the older

retired public servant has been at a complete disadvantage because of today's inflated values. Frequently he made great personal sacrifice to provide for his declining years, and often he took out units to the limit allowed him on his salary. I appreciate that under the greatly liberalized means test public servants in certain categories of pension can obtain an age pension or part pension, but the basic idea of subscribing to a superannuation fund is to provide for one's retirement and not to depend on the age pension. I have spoken on this subject previously because I felt that adjustments could be made to bring our State fund into line with the funds of other States.

Although it is true that the Government contribution to the South Australian fund is higher than the contributions of other State Governments, apart from Victoria (which is comparable), the benefits derived from our fund are below those of other States. For instance, in South Australia, to receive a pension of £637 on a salary of £1,000, a contributor has to pay £34 2s. whereas in Victoria he pays £28 12s. 6d.—a difference of £5 9s. 6d. in favour of Victoria. The pension the Victorian public servant receives is £682. or £45 10s. more than the South Australian public servant receives although the South Australian contributes £5 9s. 6d. more. On a salary of £2,000 the South Australian would have to pay £65 6s., which is £17 13s. 3d. more than his Victorian counterpart, but the South Australian receives a pension of £1,228 10s. as compared with the Victorian pension of £1,137 10s., giving the South Australian a £91 advantage. These figures are the same as those I quoted earlier this session, and honourable members can refer to them if they so desire. I was glad to hear the Treasurer say yesterday that the Government would look again at the state of this fund, probably before next session, and that the committee set up last year to report on the fund recommended that revaluations should be made every three years instead of every five years. I think this suggestion would meet with the general approval of members of this fund. When the Government looks at this whole question next year, I am sure it will investigate the matters raised by the Public Service Association on behalf of its members, and I hope that some of these matters can be satisfactorily resolved. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—The Leader made one or two remarks to which I wish to reply briefly. Firstly, I will set out clearly the

position relating to widows, an explanation of the provisions relating to whom was made in 1959. The position is that the unit value of a pension is 17s. 6d. a week, and this still remains the value of a unit. Prior to 1958 widows received a half pension (8s. 9d. a week for each unit). In 1958 special provision was made to raise the pension being paid to contributors who had retired before January 1, 1949, from 17s. 6d. to £1 a unit. At the same time the rate for widows was raised from one-half to four-sevenths of the pension payable to a contributor. This provision regarding widows could, however, apply only in future and accordingly existing widows' pensions were increased by one-seventh, thus bringing them up to 10s. a unit (instead of 8s. 9d. a unit) in all cases. This Bill increases the rate of pensions to contributors who have retired since January 1, 1949, by one-seventh so far as the first 10 units are concerned but, because the provision for raising widows' pensions from one-half to four-sevenths was made in 1958, this Bill by clause 4 merely makes it clear that widows of contributors retiring before January 1, 1949, will continue to receive the ordinary basic rate of 10s. a unit. In other words, this Bill does not make any further provision for widows, because the 1958 Act in its application to widows applied to all cases, both current and future. It is thus unnecessary to provide for increases for widows under this Bill.

As I heard from one of my officers that the Leader wanted some information about this, I readily obtained information so that it would be available to him. I also asked for that information to be carefully checked so that I could state the position fully. When I introduced this Bill I said that it was not intended to amend the Superannuation Act as a whole. It deals with one main question: that of increasing certain pensions. The Government considered these increases were justified because of altered circumstances. If anyone had put his money into an insurance company at the same time as he had put it into the Superannuation Fund, the company would not be altering the policy in the way we are altering this legislation.

I have often heard it said that the general provisions of the Superannuation Fund in South Australia are out of line with the funds in other States but, from the best information I can get, that is not correct. It is easy to quote one phase of a fund and hold it up by comparison with every other fund and say, "The contributors in other States

pay only so much for a unit value of so much," but let me give the facts and the latest figures I can get on this matter. Of the money that has been paid by the Superannuation Fund of the Commonwealth Government to annuitants, 75.8 per cent has been provided by the Commonwealth Government and 24.2 per cent by the contributors; in New South Wales, 71.9 per cent has been provided by the Government and 28.1 per cent by contributors; in Victoria, 77.7 per cent has been provided by the Government and 22.3 per cent by contributors; in Queensland (under the old scheme) 47.5 per cent has been provided by the Government and 52.5 per cent by contributors; and in South Australia, 77.7 per cent has been provided by the Government and 22.3 per cent by contributors. The funds of Western Australia and Tasmania started much later and are somewhat out of line with the other States. In Western Australia the Government provides 88.4 per cent and contributors 11.6 per cent, and in Tasmania the Government provides 83.9 per cent and contributors 16.1 per cent.

I have given these figures so that they will appear in *Hansard* for members to examine. If members study them, they will see that the South Australian Government pays more to the fund than the Governments of Queensland, New South Wales and the Commonwealth, and as much as the Victorian Government. Members can substantiate the South Australian figures by looking at the Auditor-General's report, which shows that the amount payable by the Government was £969,428, that payable by public authorities we allowed to participate in our scheme was £13,337, and that the amount paid by the fund (the amount that comes from contributors) was £290,608. Members will immediately see that 77.7 per cent is being paid by the Government and only 22.3 per cent by contributors.

I thank you, Sir, for your forbearance in permitting me to discuss things outside the Bill, but at times it is said that the South Australian Government is not concerned about the welfare of the members of its Superannuation Fund. However, on this occasion, and on other occasions from time to time, the Government has introduced improvements of its own volition. This Bill was brought in, not as a result of some special petition or deputation but because from time to time an officer of the Treasury examines our fund and other funds to see that we are maintaining a fair thing. This Bill was introduced because

it was found that some cases justified an increase. I thank members for their support and, as the Bill provides an increase in the amount being paid, particularly in the lower pensions, I hope it will be passed this session.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Increases of certain existing pensions."

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—The Opposition does not oppose the increase provided by this clause. I understand that the Government contributes 77.7 per cent of the total cost of this fund. What would be the position if the Government made its contributions over the same number of years as the contributors? A pension is seldom paid to a contributor under the age of 65 years. Many contributors pay in for 35 or 40 years, or even longer, at certain rates in order to receive benefits, yet the Government does not pay anything into that fund until a contributor reaches the age of 65. On reaching that age, a person can receive one pension payment and then die. I hope that when the Treasurer brings down his next report on these matters he will have some information for members on that point.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—What the Leader is saying is beside the point. The original scheme provided that the Government was to pay 50 per cent of the pension and the fund 50 per cent. That was the scheme for many years, but at various times the Government has altered that scheme to provide for the payment of a bigger percentage by the Government and a correspondingly smaller percentage by the contributors. The Government has also at various times provided that contributors may take out additional units, at least some of which could, because of their age, be taken out at concession rates. This was an important concession. Frequently a pensioner has paid in for only a very short time in respect of some of his units. The amount paid out in pensions each year indicates that our scheme is not behind the other States, as is so often claimed. Of all the big States, and of all the schemes that have been going for some time and are therefore established, South Australia and Victoria have the highest ratio; the Commonwealth and New South Wales are lower; and Queensland is appreciably lower. We have to remember that much of the money we are providing here is coming from taxation of people who have no

superannuation scheme whatever, and we have to justify what we are doing because we are handing out other people's money. The Government recognizes that it should provide a liberal scheme for its public officers, and it is doing so. From time to time we overhaul that scheme to ensure that it compares with the Australian standard. I would have thought that the Leader, instead of criticizing this measure and objecting to it, would have been the first to say "Well, we are very pleased to see that the Government is able to give this extra concession."

Mr. FRANK WALSH—That is a glowing contribution by the Treasurer, but from his remarks one would think that we on this side of the House wished to damn the Bill. I have never tried to do so: I am merely concerned with trying to obtain a little more for the people who deserve it. I agree with the Treasurer that the fund when it was first introduced was on a 50-50 basis. However, to quote just one example, a person under the Commonwealth scheme pays £1 16s. 10d. a year for a pension of £45 10s. at the age of 65, whereas a person under the scheme in South Australia pays £2 8s. a year for the same pension. Perhaps the Treasurer could obtain information on whether the 50-50 basis could still work if the Government commenced its contribution at the same time as the contributor, and continued to pay it over the same number of years. I believe that in those circumstances the Government's contributions would not be as high as they are today.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SALARIES ADJUSTMENT (PUBLIC SERVICE AND TEACHERS) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LANDLORD AND TENANT (CONTROL OF RENTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:—

No. 2. After new clause 2a, insert new clause 2b as follows:—

2b. *Amendment of principal Act, s. 42—Restriction on eviction.*—Section 42 of the principal Act is amended by adding the following new subsection:—

(3a) In any legal proceedings taken by a lessor for the recovery by him of any premises to which this Act applies (or of any furniture or other goods leased therewith) on the ground prescribed in subsection (6) (a) of this section the provisions of Part VIII of the Local Courts Act relating to signing judgment and confession of judgment and such other provisions of the said Act as relate to rights, powers, duties and liabilities of parties to a personal action and of the Court and officers thereof, and to procedure so far as they are applicable shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to any such legal proceedings.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1834.)

Amendment agreed to.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2, line 19 (clause 7)—After "members" insert "(one of whom shall, except in relation to representatives of teachers in trade schools, be a woman)".

The Hon. B. PATTINSON (Minister of Education)—I have no objection to this amendment and ask the Committee to accept it. This has come without any notice to me, the Director of Education, anybody associated with the Education Department, or anybody in the House of Assembly. Under the existing law, in 1945 at the request of the Teachers' Institute (then the men's and women's branches of the Teachers Union), Parliament was asked to establish a Teachers Salaries Board, which it did under section 28a of the Education Act Amendment Act, 1945. Section 28b (2) reads:—

The board shall consist of a chairman and four members.

Subsection (3) reads:—

The chairman of the board shall be appointed by the Governor and shall be a Special Magistrate.

Subsection (4) then says:—

Two of the members shall be appointed by the Governor and the other members shall be a male teacher elected by male teachers and a woman teacher elected by women teachers (in manner to be prescribed by regulations).

That has been the law since 1945. It has worked well except that the Teachers Salaries Board has been dealing with the salaries, promotions and transfers of teachers. Recently, there have been many transfers and promotions,

and hundreds of teachers have exercised their right of appeal against provisional appointments and promotions. The work of the Teachers Salaries Board has thus been cluttered up. There have been interminable delays in making decisions on appeal. As a result, the Teachers Institute has been considering the idea of asking for a special appointments board to be set up by the authority of Parliament. For over a year, the principal officers of the institute have been negotiating with the principal officers of the Education Department for the establishment of an appointments board. They made little or no progress during the year or so of negotiation and early this year the president and the past president of the institute waited on me to see if I would give the matter my personal attention. They told me that what they wanted was an early appointment of an appointments board and they indicated the merit of having a clear and defined right of appeal to a body where the interests of the teachers could be both represented and protected. To achieve this objective, they recommended—

That there should be an Appeals Board separate from the Teachers' Salary Board, to hear appeals in connection with the filling of special appointments in the teaching service.

That this proposed Appeals Board consist of five persons, namely, an independent chairman appointed by the Governor in Council, and four members, and that of these four members two should be appointed to represent the Education Department and two should be elected by the teachers.

I called a meeting of the principal officers of the Education Department and of the Teachers Institute to meet me in conference. They consisted of the Director of Education, the Deputy Director, the Superintendent of Technical Schools, the Superintendent of High Schools, the Superintendent of Primary Schools, the Superintendent of Rural Schools and officers of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, including the president (Mr. Golding), the immediate past president (Mr. Davis) and Miss Milne and Miss Pavey (representing the women's branch of the institute). (They are, respectively the president and vice-president.)

We had two lengthy meetings in my office and made much progress. I then suggested that they have a further meeting under the chairmanship of the Director of Education, which they did. All these ladies and gentlemen were present at the next two lengthy meetings, where they made further progress. Finally, there was a fifth and last meeting under my chairmanship, at which all the same ladies and gentlemen were present. I have the detailed

minutes of all five meetings; there was not at any of those meetings any request for separate representation on any proposed board by any man or woman.

Mr. Clark—You would think that if they wanted that they would seek it from the Minister?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—I should have thought so. I called them together at their own request and they were all present at those five meetings which lasted for a total of about 15 to 20 hours.

Mr. Clark—Would they want a man on the board dealing with an appointment of, say, a home science teacher?

The Hon. B. PATTINSON—They are not so much concerned with that as they are concerned that there must be a woman. There is no greater upholder in this Parliament of the rights of women than myself. Women should have the right to occupy all positions of power, authority and prominence and should not be debarred from occupying those positions merely because they are women. On the other hand, I do not subscribe to the principle of the extreme feminist that women should be entitled to occupy all positions of power and authority not by reason of any degree of capacity but merely by reason of the caprice of sex, or merely because of the physical characteristics of sex. That is what this amendment is proposing—not that they should be entitled to it on merit but that they should demand it as of right whether dealing with the problems of women or problems exclusively of male teachers. They do not say that of the two teachers one should be a woman and one should be a man: all they say is that one should be a woman. However, I received a definite and specific recommendation from the Director of Education, from this large assembly of the principal officers of the Education Department and of the Teachers' Institute, including the women, and what they asked me to include in the Bill was that there should be a separate appeals board to deal with appeals of teachers relating to special positions, with the Director of Education reporting the unanimous decision of this series of conferences.

Those present included Misses Milne and Pavey, president and vice-president respectively of the women's branch of the Teachers' Institute, who were present at all five of these meetings. This is the report:—

Recently there have been two meetings between officers of this department and the president and executive of South Australian Institute of Teachers to discuss ways in which

the appointment of teachers, especially appointments to special positions, could be effected more quickly. As a result, a number of proposals have been submitted to you to amend the regulations and the procedure under the regulations, and these have now been approved and are being put into effect.

The meetings also considered possible amendments to the Education Act and, after considerable discussion, it was thought to be desirable to amend section 28t of the Education Act so as to enable appointments to special positions to be made more quickly. These proposals are given in Appendix A herewith. In brief, the five proposals are as follows:—

- (1) That there should be a separate Appeals Board to deal with and determine appeals from teachers nominated to special positions;
- (2) That the Appeals Board should consist of five persons, namely, an independent chairman appointed by the Governor in Council, and four members—two appointed by the Minister to represent the Education Department, and two to be elected by the teachers.
- (3) It was thought that the membership of the Appeals Board, other than the chairman, should change with the branch of the service in which the appointment to be filled is located.

This report and the recommendations of this committee were handed over *in toto* to the Parliamentary Draftsman, who drew up the Bill in accordance with these instructions and in consultation with the Director of Education. I considered the Bill, approved of it and recommended it to Cabinet, which approved of it and gave me the task of introducing it.

All I want to make clear is that this recommendation came after five lengthy meetings involving the most senior executive officers of the Teachers Institute and of the Education Department. This matter was explained to the House by me, then it was explained by the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) who is, of course, a former member of the teaching profession. His views and those of the teaching profession are nearly always synonymous. He supported the legislation, which was passed here with little or no opposition. I have no objection to this amendment and I propose asking the Committee to accept it, but I thought, in fairness to the Education Department and to this Committee, that that explanation should be made. It was with no lack of respect to the sex, for which we have the utmost respect in this Chamber and elsewhere, that they were not specifically included in this particular provision. I have not the faintest idea how it will work out. Had they consulted me I would have told them a way in which they could have been adequately represented at the highest level by a woman

who is not only eminent in the teaching profession, but who is pre-eminent in the affairs of women throughout this State, the whole of Australia and beyond. She would be a permanent member of the board at every meeting, whereas now they will have the selection of a half a dozen women at different times. I have no objection to the amendment and I ask the Committee to accept it.

Mr. CLARK—When I discussed this amendment privately with the Minister I said that I regarded it as silly, but would accept it. However, having listened to the Minister this afternoon, I am convinced that I must oppose it. It is unnecessary. Had we sought to amend this Bill as it has been amended in the Legislative Council, we should have amended section 28zb, which provides for the appointment to the board of two members to represent the Director by the Governor on the recommendation of the Minister and two members to represent teachers, by stipulating that one should be a woman. Perhaps we should have stipulated that one should be a man. I have read the debate that took place in the Legislative Council and advise members to do so. There was a peculiar conflict of opinion on this topic. The amendment makes it obligatory to appoint one woman. There was nothing in the original Bill to prevent the appointment of two women. In respect of some branches of the service it would have been more appropriate to appoint two women, and in other sections it would be better to appoint two men. The Minister has explained how this Bill came about. Teachers welcome it, but the Minister explained that during the course of the amicable discussions he had with persons representing various branches of the profession there was no suggestion of the specific appointment of a woman.

This amendment is a reflection on the women in the Education Department. It presupposes that there are no women of sufficient capability to be appointed to the board in competition with men. If any member doubts the capability of some of our women teachers I need only refer to Miss Vita MacGhey who, for many years, was a valuable member of the Salaries Board. A teacher is a teacher, and it does not matter whether the teacher is a man or a woman. Will it be appropriate for a woman to be a member of the board hearing an appeal regarding the appointment of the head of a boys' technical school, a senior master of a boys' high school or a male physical education instructor? Will it be appropriate for a man to be a member

of the board hearing an appeal concerning the appointment of a domestic science teacher? The Minister made it abundantly clear that he is not happy with this amendment, and I do not blame him. This legislation was framed after consultation and agreement with members of the Teachers' Institute. The original Bill gave the teaching profession the right to elect two members to an appeal board. We should permit them to elect the people they want—a man and woman, two women, or two men. The amendment takes that right from them.

Mr. Quirke—Let's toss it out.

Mr. CLARK—That is exactly what we should do. If there were a great desire for a woman to be specifically appointed as such, rather than having the right to be chosen as a teacher, as the original legislation proposed, it would have been raised with the Minister. The amendment casts an aspersion on women teachers by suggesting that in competition with men they would not be elected to a board. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mrs. STEELE—This amendment was moved in the Legislative Council to bring this legislation into line with another part of the Education Act dealing with the salaries of teachers in places where two teachers were appointed, one of whom was to be a woman. As the Minister of Education has spoken so chivalrously about women, I pay a tribute to him for his support for women in public positions who have the capacity and qualifications necessary for those positions. I support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:—

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Hall, Harding and Heaslip, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Jenkins, King, Laucke, Nankivell, Pattinson (teller) and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Mr. Shannon and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Coreoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, McKee, Quirke, Ralston, Riches, Ryan, Stott, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Millhouse and Nicholson. Noes—Messrs. Lawn and Tapping.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus agreed to.

NATIONAL PLEASURE RESORTS ACT, AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

NATIONAL PARK AND WILD LIFE RESERVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

POLICE OFFENCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:—

No. 1. Page 2, line 21 (clause 3)—Leave out “ten pounds” and insert “for a first offence twenty pounds; for a second or subsequent offence fifty pounds or imprisonment for three months”.

No. 2. Page 2, line 36 (clause 3)—Leave out “ethyl” and insert “methyl”.

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture)—This amendment is to increase the penalty in respect of breaches of this law. It was felt that the penalty should be increased, and the Government does not object to the amendment. I move that it be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 2.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN—This amendment will apparently correct the position, and I move that it be agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

STIRLING DISTRICT COUNCIL BY-LAW: DWELLINGHOUSES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Shannon:

That By-law No. 31 of the District Council of Stirling in respect of the size of dwelling-houses, made on February 17, 1960, and laid on the table of this House on August 9, 1960, be disallowed.

(Continued from October 5. Page 1161.)

Mr. RICHES (Stuart)—I do not intend to exercise a silent vote on this matter, if it is to go to a vote. I ask the House to reject the motion on the same premises as I asked it to reject a similar motion earlier this session. I think a principle is at stake here: our belief or otherwise in the efficacy of local government. Parliament has decided that certain powers can better be exercised by local government. In fact, local government is charged with the responsibility of determining by by-law what is in the best interests of the people. Certain powers are vested in local government, one of which is to control the sizes of buildings erected under the Building Act. Here, the local government body has brought in a

simple by-law setting out that it will be an offence to erect a building of less than 1,000 square feet in area, with a proviso that, should there be any circumstances that merit special consideration, the council will have power to consider them. Surely nobody can quarrel with that. Parliament in the first place has agreed that it is a right and proper responsibility for local government to exercise, a by-law has been drawn to comply with all the requirements of by-laws, and it carries the certificate of the Crown Solicitor that it has been properly drawn and in no way infringes the powers of the council that promulgated it. It stood the examination of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, and there was no adverse report on it. It seems to me that the council has done everything that this House requires of it in the promulgation of the by-law, and there is no reason why it should be disallowed.

All of the circumstances enumerated by the member for Onkaparinga in moving the motion are circumstances which, if they exist at all, can be rightly considered by the council. This is not a rigid by-law, but one that merely sets a standard. All power to the district council concerned for its attempt to set a standard and to reserve to itself the right to consider on its merits any application for a departure from that standard because of circumstances which may exist. There is nothing to prevent the people, for whom the member for Onkaparinga said he had a special concern, from building smaller houses. The only practical effect would be that the council would control the erection of such houses.

Mr. Shannon—It could arbitrarily refuse permission.

Mr. RICHES—Each case would have to be dealt with by the council on its merits.

Mr. Shannon—You are missing the point.

Mr. RICHES—The requirement is that each building shall be at least 1,000 sq. ft. in area, with a proviso that the council can dispense with that provision in special circumstances. If there are abuses the council is answerable to its ratepayers, but there is nothing to indicate that such abuses would take place. I have sufficient confidence in local government to suggest that neither this council nor any other council would abuse that power, which I think is one that we can rightly leave with the local government bodies. I maintain that it would be impracticable to frame any other by-law in this matter. For instance, it would be wrong for any council to frame a

by-law setting an area for a house and saying that that area could not be departed from.

Mr. Shannon—Does the honourable member know of any council with a by-law such as this?

Mr. RICHES—I know of many councils which have by-laws, dealing not only with this subject but with other subjects, with the proviso that seems to be so objectionable to the member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. Shannon—I am referring to by-laws dealing with the limitation of size of houses.

Mr. RICHES—This type of by-law retains to councils the right to dispense with the by-law if special circumstances warrant that dispensation. When the Housing Trust first submitted plans, and when its building programme was first debated in this House, great concern was expressed as to whether the area of these houses would be sufficient. The member for Onkaparinga quoted sizes of single persons' flats and married couples' flats, but I consider that that does not affect this proposal in any way. If a case can be established for the erection of houses of a size less than that stipulated, this by-law does not prevent such erection, because the decision rests with the council. That is the only principle I can see in the matter. We have said to local government bodies: "This is a power you can exercise; this is a responsibility that is yours." This particular council has done everything Parliament has asked it to do; it has complied with the requirements in every respect, and there are no grounds for summarily throwing out the by-law. I ask this House to demonstrate its faith in local government and to reject the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham)—I find myself in a rather unusual position on this question. This by-law, of course, as are all other by-laws laid on the table of this House, was placed before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation for consideration. At that time the members of that committee, after considering the by-law, considered that there was no case for the recommendation of its disallowance. I am bound to say, however, that at that time we did not have—and I regret it—the full benefit of the views expressed by the member for Onkaparinga in this House in moving the motion.

Mr. Clark—Anyway, you did not have to vote on it when it was before the committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—Had we had the benefit of the member for Onkaparinga's full views (which he merely expressed tersely and

informally to the members of the committee), it may be that we would have had very grave second thoughts about the wisdom of a recommendation or otherwise in this case.

Mr. Riches—On what grounds?

Mr. MILLHOUSE—On the grounds which the member for Onkaparinga put forward in his speech in this House. I was not present when the honourable member moved this motion, but in the considerable time that has elapsed since then I have had an opportunity to look at what he said. I must say that some of the arguments he brought forward are clearly impressive in favour of the disallowance of this by-law. There is one matter which as a private individual I do not like, but I am bound to point out to the House that it has in the past endorsed this principle. I refer to the discretionary clause—the power of the council to dispense with the observance of a by-law. I do not like that.

Mr. Riches—That shows a complete lack of confidence in local government.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—No, it does not. We do not allow such discretion in legislation in this Parliament; such a thing is most exceptional and, indeed, it is objectionable in our legislation.

Mr. Riches—You give discretionary power to Ministers over and over again.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—I cannot think of any occasion on which it has been done.

Mr. Riches—Only yesterday you gave the Minister power to fix a minimum rating.

Mr. MILLHOUSE—We do it over and over again by by-law and the House has, in fact, endorsed that principle on previous occasions. Speaking as a private individual, and not as chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I say that as a general rule I do not like that principle. The member for Onkaparinga has placed before the House information which was not available to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation because he did not present it there—although I must say he had the opportunity to do so if he wanted to—and unless he now says something to change my mind (and he is unlikely to) my present inclination is to support the motion for disallowance.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I am a little confused about this matter, because we find ourselves in rather a peculiar position. This is a by-law that was brought down by a district council and one which, of course, had to go through the ordinary channels of the Crown Law Department and the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation. As I

understand it, the committee has found the by-law in order and has agreed to it, yet now we have the extraordinary spectacle of the member for Onkaparinga moving a motion which seeks to over-ride the decision of a committee of both Houses in that it seeks the approval of Parliament to throw out a by-law that has gone through all those channels. Of course, the member for Onkaparinga is within his rights in moving for the disallowance of a by-law. Many years ago, before this Joint Committee was set up, we had a spate of motions for the disallowance of district council by-laws, and in order to save time Parliament in its wisdom set up this committee to examine by-laws of this character, and to advise members of Parliament whether they should be disallowed or not. In the whole of my 28 years in Parliament I have never seen so many motions from the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation to disallow by-laws as I have seen during the past two years, and that proves to me that the committee has done its job thoroughly. It is doing a good job, but it did not, as a committee, recommend the disallowance of this particular by-law. That seems an extraordinary thing. Is this motion of the honourable member for Onkaparinga a vote of no-confidence in the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation?

Mr. Millhouse—The member for Onkaparinga did not come forward to give evidence.

Mr. STOTT—The chairman of that committee now has an opinion which is different from the opinion expressed by the committee. This by-law was approved by the committee, yet the honourable member is now asking us to do something that the committee will not do.

Mr. Quirke—And without even considering it again.

Mr. STOTT—Yes. I have closely examined the by-law and I admit that the member for Onkaparinga has brought up one or two points that should be considered. At the same time, I find myself on the side of the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches). The district council went into this matter very carefully, and the rate-payers of that council had ample opportunity to approach their representatives in the matter. No action was taken, and no evidence was tendered by the ratepayers before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, yet we are being asked at this hour to carry this motion. I am not prepared at this juncture to agree to the motion.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—I am a great advocate of the rights and privileges of local government but, apart from that altogether,

today we have in the House this position: that this proposed by-law went before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, which approved of it and found nothing wrong with it. But the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) has found something wrong. He never approached—

Mr. Shannon—Oh!

Mr. QUIRKE—Wait a minute! He never gave evidence before the committee.

Mr. Shannon—The honourable member should take care!

Mr. QUIRKE—Did you give official evidence before that committee?

Mr. Shannon—I was not invited.

Mr. QUIRKE—That is exactly my point. This is an instance where the chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee took evidence and the whole of his committee saw no objection to the by-law. Now the chairman of that committee says that, because of something that the member for Onkaparinga has said, he (the chairman) has changed his mind. In that case, is not the right thing to do to refer this back to the Subordinate Legislation Committee and let that committee deal with it? I am not concerned so much about what the honourable member for Onkaparinga has to say—he may be right in his attitude towards the by-law—but this is a dangerous way to handle subordinate legislation.

Mr. Riches—The by-law could be amended.

Mr. QUIRKE—Yes; the council could be given an opportunity to speak. But can it go back to the Subordinate Legislation Committee?

Mr. Millhouse—I do not think it can.

Mr. QUIRKE—Are you sure?

Mr. Millhouse—No.

Mr. QUIRKE—Then there is another thing about which we are in doubt; there are doubts everywhere. The member for Onkaparinga may be right in his objection to this, but I am going to vote against disallowance on the ground that I do not think that this matter has been properly handled. In fact, the way it has been handled is shocking. If this sort of thing is to happen, we may as well get rid of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I like to see these things done properly. I am disappointed that the member for Mitcham, as chairman of the committee, has adopted this course, but what about the members of his committee, some of whom are in another place? What say have they in it?

This thing has got more points than a porcupine. Occasionally, when they are all

lying flat, one sticks up and that is when you prick your finger. That is what the member for Mitcham has done this time. That is the only reason why I propose to vote against the disallowance of this by-law—not on the merits of what the member for Onkaparinga said. He jumped into the breach and said he had not given evidence before the committee because he was not invited. I did not, either, because I was not invited, and every other member of the House did not. That sort of thing is just nonsense and makes a burlesque of the proceedings. The committee always invites the member for the district to give evidence.

Mr. Shannon—The more you say on this, the deeper you are getting into the mire. I am just waiting my turn.

Mr. QUIRKE—I have no doubt the honourable member is waiting. He is often amusing and we shall be amused by him again today. But what he has said is not my reason for opposing this disallowance: it is because of the attitude of the member for Mitcham. I stand by that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—A rather interesting picture arose in the speech of the honourable member who just resumed his seat. I think there are one or two principles of Parliamentary government that should be restated in this House. The first is that a member elected for his district is not responsible to any committee: he is responsible to his electorate, and to his electorate only. If something comes up in my district (perhaps a by-law) that I think is wrong, I shall not go to a committee to place a case before it; I shall move in this House that that by-law be disallowed. That is my constitutional right. To say that an honourable member must substantiate his position before a committee is, I venture to suggest, not the proper constitutional course at all. A member is responsible to his electorate and to no-one else. Honourable members opposite will appreciate that, if a member places his responsibility before a committee and lets that committee decide what his political vote shall be in the House, that is doing away with the very purpose of this Chamber.

Mr. Riches—The honourable member said, "Abolish the committee."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—No. The purpose of the committee is to investigate these matters and report to Parliament on them. Many matters that come before the committee would not peculiarly affect one district but would have a bearing over the whole State. I am proud to say that the establishment

of the committee was moved by myself when I was a back-bencher. I believe it has been in the best interests of subordinate legislation in this State, because it means that matters agreed upon from day to day in the ordinary way have to be submitted to that committee for scrutiny. The committee may not see anything wrong or may make no recommendation for disallowance but, having done that, it has complied with its duties; but that does not alter the fact that every member has a duty of his own, irrespective of the committee, to decide whether regulations should be allowed or disallowed.

The second point is also one of great constitutional importance. The honourable member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) criticizes the honourable member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) because the member for Mitcham, who was the chairman of the committee that did not recommend that the by-law be disallowed, now proposes to disallow it. I point out that the fact that members are appointed to a committee does not tie their hands in any subsequent vote in this House, and never has. At one time I remember that half the members of the Public Works Committee who had reported upon a work got up in the House and proceeded to recommend that the House take a completely different view in respect of it. The fact that a member is a member of a committee does not in any way tie his hands in exercising his vote in this House. I am not proposing to discuss the by-law but, if we want to preserve the good government of the State and of this Parliament, we must remember that a member is always responsible himself for voting for the disallowance of a regulation if he feels like it. That has happened many times.

The Subordinate Legislation Committee does a good job, but many points of view may escape its notice. There may be interests of which it has no knowledge that will come up and frequently make it necessary for it to disallow a whole parcel of regulations. Once, 47 regulations were passed by this House but they were challenged in the Supreme Court, which ruled them all unconstitutional. After they had run the gamut of an investigation by the committee and by the House, the fact still remained that, when they came before the Supreme Court, it said that they were all wrong in law and should be withdrawn. The Executive Council did withdraw those regulations as a consequence of the Supreme Court decision. An honourable member surely is not to be tied willy-nilly to the recommendations

of a committee. If that happens, then his rights are abrogated in this House. Any member of a committee having served on a committee is surely still entitled to exercise his discretion in any subsequent proceeding where he feels justified in so doing.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga)—I am amazed that merit in argument cuts no ice in this Chamber. I have never seen the honourable member for Burra act like this before. I hope he will not disregard merit entirely and vote against this just because the member for Mitcham has changed his views. That is, in effect, what the member for Burra said had happened. It now looks as though we are not going to argue the merits of the matter before us but are going to use personal grudges or reactions to decide which way we shall vote. A deliberative Chamber would not get very far if it adopted this as its basic principle, and I do not think the member for Burra believes that, either.

[*Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.*]

Mr. SHANNON—Prior to the dinner adjournment I was going to speak of the powers the Stirling District Council enjoys as a result of its declaring the whole of its area a township area. They are so wide that the proposed by-law is redundant. The council has better powers under the Building Act, which applies to the whole of the area. The Building Act is of general application and applies throughout all areas that have been declared council areas. That is an aspect the Subordinate Legislation Committee may have considered had I appeared before it, as I was invited, to tender evidence. However, other duties denied me that opportunity. Instead, I tendered a written submission which I thought would be adequate to draw the committee's attention to the unnecessary imposition of this by-law upon the unfortunate purchasers of property in my area who do not wish to build to the minimum area prescribed. The Adelaide hills is an ideal area to retire to, and the fact that as much as £2,000 is paid for a block of land is adequate proof of that. The weather is much cooler in the summer, and in the winter it is not much colder than the city area.

The council has attempted to ensure that all houses in its area shall be of a solid construction. I favour that policy, but this by-law is a super-imposition on the powers the council already has. It has the necessary power to control the type of house to be built in what may be regarded as a most desirable area. I

have received a letter from a well-known land agent, who writes:—

It would appear to me that a small house suitable for, say, a couple, such as a husband and wife, perhaps pensioners, need not consist of more than five or six squares. For such people a 10-square home would be a needless expense, being probably more than could be afforded.

He realizes that many people who buy blocks of land in the hills do not want a big house. The size of a house has little to do with its quality or architectural beauty. Nowadays architects can design small houses that are extremely attractive. I do not think that a person who paid £2,000 for a block of land would erect a house costing only £2,000 on it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson—Little houses are the prettiest, aren't they?

Mr. SHANNON—It is often said that good things are packed in small parcels, and my wife is a little thing, but I do not think she suffers because of her stature. The same applies in other fields. A small house can be comfortable and no detriment to the locality in which it is built. The member for Stuart stands for local government; right or wrong, it is sacrosanct. However, central government, which he and I and other members represent, is not sacrosanct. Why should we grant immunity? In the field of government, whether local or central, there must be a power of revision and the right to criticize—and that is all I am seeking. That is a right inherent in democracy. If I quoted the Building Act I would be suggesting that the honourable member did not know his business, and by virtue of his office he should know the powers conferred by that Act on local government. I know the powers: I have looked at them, and it is my duty to do so.

Mr. Stott—Do you suggest that the Stirling council did not know them?

Mr. SHANNON—I suggest that the Stirling council did not know. This will go on record, and the member for Ridley will be able to come into my district and address a public meeting and say that I said that—and he would be right. I have not said this without some consideration, and I have not acted without first consulting the district council. The honourable member may be surprised that I would have the courage to talk to people who propounded the regulation. The new district clerk, who has not been in office very long, is an excellent officer.

Mr. Stott—You called them out.

Mr. SHANNON—I did not. I drew attention to their powers, which are very wide.

Mr. Paech immediately said, "If my council knew that it had this power, it would not have made this by-law." The member for Gawler said that I could have submitted my opinions to the Subordinate Legislation Committee but that I did not do so. The member for Mitcham, who is chairman of that committee, invited me to appear but, as it was on a day when the Public Works Committee was sitting, and as chairman I had to be present, I did not appear before his committee. However, I had the courtesy to tell the member for Mitcham what I proposed to do. The member for Mitcham has been taken to task. What a strange thing that he should be taken to task for changing his mind in the light of evidence produced to him! Is this a deliberative Chamber or a place where we just talk for the sake of talking?

This afternoon the member for Ridley and the member for Burra spoke for the sake of talking, and to take to task the member for Mitcham because he was amenable to reason appears to me to be an improper approach in a democratic institution, which is what we say this Parliament is. Although I do not want to influence members opposite, I hope they will vote against me! The member for Stuart is such a strong supporter of local government that, right or wrong, he will support it. I wish he would have the same approach to central government. I am sure those who have had the opportunity to consider the rights or wrongs of this matter will support me in this motion.

Motion carried.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

In Committee.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1836.)

Clause 3—"Land transactions."

Mr. RICHES—Following on this week's happenings, we are confirmed in our convictions about this clause. Recent happenings are no more palatable to the people of Australia than this clause is to this House. In diagnosing the economic problems of Australia, the Commonwealth Treasurer pinpointed the unprecedented rise in land prices as one of the evils with which this country has to deal. He certainly mentioned that in association with other trends, and most of the other matters he dealt with in one way or another, but how he intends to correct the situation in other matters I do not know. However, there was nothing discernible to me in his speech designed to correct the evil caused by the boom in land

prices. I take it that that is because the Commonwealth Government does not have the constitutional power to deal with this matter, which is a matter for the States.

The Minister has, by proclamation, deferred the operation of these sections, but the power is there and can be invoked by proclamation if expedient. We have listened with a great deal of interest to the Premier's explanation of why, after summarily rejecting a similar suggestion last year and even refusing the House an opportunity to discuss it, and after introducing a Bill to re-enact these very provisions a few weeks ago, he has completely changed his mind and has exercised the prerogative that the member for Onkaparinga would have us regard as a virtue. Without any altered circumstances, he is prepared to accept this Bill, which is a complete reversal of everything he said 12 months ago and of the attitude he adopted when he introduced a Bill to re-enact the principal Act earlier this session. I find it difficult to go through the physical jerks in completing all these political somersaults which not only the Premier but all those seated behind him seem to be able to accomplish without much difficulty. I maintain that the power contained in these sections is very valuable, and that it is important that the Government should have it. The importance is pinpointed by the remarks of the Commonwealth Treasurer; and everyone knows that what he has said regarding land prices is true.

Only this evening I listened to an eminent speaker who claimed to be speaking with some authority. I refer to the Premier, and I am wondering whether another somersault has been turned since he addressed himself to this debate. On a television programme this evening he drew attention to the fact that land values in South Australia had doubled in recent years. He said that the land values created by the boom in land was creating concern and consternation, particularly in rural areas, so much so that he forecast legislation next year to reduce the incidence of land tax. It cannot be denied that there is already a situation that needs control, and the fact that the Government seems to be content to sit back and allow these prices to boom; to content itself, by dealing with its immediate supporters in rural areas by a reduction in land tax, to allow the speculators to still get their rake-off; and to allow the price to rise in the settled areas to the advantage of those who are investing in land, subdividing land and forcing prices to the limit, surely indicates that this matter will have to

be seriously considered by Parliament next session.

I suggest to the House that it could well be that next session this matter of the increase in land prices (to quote the Premier) will have to be seriously considered by this Parliament. This very power that is sought to be taken away may be a power that the House will sorely need, and once it has been taken away it will not be very easily regained. Of course, that is the very reason for the present move. There is no emergency that would lead to the introduction of this legislation except the knowledge that these trends I have referred to are evident, and that at any time a situation may arise where the Government will be forced to take action. No action has been taken for 11 years because, by proclamation, the operation of that part of the Act has been suspended, and there is no reason in the world why that position should not be allowed to continue. However, there is apparently a fear somewhere that the power will have to be invoked and that there will be a need to exercise it, and the member for Mitcham and his supporters are getting in early with the idea of seeing that the Government will not be able to exercise that power in the certain knowledge that another place will see to it, once this power is removed from the Statute Book, that it is never placed there again. This clause has nothing to commend it, and I urge the Committee to vote it out.

Mr. BYWATERS—This clause seeks to delete sections that have been in the Act for many years, and that is very important. In the past the Government has felt that it is necessary to retain these sections. I join with other Opposition members who have expressed themselves in this matter. Last session the member for Mitcham had the same thoughts in his mind as he has this session, but his was the only thought along those lines at that stage. Surely, there has been no reason for others to change their minds in that time, and I am surprised that the Premier has changed his mind. It is evident that what the Premier says on these occasions affects the minds of all Government members. When a Bill was introduced recently to extend the operation of the Act for another 12 months, no mention was made of an amendment such as this. Very little was said in the debate. In fact, the member for Stirling (Mr. Jenkins) was the only member who spoke on the Bill, and I commend him for his speech on that occasion. He made an impassioned plea for this Act to remain for another year, pointing out the

dangers that could occur if this Act were allowed to lapse. He drew our attention to what had happened in another country, and warned that it was necessary for us to agree to the extension of this Act for another year.

I feel sure that the member for Stirling in that time would not wish to change his mind. Last year the member for Mitcham, when he brought this matter forward, knew that he would not have the opportunity to debate it because he knew that he would be refused an instruction. It has been the Government's attitude to refuse instructions; in fact, the Premier has refused instructions on many occasions when members on both sides of the House have endeavoured to move for them. The member for Mitcham knew that, and that he would not have the opportunity to debate the matter, so he flouted Standing Orders to get it before the House. On no fewer than five occasions the Premier took points of order and tried to get the Speaker to say that the member for Mitcham was debating something he had no right to debate at that stage. The Premier did not want the member for Mitcham to put his case before the House on that occasion. Regardless of that, the member for Mitcham went on his way merrily, and put before the House just what he had in mind, as he has done on this occasion.

I cannot see the reason for the change in attitude. Surely the price of land has not dropped in that time, and if anything the need is more urgent today. The member for Stuart has drawn our attention to the rising land prices. The member for Mitcham, in the course of the debate, said that he was afraid that if a Socialist Government got into power it would implement these very sections which, although they have been suspended, the Government has the right by proclamation to implement. I can appreciate the concern of the honourable member, because he knows full well that the stocks of the Liberal and Country Party Government are going down rapidly throughout Australia. If there is a need for this power to be brought in by proclamation, it is necessary to have the legislation on the Statute Book, regardless of who is in power. If these sections are left in the Act they will have a retarding effect on people who are exploiting others today. This legislation should remain as a safeguard for the people of Australia. I oppose the clause.

Mr. RICHES—We have made far too much progress with this Bill, and I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EARLY CLOSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

DEATH OF MR. M. R. O'HALLORAN.

The SPEAKER—I have to inform the House that I conveyed its resolution passed on September 22, 1960, to Mrs. M. O'Halloran, widow of the late Leader of the Opposition. By letter I have received this afternoon Mrs. O'Halloran wishes to express her deep appreciation for the very kind and comforting expressions of sympathy.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

KIDNAPPING BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendment:—

Page 1, line 6 (clause 2).—Leave out "other purpose whatsoever" and insert "similar purpose".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer)—This amendment strives to do what the member for Norwood attempted to do in this House, but in a slightly different way. If, for instance, there were a dispute between two parents over the custody of a child and the court gave custody to the father, the words "other purpose whatsoever" could apply to the mother if she removed that child from the father's custody. She would be liable to be charged with kidnapping. No member would claim that that was a real attempt to kidnap. The substitution of the words "similar purpose" overcomes the problem of a person who may act

innocently, and I move that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. DUNSTAN—The amendment made in the Upper House does what I attempted to do in this House. While I was attending to urgent duties in my district last week I was interested to hear that the Premier had said that, because I proposed to put in the words "and without a *bona fide* claim to custody", they restricted rather than enlarged the exceptions under the clause. He said, in effect, that the person had to do whatever he did unlawfully, and if he also did it without a *bona fide* claim to custody, whether lawfully or not, then he was caught by the clause. It was not a restriction at all and I submitted my amendment to learned counsel for advice and I received the following letter:—

Dear Sir,

You have requested my opinion on two questions.

1. Whether section 2 of the Bill for the "Kidnapping Act, 1960," renders liable to prosecution any person who in the exercise of any *bona fide* claim to the right to possession of any child, obtains possession of any child or takes such child out of the possession of any person having the lawful charge thereof.
2. Whether section 2 of the Bill should contain a safeguard to the like effect of subsection 2 of section 80 of the "Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1956."

The answer to both questions, in my opinion, is in the affirmative.

Yours truly,

J. W. Nelligan.

I am happy that right has prevailed and that children, who otherwise could not have had their cases properly investigated by the court to see where custody should properly lie, will still have the protection of the court as *parens patriae* in this country, and that people who are attempting to see that children are properly cared for are not going to be liable to imprisonment for life and a whipping because of their proper concern. I support the amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

PROROGATION SPEECHES.

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, December 20.

May I, on behalf of my colleagues of the Cabinet, thank members of both sides for the assistance and attention they have given this session. This year we have considered a heavy legislative programme. I doubt whether any Bill has been attacked on either the second or

third reading, although there have been discussions and arguments over features of it. I thank members for their courtesy during consideration of one of the heaviest legislative programmes that has been before the House for many years.

During the course of the session we suffered the sad loss of our friend and colleague, Mr. O'Halloran, the Leader of the Opposition. I realize how difficult it is for a new Leader to take over, particularly towards the end of a session when a large volume of legislation is coming in. I congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition on the way he took hold and for the assistance he gave under those circumstances. We are not always going to agree with him—I am sure of that. Probably, he will not always agree with the measures introduced by the Government, but I can assure him and honourable members that it will always be the Government's desire to see that honourable members opposite have placed before them the fullest possible information to enable the facts of various pieces of legislation to be known fully before debate upon them. I also assure the Leader that any matters he brings forward on behalf of his Party or himself will always receive consideration.

May I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the way you have conducted the sittings of the House. We have learned over a period of years that you will always give an impartial decision, backed by an intimate knowledge of Standing Orders. Every member of this House has the greatest respect for you, Sir, as our Speaker. I should like to thank you on behalf of the House for your conduct of the business of the House. I doubt whether there is a Parliament in Australia, or in fact in any part of the world, that gets along with so little bickering as ours does. That is largely because you, Sir, while you let honourable members express themselves freely, nevertheless see to it that the rules are reasonably applied and that each honourable member's rights and privileges are properly safeguarded.

The Chairman of Committees has an onerous task involving the consideration of all the lines of Supply and Bills in Committee. I should like to thank the member for Unley, Mr. Dunnage, for the way in which he conducts the business of the House from the Chair and upon the businesslike way in which he sees that the Committee deals with the amendments that come before it. I express to Mr. Dunnage the compliments of the House on the high order of chairmanship in Committee.

Our friend, Sir Edgar Bean, has retired and we have a new Parliamentary Draftsman and Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman. Every honourable member will agree with me when I say that the tradition that Sir Edgar Bean and Mr. Cartledge established in the drafting of Bills and amendments has been continued by Dr. Wynes and his assistant. I should like to thank those two gentlemen for the way in which they have prepared the work for this House, for their readiness to assist honourable members, and for the excellent explanations they prepare on second readings.

The Clerks of the House know the Standing Orders and are prepared to advise us and see that the work of the House goes forward smoothly. I doubt whether there is any Parliament in Australia with a more competent staff at the table than ours. They are courteous and helpful at all times. I wish to give to the two officers at the table my personal thanks for the many occasions when I have been trying to do something and have not been able to think of the appropriate Standing Order and they have helped me to decide on the best way to circumvent any difficulties. We have, associated with this House, a loyal and competent staff in all the services. When I see some of the speeches I have made reported in *Hansard*, and remember the disjointed statements I have made, I realize that in *Hansard* we have not an ordinary class of reporting officers but specialists of the highest order.

Mr. Frank Walsh—That would be an understatement.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD—I thank them, the librarians, and the catering staff, and I thank the messengers for the way they have kept our files up to date. Indeed, I think that we have in this Parliament a staff of which any Parliament would be proud. As we are getting towards the end of the year, I should like to thank all members and my colleagues in Cabinet for their assistance and to extend to all the compliments of the forthcoming season. I hope that the Christmas period will be a happy one and that you will all enjoy the best of health and good luck in the New Year.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition)—I second the motion. When we have anything of importance that we think the Premier should know about, we shall certainly inform him and, if there is anything we think he should know about, we will tell him at the appropriate time when we desire to discuss it. Whilst it is true that much legislation has been dealt with during this session, I

believe that members of my Party have been responsible for the introduction of important legislation: I thank the Premier for his comments about the late Leader. I have followed on from where he left off, and I can assure members that the work has been heavy. However, I have had every assistance from my colleagues and, in addition, I must not forget Mr. Lloyd Hourigan, my efficient secretary.

The members of the Opposition congratulate you, Sir. Although we may have agreed to disagree with you on a couple of occasions, we have accepted your rulings. We join the Premier in his remarks about the Clerk, the Clerk-Assistant, the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant. We have a very good *Hansard* Staff. In fact, they have been so good that I have not had to look at what I have said this session. The messenger staff does a yeoman service, and Mr. Gordon Ellis has done a tremendous job since he was appointed Chamber messenger. I know all members will agree that the catering staff, led by Miss Jean Bottomley, has done a remarkable job. I know she worries a lot, but that has not affected the service she has provided.

I now sound a note of warning. Although the Premier has never had the experience of being Leader of the Opposition and realizing certain difficulties, between now and the time when we next resume I hope he will acquire a section of land and submit a reference to the Public Works Committee to have a new Government Printing Department established. Assisted by my colleagues, I have had to accept the responsibility of talking on second reading without having received Bills, and that is not fair. We need an improvement in that department, and the only way that that can be brought about is to have a new Printing Department so that the Government Printer can do his work and engage the necessary labour.

The Premier wished us the compliments of the season on this occasion, as we will celebrate Christmas before reassembling. I hope we will be able to prevail on someone in a high position in this Chamber to provide some geese, as I understand there are many geese in a hills area that would do justice to any table in the metropolitan area. I join with the Premier in his felicitations towards the staff, you, Sir, and all members.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra)—After 20 years in this House, this is the first time I have risen on such an occasion. I do so only because I wish to make a few remarks before I reach an age of service that will entitle me to

vote! I join with the Premier and Leader of the Opposition in thanking all of those who have given service in this House, and I thank all members for the courtesy and assistance they have given me. However, my principal reason for rising is to pay a tribute to someone who has given unremitting service here and is now to retire. I refer to Mr. Harrison, the Centre Hall Messenger, the old soldier who never failed in his duties and who never failed to give unremitting service and unfailing courtesy. He is one of those few people one meets in a lifetime whom it is a pleasure and honour to know. I rose to pay that special tribute to him, because tonight is the last occasion when he will be in this House on a sitting day. I know all honourable members will join with me in that tribute to our faithful friend.

To the *Hansard* staff and to others who have assisted me and to whom I may have been troublesome, I offer my thanks and my apologies for the trouble I may have caused them. If I have given them trouble I wish to recompense them for it now. I join with all other members in wishing all of us everything that we could wish for, all the pleasures and blessings and those things that we value so much in a country such as we have in this Australia of ours. I extend the best wishes for the festive season, which means so much to us but which in these materialistic days perhaps goes without the recognition it deserves.

Mr. STOTT (Ridley)—I endorse the statements made by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the member for Burra. This has been rather a peculiar session, for it has been intermingled with joy, hard work, and sorrow. First we experienced joy because of the excellent season that we had, and the improvement the State made right through the season. The early part of this session involved much hard work. The sadness was in losing one of our most valued colleagues, the late distinguished Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran), and we also just recently lost a former Cabinet Minister, who played such an important part in this House for so many years.

We in this House are fortunate in having the staff we have. I am glad the member for Burra saw fit to specially mention Mr. Harrison, the messenger, who is now retiring. We have had some excellent messengers in the past, and I recall that the one before Mr. Harrison had a jolly personality and always

had a few anecdotes about the Navy which were enjoyable. I think Bill Harrison will be sorry to leave Parliament House: he will miss the members, and we will miss him. The person who will be fortunate enough to fill his place will have a hard task, as he will have a high standard to emulate.

The Clerks of the House have done excellent work over many long hours of tedious tasks. The abnormally large number of Bills brought down this session has resulted in a tremendous amount of clerical work in order to keep the House records up-to-date. To them I offer special thanks for the work they have done. You, Mr. Speaker, have had rather a varied session. Your rulings have been challenged, but I think that is a good thing in a Parliament because it keeps all members on their toes. Although I have had occasion to disagree with your ruling, it does not alter the fact that I still respect the opinion you express in your capacity as Speaker of this House.

I agree with the Leader that the *Hansard* staff and the Government Printer's staff are working under great difficulties, for I am sure the delay in printing the *Hansard* pulls is due to these handicaps. I remember that in my early days in the House (the 1933-1938 Parliament) it was most unusual if we did not have the full *Hansard* pulls of the previous day's proceedings before us when the House met. I think the Government could examine the matter to see if an improvement could be effected in this regard so as to expedite the printing of the pulls. It is often important for members to have before them a record of what was said in debate the previous day.

The staff have had long hours and have done a magnificent job. I think they must like the job as all the members are beginning to know them, particularly those on the catering side, because they stay so long. We have had long records of service of caretakers and others on the catering side of this Parliament over many years. It seems that once they become established they stay a long time, and I think that speaks volumes for the Joint House Committee and the Parliament generally. These people must be satisfied, otherwise they would not stay; we like them, and I think they like us. I pay a tribute to them for the important part they have played in making the social functions in this Parliament a success. We have had the privilege, honour and joy of meeting one another's wives and daughters in the social atmosphere which is important in a Parliament such as this.

I thank the Ministers of the Crown for their co-operation. Although at times they may not have done everything I wanted them to do, they have co-operated splendidly. I do not claim they have given 100 per cent satisfaction, because I think they are beginning to learn the art of saying a diplomatic and polite "no". I reciprocate the good wishes that have been expressed by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for the festive season, and wish every member a jolly time during that season. I hope that next session we will come back after the vacation watching the trends of the economic atmosphere that it is inevitable we will have to face. Not being one who possesses a crystal ball, and not being fortunate enough to be able to forecast what will happen in the future, I confess that I have much anxious thought that in the next session we shall have to face many economic problems which will be accentuated as time goes on. I hope we will have another good season next year, and that we will again have the joy we experienced this season. I also hope that we will again have the hard work we have had this session, because most of us enjoy hard work. I wish everyone a happy festive season, and I trust we will all live long enough to see some important legislation to benefit the State in 1961.

The SPEAKER—I acknowledge, with gratitude, the sentiments expressed by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the members for Burra and Ridley. May I take this opportunity of congratulating the Leader of the Opposition on the celerity with which he acclimatized himself to his important, onerous and responsible role of leading Her Majesty's Opposition in this Chamber. The work that both the Chairman of Committees and I, as Speaker, have been able to do has been made less onerous by the co-operation we have received from the leaders of the respective Parties in this House, from the Whips and, indeed, from all members. It is to their credit that, through the high standard of conduct they have exhibited, the decorum and dignity of our Parliamentary institution has been maintained during the year, as it has been for many years past. It is recognized that our Parliament stands high among the Parliaments of Australia as far as the maintenance of dignity and decorum is concerned.

Although on occasion some harsh words have been spoken by members in the cut and thrust of debate, nevertheless they have been able to leave this Chamber and meet again as friends.

It is good that members can be in the fight in this Chamber but leave it afterwards as friends. The Chairman of Committees has rendered me extreme favours on occasions by taking the Chair and I thank him for the service he has rendered to me. I express my personal appreciation to the Clerks at the table for the work they have done in the interests of members and particularly for the assistance they have given the Chairman of Committees and me. At times we lean heavily on them and we naturally appreciate the assistance they are able to give us.

Members have referred to the Parliamentary Draftsman and his assistant. Members will agree that in the past year their work has been particularly heavy and onerous. A reference to members' files indicates that over 90 matters have been dealt with—Bills in the main. That illustrates clearly that they have both had considerable work to do this session. Previous speakers have referred to the excellent services rendered by the library staff, *Hansard*, messengers, and catering staff. I should like to include the typistes and telephonistes. An innovation was made during the current year: two typistes were appointed to assist members. I understand that members greatly appreciate the extra help that has been made available to them. I can say without fear of contradiction that both typistes appointed to the staff have rendered excellent service, which has been appreciated by all members.

Miss Roach, who has been on the staff for several decades, will be retiring next year in, I think, September. I should like it placed on record that her services over many years in the interests of this institution have been much appreciated, as have those of the messenger, Mr. Harrison, who will be retiring in April next. Members are no doubt aware that Mr. Harrison's son is a messenger and is also giving excellent service. I think I would be voicing the opinion of all members when I say that all members of the staff have, in the conscientious discharge of their respective duties, contributed in no small measure to the smooth functioning of the Parliament.

I hope that those members who are absent through sickness may be restored to health rapidly and be with us when we meet in the new year. Finally, I reciprocate the wishes extended by the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, and the members for Ridley and Burra for a blessed Christmas and a happy and prosperous new year.

Motion carried.

PROROGATION.

At 9.03 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 20, at 2 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of the National Anthem.