HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, October 25, 1961.

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

PETITION: PENSIONERS' RATES.

Mr. QUIRKE presented a petition signed by 27 age and invalid pensioners and respectfully praying that the Local Government Act be amended to allow for lower differential rating on houses owned and occupied by pensioners.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS.

CAR SALE.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Some time ago a constituent of mine purchased a motor car from Civic Motors. The proprietor, a man known as Asikis, recently appeared in a coronial inquiry following a fire which occurred in Hanson Street, under, I believe, very doubtful circumstances which did not appear to reflect much credit on the person concerned. The car in question, a 1947 Nash, was sold as a "good, roadworthy, reliable car", after it had been guaranteed as checked by the company's mechanic. After my constituent had had the car a few weeks he found it necessary to spend £80 on repairs. He took the car back to the firm and the proprietor informed him that he would exchange it for another of the same value. The car has been stored in one of the company's used car establishments for the past four months, but no move has been made by the proprietor to honour his promise. Further, certain action has now been taken by the finance company involved because of the arrears in payments. Provided I supply, confidentially, my constituent's name and the price paid for the car, will the Premier ask the fraud squad of the Police Department to see whether this car was sold as a mechanically sound and roadworthy vehicle?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the Leader will give me the information I will inquire.

WALKERVILLE SCHOOL TOILETS.

Mr. COUMBE: I recently asked the Minister of Works whether better toilet accommodation could be provided at the Walkerville primary school. The toilet block there, incidentally, has been the subject of much annoyance and complaint in the district of Walkerville. Has the Minister a reply to my previous question?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Director of Public Buildings has examined this matter closely. It is agreed by the department that the toilets at the Walkerville school are not up to the standard that the department wants at this stage for schools of this type, although they were, at the time they were erected, the standard type of installation for that school. Similar types can be seen at schools of the same vintage throughout the State. The toilets are, however, inadequate as they do not provide accommodation of present-day standard for the teaching staff. The department agrees that something should be done to improve them.

There were two possibilities. One was to re-model the present block and improve its appearance and functioning; the second was to demolish it and build a new block. The department has great calls on its funds this year and cannot finance the building of a new toilet block out of this year's allocation, but the Director tells me that he thinks the matter is of some importance and he would be prepared to include a new toilet block at the Walkerville school for serious and urgent consideration in next year's Estimates. If that is acceptable to the honourable member, I will communicate with the Director. I think that that would be preferable to endeavouring to patch up the existing toilet block.

DUST NUISANCE.

Mr. TAPPING: I have twice referred to the dust menace at Taperoo. I have since been persistently approached by many people (verbally, by letter, and by telephone) saying that the menace is not at all abating. When the Minister replied on October 19 he said that much, if not all, of the land in question had been sold by the Harbors Board to the Housing Trust for building purposes, from which I gathered that it was now the obligation of the trust to see to this matter. He said also that he would confer with the Chairman of the Housing Trust. Has the Minister any results to report from that conference?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In accordance with my reply to the honourable member on the date mentioned, I have sent the documents and correspondence to the Chairman of the Housing Trust and asked him to discuss the matter with me. That discussion has not yet taken place but I imagine that, as soon as the Chairman can, he will discuss it with me.

CLEVE PROPERTY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about a property at Cleve?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Deputy Director of Agriculture reports that on April 17, 1961, Cabinet approval was given to the leasing on a short term of the property bequeathed to the South Australian Government by the late C. L. G. Sims. A draft agreement has been prepared by the Crown Solicitor, and approval to call for offers by advertising in the daily, agricultural weekly and local press is being sought. Pending the finalization of such an agreement, steps are being taken to arrange for the ploughing of firebreaks by contract.

NEW POWER-STATION.

Mr. RICHES: I understand that the Port Pirie council and other organizations in Port Pirie have made representations to the Premier concerning the new power-station to be erected in South Australia. These organizations have forwarded copies of their representations to the member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee) and to myself. In reply to a previous question the Premier said that he would refer the subject matter of that question to the Electricity Trust. Will the Premier also refer the representations made by the local authorities to the Electricity Trust?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have already done that.

STUD MERINO EXPORTS.

Mr. JENKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the alleged export of stud merino semen?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chief Inspector of Stock reports:

The export of merino sheep and of semen is controlled through the Department of Primary Industry. There is a complete embargo on the export of merino sheep. Semen, irrespective of the donor animal, is listed as a prohibited export. The illegal export of sheep semen would be virtually impossible as considerable difficulties have been encountered in developing techniques of deep freezing it. It is considered that the reports of exports of merino semen are unfounded.

COUNTRY SCHOOLS.

Mr. QUIRKE: Recently I received information from the Minister of Education that, whilst school improvements at Mannanarie and Booborowie had been approved, because of a depleted money box the Public Buildings Department could not proceed with the work until an unspecified later date. I have now received information that the position is the same regarding improvements at Mintaro, Black Springs and Burra primary schools. Can the Minister of Works say when a money box refill can be expected to enable the work to proceed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: From the way the honourable member has framed his question I know that he is aware that the demands on the Public Buildings Department for all public buildings, particularly education buildings, are extremely heavy and that it has not been possible to do all the things, both large and small, which the department desires and which my colleague, the Minister of Education, has earnestly requested. The matters the honourable member mentioned fall within that category. The department is heavily committed for this year's programme both for Loan works and for matters which come within the advance provided under the State Budget. The honourable member mentioned this matter to me yesterday and this morning I called for a report on these specific schools. That is being prepared and as soon as I get something more specific I will let the honourable member know —I hope before the House rises. As far as I can see, there is no possibility of funds being available until next year's Loan and Expenditure Estimates are being prepared.

GUIDE DOGS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have received a letter from a blind person, who is the owner of a guide dog, part of which states:

Regulations permit these dogs to travel on public transport, or at least the public transport bodies do not dispute the right of such dogs to travel on these services. However, from personal experience, I may say that cafe owners are not permitted to allow these dogs into their premises, or at least they are not permitted to serve persons while the guide dog is with them at the table. I think you will appreciate the difficulty. Dogs should not leave their owners while working, that is while away from home, unless they are in surroundings they know, and where they are known. Therefore, though I now have greater mobility when I am alone, it seems it will be impossible for me to mix socially with people in town and still retain this mobility. Sir, you may also appreciate the embarrassment it is to friends whom I am with, when having gone into such an establishment, I am told I am not able to be served. I know the sanitary standards of places which sell food and drink must necessarily be high, but these dogs are fully trained, are groomed regularly so that no vermin lives in their coats, and they are perfectly docile.

I acknowledge that this is a matter not only of regulation but also for the owner or proprietor of any cafe. However, I ask the Premier to transmit to the Minister of Health a request that, if there is any bar by regulation to the entry of guide dogs into cafes and eating houses generally, steps will be taken to

have that removed in the circumstances of these animals?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure of the procedure or whether the control is vested in the local government authority or in the Health Department. I believe some control may be exercised by both authorities. However, I will inquire. I think that the farthest we can go with this matter is to establish a position similar to that which operates at present with taxis. Many taxi drivers will accept these dogs without argument, but an occasional driver, for some reason or another, will not accept them. With public transport we have arranged that, although it is not strictly in accordance with the regulations, a discrimination is to be made in favour of guide dogs and they are to be permitted to go into the carriages with the blind persons. I will inquire to see whether it is possible to arrive at a workable solution to the problem.

MOIETIES.

Mr. LOVEDAY: On October 4 I asked the Acting Minister of Lands a question about road moieties and pointed out that where land reverted to the Crown after having been occupied, and where road work had been done prior to that occupier's handing the land back to the Lands Department, the moiety was still payable by the person who originally held the land, although the Lands Department would get the added value from the block. I have specific information concerning a person who paid his rates up to September 1, 1959, and the land reverted to the Crown. The road construction work was completed in August or early September, 1959, and the moiety amounted to £30. The man relinquished the block because the War Service Homes loan was insufficient to meet the cost of the house on the block and he could not find the difference. The moiety represents a hardship to this man who has six children. The land has since been sold by the Lands Department at an enhanced figure, and I have no doubt that the added value of the road construction has been passed on to the new buyer. Will the Minister of Lands consider this matter as well as the general request contained in my earlier question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As the Minister of Lands returned from overseas only yesterday, he would not be aware of the question the honourable member asked me, so I shall reply to that question and, if the honourable member wishes to comment further, perhaps he can complete the discussion with my colleague. The question asked on October 4 about moieties was discussed with the Director of Lands. The reply is that blocks are returned to the Lands Department because of non-compliance with agreed conditions, and the Crown Lands Act states, in section 233, how moneys received shall be credited. If the honourable member looks at that section he will see that it directs crediting of those moneys. The specific case the honourable member mentioned is something that I did not know about when this reply was prepared, and I am sure that the Minister of Lands will consider it.

EGG EXPORTS.

Mr. LAUCKE: The Minister of Agriculture is reported by *Hansard* as saying yesterday:

> The South Australian Egg Board in July and August shipped 15,000 cases (each of 30 dozen eggs in shell) to the United Kingdom and Europe.

This morning's *Advertiser* reported that the Minister said that 15,000 eggs in shell were shipped to the United Kingdom and Europe. Will the Minister state the actual position regarding the export of eggs in shell to the United Kingdom?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: What I said yesterday was correctly reported in *Hansard*—that 15,000 cases each of 30 dozen eggs were exported. This is a total of 5,400,000 eggs. This matter has caused the Chairman of the Egg Board some embarrassment, as he has received some telephone calls on it.

FERRIES.

Mr. KING: From November 1 ferry services on the River Murray will be free. As a matter of public interest, will the Minister of Works obtain a report from the Minister of Local Government on the hours of operation of the various ferries that will apply from November 1, the names of the district councils in charge of the ferries, the expected cost of efficient operation and maintenance, the general terms of the leases of the operators, and the responsibility of councils on the maintenance and efficiency of the service? Some doubt has been expressed about the efficiency that may be expected; I expect the service to be of a high standard, and I think the answer to this question will show that that is so.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: So that the public may be informed, I shall endeavour to get this information tomorrow. If it is not all available, I shall endeavour to get information on the hours of operation, which is a matter of particular public interest.

SUPERPHOSPHATE PLANT.

Mr. McKEE: I understand that the Premier has received a letter from a body at Port Pirie expressing concern about the closing of the uranium treatment plant and suggesting the possibility that the works be used to produce superphosphate. Has the Premier received that letter and, if so, will he report on it?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have not received the letter, but this matter has been canvassed for some time. The only problem is that the area served is not one of the big superphosphate-using areas of this State, so any superphosphate manufactured at Port Pirie would probably have to be taken considerable distances by rail or road. Secondly, many small plants cannot operate as efficiently or produce as cheaply as a few large plants. At present there is much competition from Victoria simply because Victorian units are much larger than those in South Australia. One Victorian unit, I think, produces more superphosphate than all the South Australian units put together and is therefore able to produce cheaply compared with the smaller plants in South Australia. This matter has been examined from time to time; it has some problems, but, on the other hand, Port Pirie has an advantage in having a large quantity of sulphuric acid readily available—in fact, looking for a market. As a result, this suggestion cannot be ruled out, but there would be much difficulty before it would be possible to solve all the problems associated with it.

GILES CORNER AND NAVAN WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NICHOLSON: Is the Minister of Works able to say when construction is likely to be undertaken on the Giles Corner and Navan water scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Cabinet has approved of a water supply for the Navan and Giles Corner area in the hundreds of Gilbert and Alma at an estimated cost of about £40,000. A sum of £10,000 has been provided on the 1961-62 Loan Estimates for this scheme and a start could be made towards the end of this financial year, after the completion or near completion of the Springton-Eden Valley scheme, the extensions to the Truro scheme and some of the branch lines from the new Warren trunk main which have been made necessary by deviations from the original route. The forecast of the Engineer-in-Chief is not definite, but he expects to be able to start this scheme towards the end of this financial year.

NORTH-WESTERN DISTRICTS SEWERAGE.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Works obtained a report in reply to a question I asked some time ago about the possibility of sewerage being extended to the north-western part of my electorate, which coincides with the north-eastern part of the electorate of the member for Port Adelaide?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have been informed by the Engineer-in-Chief that plans and estimates are now being prepared for a comprehensive sewerage scheme to serve the Wingfield, Mansfield Park, Angle Park and Athol Park areas. The cost will be considerable, and when designs and estimates are completed the scheme will be submitted to Cabinet for consideration. It is probable that the scheme as a whole will be extended over a five-year programme. However, apart from the provision of sewerage for the Housing Trust homes in this area, there is no likelihood of the extensive scheme being undertaken for some time.

ABORIGINES.

Mr. HARDING: I was very much concerned to read an article in yesterday's *News* which stated:

> The conditions of Australian aborigines amounted to semi-slavery, anthropologist Jacquetta Hawkes said today. She was addressing the Anti-Slavery Society in London.

This article could be misunderstood and misconstrued in this State. I have travelled to Koonibba, Hermannsburg, Ernabella and Point McLeay, and I know the tremendous amount being done to educate and better the lot of our aborigines, particularly the children. Can the Minister of Works refute the statement that natives in this country are considered slaves and treated as such?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I saw the article to which the honourable member referred, and I was somewhat concerned at its import. However, I think it is generally recognized that some people make pronouncements on matters such as this who perhaps have only a short acquaintance of the subject matter on which they make those pronouncements, and this could be a case of that kind. The honourable member, in his question, appreciated the work being done by not only Government departments but missions and other people who have lent their support to the improvement of the lot of the aborigines in this State and in other States. If correctly reported, the statement ignores the

great amount of work being done for the betterment of our native people. While much yet remains to be done it is necessarily a matter involving a long, and, I am afraid, rather an up-hill programme in order to achieve the desired result. I think that, far from the conditions being as reported by the authoress, the contrary is the case, because I have made extensive trips throughout the State and I can refute the statements made which are, in fact, very wide of the mark. I do not desire to comment on the authoress of the statement personally. I simply accept the statement as reported. I agree that the article is unfortunate and is contrary to actual fact. The State Budget for aboriginal welfare in this State has risen spectacularly in the last few years. I speak from memory, but I think that since 1955 the vote for the Aborigines Department has increased from about £200,000 to about £500,000 a year. If members accept the estimate that there are 5,000 aborigines in South Australia of both mixed and full blood descent, that means £100 a year spent on each of them. This represents £2 a week being spent by the Aborigines Department alone, apart from the funds subscribed by church missions and other bodies for the welfare of aborigines.

Mr. Jenkins: And Commonwealth social services?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, which include age pensions, child endowment and other benefits which, as pensioners, they receive, as do the members of the white population.

MOUNT BARKER RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have received a complaint from representatives of the Australian Railwaymen's Union concerning its members stationed at Mount Barker Junction. Those people depend on rainwater catchments for water supply, but these have been exhausted. The department has conveyed certain supplies by tankers, but the water is unfit for human consumption. I understand that water from a bore approximately 100 yds. distant from these cottages could be made available as a reticulated supply, and as late as March of this year the tenants of the cottages intimated to the department that they were prepared to pay an increased rent to cover the reticulated service. Will the Minister of Works cause inquiries to be made so that this bore water can be made available as a reticulated water service for these tenants?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall make the inquiries the Leader requests.

CONSUMERS' ASSOCIATION.

Mr. HALL: Recently an organization known as the Australian Consumers' Association has tested various commodities offered for sale on the Australian market. That organization published the results of these tests in a journal called *Choice*. Some tests have revealed most peculiar results and methods of marketing various commodities. For instance, some of the economy-size packets of breakfast cereals, which are very well promoted, have been found, when tested, to provide less value proportionately than the ordinary packets. Tests were also made on the various brands of cigarettes for sale on the Australian market, and it was found that one of the largest sellers—a filter tip cigarette—had twice the harmful tars of an ordinary non-filter tip cigarette, the inference there being that it is the harmful tars that attract the smoker. Can the Premier say whether the Prices Commissioner is aware of this magazine, the association and its work, and whether the health authorities are aware of its reports which could be of value to the public and to the work of the departments concerned? If they are not aware of them, will he acquaint those departments with this non-political organization?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will bring the magazine and the report to the notice of the Prices Commissioner. The Health Act does not protect the public in regard to quantities: it is designed to protect the public against deleterious material rather than to ensure that the public gets what it believes it is buying when it buys an economy-size package. The Prices Commissioner's duties are to fix the maximum price at which anything can be sold. Over the years, honourable members and the public generally have come to regard him as a person who will look into this type of thing to see whether action should be taken generally to protect the public interest. He would be the most appropriate authority to whom to send this question, and I will see that he has a copy of it. These unofficial surveys can be dangerous, in certain conditions. If, for instance, they were designed to promote the sale of a product, those concerned could easily do that by sending along unfavourable comment about their competitors' products. That would have to be watched.

Mr. Hall: It is a consumers' association.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A consumers' association I should be happy about

but it would have to be completely unallied with any other selling authority or it could be a dangerous undertaking in itself. However, I will see that the matter is investigated.

COOL DRINKS.

Mr. RICHES: During the Budget debate I referred to the fact that cool drinks on sale in the Port Pirie railway refreshment rooms were brought from Adelaide to the exclusion of cool drinks produced in Port Pirie. I asked for a report on that. I understood from the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, that he would secure a report. I am anxious that the reason for this state of affairs should be made known to us. If the report is not to hand, will the Minister ensure that we have one before the end of this session?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not the report to hand but will endeavour to expedite its production.

TINTINARA WATER SCHEME.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I believe the Minister of Works can now make a further statement on when it is intended to commence the new Tintinara water scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief has informed me that the proposal to begin main-laying at Tintinara in September depended upon the acquisition of plant for the newly formed southern water district. I may amplify that by saying that the extension of activities in water supply and sewerage in the area generally south of the railway line to Melbourne has necessitated a separate district being created with headquarters in the South-East to service that area. That is what the Engineer-in-Chief means when he refers to the "acquisition of plant for the newly formed southern water district". The Engineer-in-Chief states further that a trenching machine has been purchased but delivery will not take place until the end of this year. In the meantime, a machine was transferred from the central water district to the southern water district but, owing to the urgency which arose at Millicent for laying mains in the Housing Trust area, the machine was diverted to that locality where it will be in operation for several weeks. It should then be available for use at Tintinara about mid-December, when work can be commenced.

POST-GIRO BANKING SYSTEM.

Mr. LAUCKE: My question concerns the Swedish post-giro banking system. Bearing in mind the sterling services the Savings Bank of South Australia has through the years rendered the people and the economy of this State, I expressed concern last week in a question to the Premier about the decrease in total deposits with that bank. In his reply, the Premier referred to the Savings Bank current accounts. Since then I have received a most interesting letter from a gentleman who refers to a system adopted in Sweden by organizations similar to savings banks. It is of real interest and could possibly be applied in Australia. I shall read this letter. I ask the Premier to have this matter investigated with a view possibly to introducing something on these lines in South Australia. The letter reads:

I was interested to read of your question in the Assembly concerning the advisability of the State Savings Bank opening cheque accounts, to preserve its business. May I suggest that there could be benefit to the bank, and to the public, by its pioneering in Australia of the introduction of the Swedish post-giro banking system. In Sweden, this is conducted through the post offices, but it could be almost as well done through the State Savings Bank's branches, which are pretty well spread. An outline of the system will, I feel sure, indicate to you the great convenience it would be to the public of South Australia as well as advantage to the State Government's savings bank. Briefly, this is how it works:—Anyone desiring to enjoy the advantages offered by the post-giro banking system (and in Sweden that means everyone) would simply go to their nearest savings bank branch and pay in whatever sum they have available, or regard as necessary, for the payment of their week-to-week commitments. With a receipt for this initial deposit they would be given a book of cheque forms, each cheque having three butts, and a supply of envelopes addressed to the Bank and pre-stamped (the cost of the stamps being debited against the person's account).

When an account-holder wishes to pay any of his creditors, he simply writes the creditor's name and address and the amount involved on the three butts and the cheque form, signs the cheque form and adds his account number, and posts off the cheque with two of the butts attached in one of the special pre-stamped envelopes already addressed to the Bank. (Or, if he wishes to save the postage, he can just hand in the cheque with the two butts attached to the nearest branch of the Bank.) Upon receipt of the cheque (or cheques, for the payer may settle a number of accounts at the one time, tendering a cheque for each), the Bank passes them on to a central office, where the payer's account is debited with the amount involved and the payee's account is credited.

The Bank then sends one of the butts on to the payee as an intimation to him that the payer has paid the amount and that it has been credited to his (the payee's) account with the Bank. The butt is also marked with the payee's balance in his account after this credit. The second butt is sent back to the payer as an intimation to him that his instructions have

been carried out, and it is marked by the Bank with the balance standing to his credit after the transaction. By this means both parties are kept informed of their balances after every transaction, so that they always know how they stand; the creditor is saved the trouble and expense of posting the debtor a receipt, and the debtor is saved a good deal of trouble in paying his accounts.

As the post-giro system makes virtually no charge for its services other than stamp duty on the cheques and postage on the envelopes, you might wonder where it is to make the expenses of running the scheme and showing a profit. Well, this is covered by the interest that the post-giro derives by lending the money lodged with it by its customers to the Government at interest. In Sweden, this is one of the chief sources of Government finance, at a very cheap rate of interest which is nevertheless sufficient to enable the post-giro to show enormous profits that also go to the Government in one way and another. Thus, not only would the public's convenience be well served by the introduction of this system, the Government would also find it of tremendous advantage financially; and the State Savings Bank would be reborn as a vigorous dynamic instrument in serving the State's future development and progress.

Will the Premier examine this system to determine whether it has any virtue for South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will submit the question to the officers of the Savings Bank for examination, but I point out that if the postage is the same in Sweden as it is here the bank will soon be in financial difficulties.

Mr. Laucke: The customer pays the postage.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under those circumstances the customer will still be grumbling because the cost of postage in Australia is becoming so exorbitant. It is causing concern to every business house and most firms now refrain from posting receipts to try to overcome the high cost of postage.

Mr. Dunstan: And that deprives us of revenue.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At present I am dealing with a banking proposition that appears to me to be largely dependent upon cheap postage to enable it to function. I will have the question examined and notify the honourable member in due course.

BURRA-HALLETT ROAD.

Mr. QUIRKE: Last financial year I received information from the Minister of Roads that £20,000 could possibly be made available to the Burra District Council for the formation of the main road from Burra to Hallett. I understand £10,000 has been allocated. Will the Minister of Works ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether a further £10,000 will be available this year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will ask my colleague for that information.

POLICE RADIO COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Premier a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question about police radio communications in outback areas?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If I remember the honourable member's question correctly it related to radios being attached to police cars that were engaged in searches. He mentioned particularly the search for the rabbit trapper who was lost in the north-eastern part of the State. I received a report from the Commissioner of Police that no police vehicles were actually associated with that search. I point out that where an incident of that nature happens the vehicles normally used are those on the spot and they may not necessarily be police vehicles.

Mr. Loveday: Are any portable transmitters available?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think so, but I will get the report for the honourable member to refresh my memory.

METROPOLITAN MILK SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding the admitting of the Cooke Plains area to the metropolitan milk pick-up area?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the Milk Board reports:

The following report is submitted on the questions asked by Mr. Bywaters, M.P., relating to the licensing of milk producers in additional areas. The statement regarding the probable increase in milk production required within the next 10 years in order to meet estimated increased demands, as mentioned in the annual report of the board, was based on figures obtained from the Town Planner's Department. It is correct that, allowing for possible expansion of the metropolitan area, particularly on the southern and north-eastern boundaries, that more milk will be required to meet the expected demand during the next 10 years. At the same time, it must be appreciated that present production from existing producers is considerably in excess of that of the previous year and, if present trends are maintained, plus production from the Meningie-Narrung area, the supply should be adequate for at least another five years.

Although greater use of irrigation and better feeding methods have increased production considerably during the autumn, seasonal conditions have a marked influence on production

levels and therefore it is difficult to accurately assess milk production for each autumn. This was well illustrated last autumn when March production was below that of last year, while, as the result of unusually favourable seasonal conditions in April, the milk intake reached a record level for that month. The question of maintaining sufficient supply is under continuous examination and, should it become evident that the margin of production over sales is likely to become inadequate, the board will give immediate consideration to a further extension of the production area. At the present time the board cannot go beyond the information supplied to Mr. Bywaters in February last, when he introduced a deputation of producers from the Cooke Plains district seeking admittance to the city milk production area, that if and when it becomes necessary to consider any further extension to the present production area the claims of producers within the Cooke Plains district will receive full consideration.

EDEN HILLS WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I have received a letter from a constituent at Eden Hills. It appears that in this area the water supply has reached a low ebb and that, as soon as the hot weather commences, it is almost impossible to obtain any water during the daytime. I understand that my constituent is paying full water rates—but is not receiving anywhere near the quantity of water for which he is paying. Unless storage for water is provided before 8 a.m. each day, it is doubtful whether any water supply will be available to him. Will the Minister of Works have an investigation made into this matter with a view to improving the water supply in the Eden Hills area?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I shall be pleased to do that. If the Leader gives me details of the case, they will assist in the investigation.

PORT AUGUSTA FOUNDRY.

Mr. RICHES: I understand that specifications have been issued and tenders called for field welding and miscellaneous steel work associated with power-house construction at Port Augusta. I refer in particular to specifications numbers 173 and 169. As I understand that these include work that could be done at Port Augusta, will the Premier use his good offices to see whether that work can be done at Port Augusta foundries and perhaps prevent their closing? One foundry has left the town and another is being fed under difficulty, largely by orders from the city. When such work occurs, possibly negotiations could be entered into. Could not work covered by these specifications be done reasonably at Port Augusta instead of being let out to firms in other parts of the State or the Commonwealth?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no knowledge of the tenders or the conditions under which they were called and accepted, so I cannot make any pronouncement on the matter now. However, I shall get a full report and advise the honourable member in due course.

PORT RIVER CROSSING.

Mr. RYAN: A considerable time ago Cabinet approved the commencement of an alternative road or causeway linking Port Adelaide with LeFevre Peninsula. It would not be necessary for the money to be allocated from the Loan Estimates, as it would be paid out of the Highways Fund. Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Roads details of the expected time of commencement of this important project?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My information is to the effect that the planning of the project is well under way, so I should think there would be no impediment to the commencement of the work. However, I shall refer the matter to my colleague for a more precise answer.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.

Mr. LAWN: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce a Bill this session to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government recently had a report from the Workmen's Compensation Committee, which it is examining at present. It will probably be considered by Cabinet next week.

ELIZABETH TRAFFIC.

Mr. LAUCKE: Will the Premier say whether a decision has yet been arrived at about an increase in the current unrealistic speed limit attaching to the magnificent Main North Road through Elizabeth? Also, when the present highway to Gawler is completed, will the proposed by-pass road along the foothills be proceeded with?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no proposal for a by-pass road at present. This would mean complete duplication of the road through to Gawler. Much money has been spent in that district and I should be utterly opposed to a further duplication of the road at present at the expense of others, as

the road to Gawler is surely one of the best highways in Australia. I do not favour further expenditure in that area to provide a by-pass when already a limited access road is available. In reply to the first part of the question, I have no doubt that the committee that has been appointed will in due course make recommendations that will materially lift the speed of vehicles using the road. That was one reason given for the appointment of the traffic authority in the first place, so I do not think there will be any problem about this. However, I know of no immediate plans for a by-pass road along the foothills. Incidentally, work is proceeding to by-pass some parts of Gawler to get traffic out of the congested street, which I agree is necessary work.

PAYMENT OF ACCOUNTS.

Mr. McKEE: I noticed in a recent press statement that some Adelaide firms had hit on a neat idea of hustling reluctant payers of bills by sending accounts in unstamped envelopes, which they claimed had a good effect. As the addressee has to pay 10d. to take delivery of the letter, will the Premier say whether this practice is legal? If it is, I think it is morally wrong, so can he say whether action can be taken to stop this practice?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter is entirely under Commonwealth post office law, and there is no action that this Government can take.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE PAYMENTS.

Mr. BYWATERS: A constituent of mine was employed for 13 years by a firm in my electorate that is now in liquidation, and he was entitled to receive £127 in long service leave payments under the State Act. He has received £27, leaving about £100 still to be paid, and has been told that the remainder will be treated as "other debts" against the company, which is expected to pay only a small dividend. Can the Premier say whether long service leave under the State Act is treated in the same way as wages and whether this man will have a priority because of that, or whether the liquidator or Official Receiver will say that the only way he can recover it is by rendering an account to the company?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The State Act provides that a person who has been employed by one employer for seven years shall be entitled to one week's extra leave a year. That leave is due to him and must be provided by the employer. At the request of some members of this House the Government agreed that, if the employer and employee agreed to a deferment, it could take place, but it was something that had to be worked out between employer and employee. If they were not in agreement the leave had to be provided. Similarly, employees could take cash payments in lieu of leave if both parties agreed. The deferment referred to by the honourable member is one that has been agreed to by the employee, otherwise he could have insisted on his leave each year as it fell due. Under the circumstances, I doubt whether any provision makes him a deferred creditor. The Long Service Leave Act certainly contains no such provision, because when that Act was introduced it was expected that the leave would be taken each year, and the Bill was brought in with that supposition in mind. The amendments that enabled deferment were requested by members after the Bill had been introduced. I shall inquire for the honourable member.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: EGGS.

Mr. BYWATERS: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. BYWATERS: This morning's *Advertiser* reports:

> Mr. Bywaters (A.L.P.) said he had been told that, if five more eggs were eaten every week per head of population in South Australia, all South Australian eggs would be consumed.

Hansard, however, reports that I said:

> At a meeting last night I was told that if every person in South Australia ate five eggs a week they would consume our production.

The *Hansard* report is correct, and I ask that the *Advertiser* reporter correct his report.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ELECTRICITY TARIFFS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In this morning's *Advertiser*, in an article relating to a decrease in the use of electric power, the following statement appeared:

> The Premier, who was replying in the Assembly to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Walsh), said that if the present reduced use of electricity continued, it would mean that the tariff reductions were probably too great.

I did not ask any of the questions attributed to me, although the member for Stirling, according to *Hansard*, yesterday asked a question on this matter and referred to a press statement attributed to myself. I admit that

I did send a letter to the *Advertiser*, and I am prepared to read it if that is necessary, but the appropriate paragraph therein was:

Whilst the present proposal of the Premier can be termed a niggardly hand-out in view of the trust's surplus of £414,000 last year, it was through the Labor Party's efforts that the Premier was forced to reconsider the needs of the country people, and I am sure that country consumers will be pleased that we did at least obtain some concession for them.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: HUNDREDS OF BOOLCUNDA, PALMER AND WILLOCHRA.

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS (Minister of Lands): I move:

That those portions of the travelling stock reserve in the hundreds of Boolcunda, Palmer and Willochra, shown on the plan laid before Parliament on August 29, 1961, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1960, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands.

These portions of travelling stock reserve contain approximately 5,000 acres, and extend from the vicinity of the town of Willochra in the hundred of Boolcunda, southwards through the hundreds of Palmer and Willochra to the southern boundary of the lastmentioned hundred near the town of Wilmington. The areas in question comprise the remainder of a travelling stock route, the greater portion of which was resumed in 1951, following a resolution by both Houses of Parliament. The present proposal has arisen from requests by the district councils of Kanyaka and Wilmington, through whose districts the reserve under consideration passes. The reasons put forward by the councils may be summarized as follows:

(*a*) The need for the reserve for *bona fide* travelling stock has not existed for a number of years; in fact, portions have been fenced across.

(*b*) In dry seasons loitering stock cause "dust-bowl" conditions.

(*c*) Control of vermin, noxious weeds and straying stock would be aided by the closing of the reserve and the allotment of the land.

(*d*) Straying stock are a danger to the public using the roads in ever increasing numbers because of the growing tourist attraction of the north.

(*e*) A three-chain road would adequately cater for movement of stock.

The views of the Stockowners' Association were sought and the council of the association has supported the proposal, having ascertained that all local committees favoured the resumption and that landholders in general were prepared to accept allotment of the land. The Pastoral Board, having by inspection and investigation confirmed that the reserve is little used by *bona fide* travelling stock, that a three-chain road would meet the needs, and that adjacent landholders would take up land made available to them, has recommended that the reserve be resumed. I therefore ask members to agree to the motion.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): The Minister said that in dry seasons loitering stock caused "dust-bowl" conditions, and I should like an assurance that when the land is subsequently allotted that state of affairs will not be continued as a result of over-stocking. I understand that at one time certain areas around Wilmington were used for fattening stock, and some of that stock could have used this travelling stock reserve. In view of the expenditure by the Queensland Government, with Commonwealth Government assistance, it now seems that many of the cattle that might have come down from the northern cattle country will be lost to South Australia. I should like an assurance from the Minister that whatever is done in the area the land will not be over-stocked, and also that there will still be a reasonable three-chain road for the movement of stock, if necessary.

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS (Minister of Lands): I am pleased to know of the Leader's interest in this matter. I assure him that the Pastoral Board, the district councils and the Stockowners' Association are right behind this proposal. The fact that the land will be allotted to nearby landholders is in itself an assurance that it will be well-cared for and no "dust-bowls" will be created.

Motion carried.

TRAVELLING STOCK ROUTE: HUNDREDS OF SEYMOUR, MALCOLM, BONNEY, GLYDE, SANTO AND NEVILLE.

The Hon. Sir CECIL HINCKS (Minister of Lands): I move:

That those portions of the travelling stock route in the hundreds of Seymour, Malcolm, Bonney, Glyde, Santo and Neville, shown on the plan laid before Parliament on August 29, 1961, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1960, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands.

The stock route in question extends from Tailem Bend to the southern boundary of the hundred of Neville, about 90 miles to the south, although at intervals throughout this distance

there are stretches where no stock route exists. The area of the stock route involved in the proposal is approximately 6,078 acres. The route varies in width from about five chains to 40 chains and follows the general course of Princes Highway, which, however, is in some places on the eastern and in others on the western side of the stock route, and in many other places crosses from side to side in an irregular diagonal course. The question of resumption of portions of this travelling stock route has been the subject of discussion and consideration for many years, particularly the portion between Tailem Bend and Meningie. In 1946, Parliament approved of a length of about four miles of that portion, in the hundred of Seymour, being closed so that it could be leased for seven years. That section is included in the present proposal.

In the last four or five years, the District Council of Meningie and others have again raised the question on several occasions, stressing among other points the difficulty of dealing with noxious weeds and vermin. As a result of investigations by the Pastoral Board and the Department of Agriculture, it was decided that it would not be opportune to close the stock route, as the requirements of the Upper South-East, because of the build-up of the beef-cattle industry in that locality, could not at that time be clearly forecast. Another approach was made in 1959, and the request was supported by the Stockowners' Association as regards the portions of the route between Tailem Bend and Meningie. Objections were submitted, however, by holders of certain nearby land to the closing of a section in the hundreds of Seymour and Malcolm. Again it was decided that action to close the route should not be taken at that time.

Since then, further representations have been made, strongly supported by the Stockowners' Association, and deputations from the District Council of Meningie have waited on me. It has been asserted that the use of the route by *bona fide* travelling stock is negligible; in any case the route is not continuous but is broken at intervals by stretches where only the highway exists. The route is badly infested with noxious weeds, and control measures could be much more effective if it were resumed and allotted to adjoining land holders. The Pastoral Board, the Department of Agriculture and the Stockowners' Association have conferred and examined the whole question in detail, paying particular attention to control of vermin and weeds, and the latest information on the facilities likely to be needed for the movement of stock to and from the Upper South-East. These investigations and further inspections by the Pastoral Board have shown that the stock route is no longer necessary in its present form for *bona fide* travelling stock, and that with modern methods of transport a three-chain road would be adequate.

Those landholders who had previously objected have been interviewed. The objections were based on the need to move sheep between separated parts of the holdings, but it was pointed out that, if the stock route were resumed, the landholders' needs of access would receive full consideration in the allotment of the land. Although the discussions, investigations and findings have been mainly in respect of the stock route between Tailem Bend and McGrath's Flat in the hundred of Glyde, it is evident that there is no more need for retention of the remainder, extending from McGrath's Flat to the southern boundary of the hundred of Neville, than there is of the northern portions, particularly if the northern portions are resumed. In the light of all these circumstances, therefore, I ask members to approve of the motion for closing the whole area.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the motion. This is something that the people in that district for some time have asked for. I have made some representations to the Minister regarding that portion in my electorate to be closed. This area has for some time apparently worried the district councils, and people have been anxious to have some of this land for grazing and development. For that reason, I commend the Minister for eventually getting round to this, and his department for agreeing to the request outlined by the District Council of Meningie and others concerned. The profusion of noxious weeds in this area has been a worry for some years. The people there have been anxious that the area be developed so that these weeds can be dealt with. I was not so much aware of the vermin, but it could present a problem.

I trust that, when the allocation of these lands is dealt with, consideration will be given to some new people who at the moment have no land there and would be interested in acquiring some of this area. One person I have in mind particularly is one whose name I have already mentioned to the Minister. For some time she has had a lease of this area referred to in the motion, and possibly others would desire to have some of this land. I am sure they would make full use of it, more so than

some who already have too much land in that area. Perhaps these people could be considered when this land is ready for allocation. I hope these points will be considered.

Motion carried.

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

In Committee.

(Continued from October 34. Page 1486.)

Clause 5—"Restriction on giving notice to quit where unlawful rent received."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I promised the honourable member for Mitcham that I would submit his query to the Chairman of the Housing Trust to see whether he upheld the view expressed by the honourable member. The Chairman has sent back, through the Parliamentary Draftsman, the following report:

I find it difficult to appreciate fully Mr. Millhouse's objections to the clause in the Landlord and Tenant Bill concerning overcharging of rents. As I understand it, his objection is that the new section ought to provide that a person shall first be convicted of the offence of overcharging rent. I have spoken to the Chairman of the Housing Trust who points out that what very frequently happens is that a tenant reports an overcharge to the trust. The trust makes inquiries and the owner is questioned. The matter having been brought to the notice of the trust the owner promptly gives the tenant notice to quit. The notice may well be unenforcible but the fact remains that the tenant has it hanging over his head and by this sort of tactic is worried out of the premises. One result is that tenants are very chary about complaining about overcharges. If proceedings have to be taken it may be some weeks if not months before they are disposed of and the landlord would thus have quite a period during which he can serve notice. The whole matter is a practical one and it is the practical aspects that the amendment is designed to cover. The chairman of the trust considers that the proposed amendment looked at from a practical point of view is not unfair but is designed to cover a situation which in his view is not adequately covered as the law now stands.

I assure the honourable member that this clause will be closely scrutinized. It is necessary that a tenant should, if he feels he is being wrongly treated, be able to apply to the trust for consideration. That should not immediately result in a notice to quit being served upon him, even though such notice would be unenforceable. If it becomes necessary, the provision can be amended next year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That last phrase gives me some comfort, but I am not happy about the clause, particularly as the Premier states that it will be closely watched and that it should be a practical solution. We are here to make the law and to make it as perfect as possible and the Premier's statement is an admission that the provision is not as it should be. The Housing Trust will be judge and jury. A complaint will be made to it, and if it accepts the complaint it can prevent the landlord from giving notice to quit. It is entirely wrong that a person's rights should be taken away by an administrative act of that nature, when it is an offence under the Act if the charge is proved. I am amazed that the Government should permit this to happen. It is all very well to say that the tenant is being victimized by the landlord's doing something he is entitled to do under the Act. Apparently the victimization arises from the giving of a notice to quit, provision for which is made in other sections of the Act. I oppose the clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 and title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

Bill recommitted.

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, section 6"—reconsidered.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Last night I added a few words to Mr. Shannon's amendment and when Mr. Dunstan drew my attention to the poor drafting of the amendment I promised to have it reconsidered. The Parliamentary Draftsman has improved it, and the Bill has been recommitted to enable Mr. Shannon to have his amendment further considered.

Mr. SHANNON: I move:

After "or" last occurring to delete all words and to insert "so far as concerns the recovery of possession of premises with respect to a lease of any dwellinghouse attached to any premises owned by the lessor and used as a shop where that dwellinghouse is reasonably needed by the lessor for the purposes of extending the shop."

That confines it to a repossession for a specific purpose and has no relation to the rent that might be charged. The Parliamentary Draftsman has clarified the position to meet the needs of the people who approached me about this amendment.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The amendment now means something, although it may involve some difficulty in interpretation by the court. However, it would be impossible to amend this section properly. The amendment

affords some relief to the people the honourable member desired to protect and I congratulate the Parliamentary Draftsman on the rewording, which was a difficult proposition.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE ARBITRATION BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

HOSPITALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for certain matters arising out of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil, 1954, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to enable effect to be given within the territorial waters of the State to an International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil which was drafted at an international conference in London in 1954 at which 32 countries, including Australia, were represented. The convention came into operation in July, 1958, in respect of certain countries and, so far as Australia is concerned, awaits ratification. Ratification cannot, however, take place until the necessary legislation enabling effect to be given to the convention has been passed. The Commonwealth passed legislation in 1960 dealing with pollution outside territorial waters. But jurisdiction in respect of territorial waters is normally within the powers of the State, and complementary legislation by the States is therefore required. Following on lengthy consultation between the Commonwealth and the States, the basis of a uniform draft Bill to be introduced by the States was agreed and all or all but one of the other States have enacted it. It therefore remains for this State to pass its legislation on the subject.

As members know, the discharge of oil into the sea by ships is a serious and world-wide problem and, while countries can in the exercise of their ordinary powers control the discharge of oil inside their own waters, they cannot control such discharge by foreign ships outside their own waters. The convention, agreed in London in 1954, made provision for those countries which accepted it to control their own ships; thus, the difficulty of the control of the discharge of oil outside territorial waters was overcome by agreement. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into detail as to the provisions of the convention itself. I have stated shortly that its object is to prevent the discharge of oil from ships and I think that I need not stress the desirability of Australia's taking all steps necessary to enable it to ratify the convention, since Australia is itself a maritime country.

The Bill, which makes provision additional to any existing provision on this matter (clause 4) provides by clause 5 that if any oil or mixture containing oil is discharged into waters within the jurisdiction from any ship an offence is committed under a penalty of £1,000. This is the governing provision to which the remaining clauses are ancillary. Clause 6, for example, provides that it is a defence to show that the discharge of the oil was necessary for the prevention of damage or for securing the safety of the ship or that the discharge was the consequence of damage or leakage that could not have been foreseen.

Clause 7 empowers the Harbors Board to take action at the expense of the owner or master of the vessel concerned to remove oil pollution that has occurred. Clause 8 requires intrastate ships to be fitted with proper equipment to prevent oil pollution, and provides for inspections and tests. Clause 9 empowers the making of regulations requiring masters of intrastate ships to keep oil records. Clause 10 requires the owner or master of any ship from which any oil is discharged to report the fact to the board, which is given wide powers of inspection. Clause 11 empowers the board to provide oil reception facilities.

Clause 12 restricts the transfer of oil at night, requiring notices to be given, clause 13 provides for the making of general regulations, and clause 14 empowers inspection. Clause 15 empowers the board upon certain conditions to grant dispensations and exemptions from any requirements prescribed by the regulations, but there is to be no exemption from the provisions of clause 5 prohibiting the discharge of oil. Clauses 16 and 18 relate to evidence, and clause 17 requires the approval of the board before any proceedings can be taken for offences.

As I have said, this legislation is complementary to legislation enacted by the Commonwealth and the other States, and is designed to enable the Commonwealth to ratify the convention. Nearly all the clauses, other than

clauses 5 and 6, are of a machinery nature covering various provisions for ensuring that pollution of the sea shall be prevented as far as possible. The Bill is on substantially similar lines to those introduced by other States. It contains provisions additional to those found in the Commonwealth Act, because the Commonwealth Act is concerned only with discharge outside territorial waters and provisions concerning matters within the jurisdiction come within State powers.

Mr. RYAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1474.)

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I am not unmindful of the courtesy extended to me by the House in allowing me to obtain the information required to verify just how the South Australian scheme compares with others, particularly that of New South Wales, which has been referred to as being probably our wealthiest neighbour State. Critics of the Bill have said that this Government has not gone as far in the Bill as it should. New South Wales not only has a Labor Government in office in the Lower House but a majority in the Upper House and can carry any legislation it wishes.

Mr. Dunstan: It has not a majority in the Upper House.

Mr. SHANNON: I understand that the Labor Party can do as it likes in New South Wales.

Mr. Dunstan: It tried to abolish the Upper House, but could not do so.

Mr. SHANNON: It is a peculiar arrangement there: they have a joint sitting to elect an Upper House. I think it is wise that we should note that at this stage New South Wales has only discussed what it intends to do with the unit value. This is still 17s. 6d., and although there has been talk of increasing it to 22s. 6d., that has not yet been done. In fact, no Bill has been prepared for that purpose, as far as I can gather. Further, we do not know whether the contributions by public servants there will be increased. In this Bill we are asking for no extra contribution from the employees, although the value of each of their units is being increased from £45 10s. to £52.

It appears to me that the amount contributed by the State and the amount contributed by the public servants enable us to assess whether or not the State is playing fair with its employees. In New South Wales the fund has to stand 28.1 per cent of the retiring allowance compared with the South Australian fund's 22.3 per cent. That is the position prior to the passing of this Bill we are now discussing. Under the existing legislation, this State Government has to find 77.7 per cent. I believe that this can be no more than an assessment until the new schedules are put into operation and working. We cannot actuarially decide at this stage what the State's contribution will be, but the Treasury is convinced that it will be about 80 per cent, and I understand that is the figure the Treasurer used when explaining the Bill. It could be that this State will be up for a little more, and in a year or two's time when the full impact of this new scale of retiring allowances is felt it will almost certainly mean that the State will have to carry a larger percentage of the cost of superannuation. It is interesting also to note that in this respect South Australia does not compare unfavourably with any of the major States, including the Commonwealth which pays 75.8 per cent, leaving the employee to find 24.2 per cent, compared with 22.3 per cent in South Australia.

In this amending legislation I believe that the State is doing something that other States will follow. We are giving public servants virtually an unrestricted choice, for there is to be no limit on the number of units: they can take as many as their salary permits. The only upper limit we finally fixed is for the man on the very high rung. For that person a limit of pension of one-half of his salary is provided which, after all, is not a bad retiring allowance, for obviously that person will have had ample opportunity during his working life to put a bit aside. Five years or 10 years before his retirement he probably will be on a pretty good salary, and to get one-half of a very handsome salary on which to retire is pretty good in any event.

I understand from my investigations that some States have given greater benefits to junior officers; they have weighted the fund in favour of those lower rungs. That has not been done here, but I am not too sure that I would not favour that approach. After all, not every public servant can reach a high rung, and of necessity there must be some who cannot get very far. Those above them either have to die

or retire, and in the latter case that does not happen until officers reach the age of 65 years. In addition, no-one hopes for another man's death so that he may get an increment in salary. It means that a number of very loyal and able servants do not get up to the higher rungs of salary, and those people in some States are recognized by being given a weighted return by way of retiring allowance.

One thing that we are doing here has, I think, not been given sufficient recognition. Many people have retired from the Public Service on the old basis of superannuation, and under this Bill they will be put on the new basis and receive £52 for each unit. They will receive the increase in their superannuation benefit without having to contribute. That is a recognition of past services. We should give credit to the Government for accepting the extra burden involved in this retrospective aspect of the legislation, because the amount involved obviously will fall upon the State's contribution: it cannot come from the fund, because those people are no longer contributing to it, and it must come from the State Government. That is an aspect of it in respect of which the Government can rightly claim to have been not ungenerous but fair in its approach to these servants no longer on its pay-roll.

I have noted one or two items that may interest members. The old limit was 36 units and, taking that as the basis on which civil servants would have retired prior to the passing of this Bill, they would have received an annual retirement allowance of £1,638. Under the present Bill that increases by £234 to £1,872. The civil servant will get that without any additional contribution; he gets it because of the increased value of the unit from 17s. 6d. to £1. The pension for dependants (the wife or any children still dependent upon the civil servant upon his retirement or death—mainly upon his death) rises by 50 per cent and 100 per cent respectively. We are on all fours with any other State. In fact, we are ahead of some, but we are up with the leaders in this field. One desirable feature of this legislation is that we are looking to the welfare of people who will be left dependent entirely upon what superannuation their services have earned for them. That fact has perhaps been glossed over a little. It has not been mentioned much, although some members have referred to it. The member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) spoke of it in relation to the female sex. I shall not repeat what she said but I agree with her entirely.

Again, we are generous in permitting the taking up of units on the basis of one for every £80 of salary up to £2,000. That is considerably better than we have had so far. Those on a salary range of up to £2,000 or £3,000 can get considerably more than half of their retirement allowance: for each £160 of additional salary they can take out one more unit. So that, in all, it gives the civil servant who is looking to his future an opportunity to more than adequately provide for his old age. Further, this is provided for him at roughly one-fifth of the cost to himself. I do not complain of that. I take my hat off to our civil servants in this State. They are people of the highest academic qualifications and their ability is unquestioned. In fact, it is of such an outstanding nature that sometimes their advice has been sought in certain fields by larger States than South Australia.

Their integrity has never been questioned. Since 1933, when I became a member, I have never heard even one word of doubt raised by anybody about the integrity of our civil servants. It is a pity that that does not apply everywhere. After all, that is a factor of the highest importance in the affairs of a country. We observe what happens in other parts of the world when certain juntas get control and start to feather their own nests: it is not long before they become oligarchs. I do not know that such opportunities apply here (I hope they do not), but certain grave responsibilities rest upon our civil servants, and their honesty must be beyond any doubt, because of the opportunity they have of even just granting a small favour for recompense. I have never heard of that being done in South Australia; there has been no whisper of that.

If it appears that this legislation is liberal (although the Opposition thinks the Government is niggardly with it), I think we are giving the civil servants fair treatment. High-ranking civil servants with whom I have spoken say that this is an eminently fair approach and is more than comparable with the position in most States. They feel that the Government has done everything that could be asked of it in this matter. Many figures are given in the tables but I will quote only one or two. They give a clear picture of the comparison between our own State and New South Wales, which is the State I shall deal with. This is the superannuation entitlement as a percentage of salary at certain levels as at January 1, 1961, in New South Wales. (This is the point I was raising a moment ago about a civil servant

who earns £2,000 a year at 65 years of age having an opportunity to put aside more than half his salary as a retirement allowance.) In New South Wales he can put aside 57 per cent; in South Australia he can put aside 61 per cent now, before this Bill is passed, but, after its passage, he can increase his units to take up 65 per cent of his salary upon retirement—a handsome retirement for a man on £2,000 a year. Coming to the £3,000 a year bracket (I will omit the intervening figures), in New South Wales it falls to 50 per cent and in South Australia to 52 per cent. When this Bill is passed, it will go from 52 per cent to 54 per cent. If a civil servant is getting about £1,600 a year, he is not doing too badly; in fact, I suggest he is doing well. Those comparisons we must bear in mind when considering this legislation.

There should not be competition between the States to see which can offer the best superannuation benefits. We have had unnecessary competition from the Commonwealth Government for some of the best brains in our Public Service. We have lost many men to the Commonwealth because it has offered higher salaries. It is not in our best interests to encourage bright men to offer their services to another authority for higher money when, after all, they will still be serving the people of Australia as public servants. Because the Commonwealth Government controls the purse strings it can offer higher salaries than the State, but that is bad policy and I think the Commonwealth Government has made a mistake in so doing. The men who have gone to the Commonwealth are not doing better work for the people than they would have done had they remained in the State.

Mr. Nankivell: Do you apply that to all public servants, no matter what departments they are in?

Mr. SHANNON: Some professional public servants could be transferred with advantage from one department to another, and the Commonwealth Government could probably use a highly professional officer from this State, but I deplore the offering to these men of higher salaries. If a man were offered £5,000 elsewhere and, to retain his services, we increased his salary from £4,000 to £5,000, all other officers on the £4,000 salary range would seek a similar increase. It is difficult for the State to hold its brilliant officers. If we were completely autonomous we could. By increasing our taxation we could afford higher salaries, but the Commonwealth Government is not likely to surrender its uniform taxing powers. Our superannnuation scheme would be slightly above the average of the States. In fact, it is ahead of the New South Wales scheme which, because of its greater population and natural wealth, could beat us hollow in this respect. I support the second reading.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I commend the Government for its fair and realistic approach to an important aspect of employer-employee relationships. Superannuation is of real importance to the employee, and the Government has been generous in its approach to affording to its employees a scheme that will enable a public servant, through the proposed amendments, to subscribe to a scheme to provide him with half of his salary on retirement. The Government has always been a good employer and its policy of endeavouring to do the right thing by its employees is evident in the provisions of this Bill. The fact that the Government pays 80 per cent of the contributions and the contributors 20 per cent—which is as high as any State with one possible exception and higher than the Commonwealth Government pays—indicates the good faith of the South Australian Government on this question. The Government's humane approach to its employees was evident recently when many men were being retrenched in industry. The Government sought then to increase the number of its employees. It is that tone of a real and honest interest in the welfare of its employees that has built up the Government's reputation as being fair-minded to its employees. In industry, and in activity generally, it is basic that there should be a common respect between employer and employee: after all, it is the two working together that leads to progress and a satisfactory way of life for he who employs and he who is employed. I welcome provisions such as those proposed because they tend to create a better understanding between the worker and the employer. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Amendment of principal Act, section 24."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) moved:

After "Exceeding £3,744—1 unit for each complete" in the penultimate line of the scale to strike out "unit" and to insert "£104".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 11—"Amendment of principal Act, section 24aa."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON moved:

In new subsection (10) to strike out "his election" and to insert "commencing to contribute for such units".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 12 to 40 passed.

Clause 41—"Amendment of principal Act, schedules."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

To strike out "£32 4s." and to insert "£31 4s.".

Widows are to receive three-fifths of the unit of pension, the correct calculation of which is not £32 4s. but £31 4s. It is merely a typographical error.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 18. Page 1394.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I have examined both the Bill and the Premier's second reading explanation. The Bill is introduced as a result of the new roll-on roll-off service to be operated by the Adelaide Steamship Company with the vessel *Troubridge*. In addition to carrying freight this vessel will vastly improve the passenger services to Kangaroo Island and the lower end of Eyre Peninsula. The Bill contains one or two other amendments, and the one relating to day to day registrations is most desirable. I see no objection to the Bill, and therefore I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Separate registrations for parts of articulated motor vehicles."

Mr. SHANNON: I think it appropriate that someone say a word in praise of the Adelaide Steamship Company which is entering this extensive venture with this new vessel. This clause provides the means for registering the trailer that will be used in association with this venture. It will virtually be a door to door delivery for the people who reside on Kangaroo Island and on the lower end of Eyre Peninsula. I recently visited Eyre Peninsula, and, as the guest of the Minister of Works, I had an opportunty to look at the recent development that has taken place on the land in areas which, I must admit, in my earlier association with Eyre Peninsula were not favourably looked upon. In fact, in those days that land would have been classified as third-grade. However, with the advent of more modern methods of top-dressing and seeding and the binding of pastures which are suited to those areas, the carrying capacity has been built up to well over a sheep an acre in most parts and, in the worst parts, to one sheep to no more than an acre and a half. When I was at Cummins I suggested that within the foreseeable future the actual stock-carrying capacity of Eyre Peninsula would be doubled.

One major drawback, both to Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula, has always been the belt of water over which the producers have to get the produce to the mainland market. In the case of lower Eyre Peninsula, that does not apply to the overseas markets. I hope the company's venture in this new field of service will be successful. I believe it deserves the utmost support from the people to whom it is setting out to give this door to door delivery. I travelled to Kangaroo Island on the old *Karatta* many times, and I used to enjoy my trips on that vessel with my old friend, Mr. Frank Condon. Mr. Tapping can confirm that those trips were most enjoyable. I think everyone regrets the departure of these old links, but the *Karatta* had been in commission for more than 50 years and had to go. What is taking her place is something that is, in this State, almost revolutionary. A similar service is running to Tasmania but this is the first attempt to provide such a service in this State. When the Public Works Committee was investigating the facilities required at Port Lincoln, Port Adelaide and Kingscote, the engineers had certain problems to solve, especially at Kingscote where the position was not as simple as it was at Port Lincoln. It is not so difficult to provide shore facilities as it is to provide adequate sea facilities, but I think the problem has now been satisfactorily solved.

All of us are, after all, prone to criticize large companies for being too hungry but this company is branching out into a field involving financial risks, and it will depend largely on the goodwill of the people on Kangaroo Island and Eyre Peninsula whether this venture will eventuallv succeed. If people do not support it and the vessel has to be taken off the run,

who will be to blame? I think it will be the men and women who do not support the venture. They will suffer if it is not successful. They will pay the final penalty because they will lose a valuable service. I plead for the best possible patronage of this new service. It will provide a valuable link, too, for tourists. The coastlines of Eyre Peninsula and Kangaroo Island have many things to offer tourists. If this new facility becomes well known, the tourist trade will benefit in those areas.

Mr. TAPPING: I support the member for Onkaparinga in what he says. As a former member of the Public Works Committee, I listened with interest to the evidence tendered by the steamship company. There is no doubt this is a progressive move. The experience of the eastern States is worth noting. For instance, the *Princess of Tasmania* has plied between Melbourne and Tasmania, with wonderful results for the island. A cargo boat, too, plies on that route, and shortly another boat will be plying between Sydney and Hobart. All this augurs well for the plans of the Adelaide Steamship Company. I have read in the press that the charges will be moderate, but I am concerned about the cost of taking a motor car to Kangaroo Island or Port Lincoln. Although the member for Onkaparinga says it is costing the company £1,000,000 to put the boat into service, the company has some responsibility to Parliament, which has helped the project so much by providing up-to-date berths at Port Adelaide, Port Lincoln and Kingscote. I look forward confidently to the success of this project.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 11) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 1426.)

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): This Bill contains some useful amendments to the Local Government Act and, although it is mainly a Committee Bill, I wish to comment briefly upon some clauses. Clause 3 has special provisions to enable the District Council of Salisbury to petition for its constitution as a municipality, and also for the division of the area into wards. Clause 4 enables the Governor to proclaim that aldermen can be elected in a municipality without a petition being submitted to him and without the need for the number of inhabitants to exceed 20,000. Previously, this was limited to similar bodies with a population exceeding that number.

The exercise of voting powers by companies is to be brought up to date. In the past, companies have been entitled to have one person enrolled where the ratable property assessed was at an annual value of £75, or under, or one person where the assessment under land values was £500, or under. Naturally, the position has changed in the course of time. The value of money has changed and assessments have increased considerably. The clause relating to this matter doubles the amounts mentioned, so it brings the Act into line with present-day circumstances, in this respect.

Clause 7 is important from the viewpoint of the obligation of councils to employ engineers. It provides that where the annual revenue of a council from general rates is £100,000 or more the council shall appoint a qualified engineer aged 23 years or over. When the Bill was first introduced in the Legislative Council I understand there was no flexibility in the clause, but fortunately it has been amended to provide that the qualified engineer may be employed full-time, part-time or in a consultative capacity.

Mr. Clark: They are not easy to obtain.

Mr. LOVEDAY: That is so. The clause was also amended to make it possible for the Minister to exempt a council from this provision if he deemed it expedient. The flexibility provided by the amendment is important, because not only are qualified engineers difficult to obtain, but councils have different methods of dealing with engineering problems. In view of the difficulty of obtaining engineers, without that amendment the position could have arisen where a council could not have complied with the provision. Many councils can cope with their engineering problems effectively by employing a consulting engineer rather than by employing one part-time or full-time. The employment of a full-time engineer is expensive and councils will be pleased to be able to handle this matter in accordance with whatever means suit their circumstances.

Clauses 8, 9 and 12 enable ratepayers to be given more information about the basis of assessment in their areas, and do not require much elaboration. Clause 17 makes special provision for urban farmlands, and there are consequential clauses to enable the Governor, by proclamation, to exempt any specified municipality from the usual provisions of the Act

regarding urban farmlands. I understand that this has special reference to the position at Renmark. I propose, in Committee, to move to delete the reference to "proclamation" and to insert "regulation" so that Parliament can supervise the matter. There is no reason why Parliament should not have the right to do so. The clause is obviously necessary to meet the special requirements of Renmark and possibly other areas later.

Clauses 15 and 16 cut administrative costs and enable a council to declare a rate either before or after or at the time of giving the assessment notices. At present it is not possible to do that, but under the Bill it will be possible for notices of assessments and rates to be posted out simultaneously. With postage rates as they are this will represent a gratifying saving to councils. The principal Act, whilst making provision for councils to spend money for pension funds and retiring allowances for employees, has no provision for benefits to dependants. This is being remedied by clauses 19 and 20. This is desirable because dependants of employees do need and should get some provision to enable their cases to be considered by councils.

Up to the present only municipal bodies have had the power to control public stands for vehicles plying for hire and the Bill proposes to extend that power to district councils. In view of the increased number of vehicles on the roads there is no doubt that this is desirable. A similar clause extends the present provisions regarding prohibited areas to councils as well as to municipalities, obviously for similar reasons. Another amendment will permit councils to lease park lands, recreation grounds or ovals directly to sporting bodies or clubs instead of restricting the leasing, as at present, to individuals. This will facilitate the actions of councils in this regard.

At present private hospitals and maternity homes can only be established in a municipality subject to certain conditions laid down in the Act. It is proposed to bring rest homes within the scope of this control. The present maximum penalty of £10 for using an unlicensed slaughterhouse has been found to be insufficient and it is proposed to increase this to £50, which will be regarded by the councils as much more realistic and will help deter the use of unlicensed slaughterhouses.

Councils, at present, have to retain unsightly chattels or structures for an indefinite period after removal and it is proposed to give councils the power to dispose of these. This matter has been considered by the Municipal Association frequently, and the difficulty of dealing with these chattels has been an embarrassment to councils. This is a desirable amendment. Under clause 29 councils will be empowered to regulate the speed of motor vehicles on a foreshore or part of a foreshore. This is desirable in view of the prevalence of speeding in these localities—a practice not only dangerous, but which causes great inconvenience to people using the foreshores. At Whyalla there has been a tendency for a few young people to use the foreshore as a speeding area to try their hand at performing acts that are dangerous and inconvenient to others in the area. This provision will be welcomed by the councils. District councils will be empowered, by clause 31, to regulate the hours during which footways in front of buildings may be cleaned. It seems desirable from the viewpoint of convenience to passers-by that this should be regulated. The Bill seems satisfactory to councils generally and it fulfils many of their requests. I support it.

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore): I desire to refer briefly to two clauses. Clause 26 controls rest homes and brings their control into line with the controls exercised over private hospitals and maternity homes. There are three rest homes in Semaphore, and I commend the matrons of those homes for the excellent services they render to the aged inmates therein. However, a year or so ago some shocking cases of bad treatment to old people by those conducting poor types of rest homes were publicized. The proposed amendment is sound and recognizes that there should be some supervision over the conduct of rest homes. Rest homes need specialized supervision, because old people are involved. Those who take on this work—matrons, sisters and nurses—are specialized and possess a kindly nature and understand old folk. This is important to people who are ill or incurable and to whom a kind word of encouragement is important.

The only complaint I have is that, although many people desire to enter these homes, they are not able to do so because of financial stringency. Some, of course, pay 9d. a week under an insurance scheme and receive a few pounds a week in hospital benefits. Some do not even do that, however, and when they have to go into homes because their relatives cannot care for them the relatives find that the expense is a burden. Although old people who go into these homes receive some Commonwealth aid, some assistance from sons and daughters is also necessary and in many cases

imposes a burden on them. I hope that in years to come the Commonwealth Government will introduce some scheme so that people in the eve of their lives will receive some financial aid and their relatives will not be burdened.

Clause 29 gives councils power to regulate speeds of motor boats along foreshores. This has been a rather contentious matter for many years because of the advent of fast motor boats, particularly on the foreshore and in the Port River, where some of the fastest motor boats in the world participate in regattas. I pay a tribute to the club in the district for the way in which it endeavours to control these boats. It is common on some week-ends to see as many as 10,000 people at Snowden Beach witnessing the feats of some of these motor boats, which could take their place in world-wide competition. However, as in other walks of life, minorities abuse privileges, and some near misses have been brought to my notice by sailing and swimming clubs which have complained that motor boats have gone near the foreshore at an excessive and dangerous speed. Therefore, I am glad that this Bill gives councils power to curb excessive speed along foreshores. These boats use the beaches from Outer Harbour 30 or 40 miles south. Before making a by-law, however, councils are bound to approach the Harbors Board to see if it will agree with it. I suppose there should be some co-operation between the board and councils, but I think councils are conversant with the requirements and will be able to implement by-laws without needing to go to the board. I may be wrong, but I think it is unnecessary for the board to be brought into the matter. I support the second reading.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I am concerned particularly with one clause, as it relates to my district. When explaining the Bill, the Minister said:

Clause 3 of the Bill inserts a special section (9a) into the principal Act which will enable the district council of Salisbury to present a petition for the district to be constituted as a municipality and for its division into wards, for the municipality to be declared to be a city, and for the provisions of Part IV of the Act (which deals with aldermen) to be applied. The new clause will empower His Excellency the Governor in respect of any such petition to exercise any of the powers conferred by subsection (1) of section 7 of the principal Act (the general powers of the Governor in relation to the constitution, etc., of areas), section 48 (assigning the name of "city" to the area) and sections 74 (2) and 76 (regarding aldermen). It is further provided that subsection (3) of section 7 (which requires the area of a municipality to be occupied mainly for urban purposes) is not to apply. Honourable members are aware of the position in the area concerned and I should say that, following discussions with the Government, the council recently passed a resolution accepting the offer of the Government for the necessary amendment to the principal Act to deal with this matter.

The Minister said that members were aware of the position, but I am not sure that they were. Also, as I understand that an invitation has recently been issued to all South Australian Senate members, all Legislative Council members, all candidates for the Commonwealth Division of Bonython, and all State members of Parliament to attend what amounts to a protest meeting at Elizabeth on this matter, I shall try to give a dispassionate, non-political and, if possible, unbiased picture of the events leading up to this amendment. At the outset, I point out that this is not a political issue; it never has been. If I may be so bold, I take some little credit (which may not be regarded as warranted in some quarters) that this movement for severance, of which this amendment is really the direct result, has never become a political issue.

I remind members that the town of Elizabeth has from the outset been widely spoken of as the "city of tomorrow", and I ask members to note the word "city". I believe this has been done with a good deal of justification. I know that both here and overseas, ever since the building of Elizabeth commenced in, I think, September, 1954, and since the Premier announced on November 15, 1955, that it would be named Elizabeth, it has been referred to as a city. The population of the area is now well over 20,000; although I am subject to correction, I think it is 23,000 or 24,000 and, as members well know, it has been planned for a population exceeding 50,000. In speeches and brochures it has always been visualized that eventually it will be a city. I have before me some brochures published by the South Australian Housing Trust as illustrative of the benefits that will accrue to people who go to live at Elizabeth. I have before me some brochures which I know I am not permitted to exhibit. However, I shall quote from them. One nicely decorated, coloured brochure states:

Build your future in Elizabeth, a prosperous, progressive city in a rapidly expanding State—South Australia.

Again, a comprehensive, roneoed booklet issued by the Housing Trust has inscribed on the front cover the words *The New City of Elizabeth.* The last sentence on the last page of that booklet states:

The new town of Elizabeth is being built on an almost treeless plain, but within a few years it will become a garden city.

I draw members' attention to the fact that Elizabeth from the beginning has been envisioned as the city of the future. Such publicity has been distributed overseas, and I believe it has had the effect of increasing the inducement to many people from the United Kingdom to come to South Australia. It has been good and well presented propaganda, and I am not criticizing it. However, I point out that before they came here many people were led to believe that Elizabeth was to be a city and from the beginning they naturally envisioned it as such. A natural expectation therefore has grown up, and with it there has been a desire by many inhabitants that Elizabeth should be a completely separate entity and a city in its own right.

At present, as most honourable members know, Elizabeth is part of the Salisbury district council. Because of the growth of Elizabeth, the council has had a colossal job to carry out. Members will appreciate that. I believe that the council has tackled this job manfully. After all, the old town of Salisbury was surrounded by largely rural areas, and now it has been changed to a town almost completely of an urban nature. Members can well imagine the problems that have been associated with the rapid growth that has taken place since 1955. There has been a huge expansion of houses and, of course, ratepayers; a consequent very large expansion of council staff, buildings and equipment, and of revenue to the council; an increasingly large amount of work and problems which are always associated with such a development; and, of course, a greatly increased expenditure in the cost of local government.

There is sometimes a tendency to forget the great development that has taken place around and to the south of Salisbury, which development, I must admit, probably is consequent upon the development of Elizabeth. In 1956 or 1957 the Salisbury district council saw fit to petition the Government for the area to be declared a municipality, but the petition was not granted because the Government took the view that the area did not comply with the conditions laid down in the Local Government Act, section 7 (3) of which states:

No district shall be constituted a municipality unless the Government is satisfied that the portion of the State comprised within the district is occupied mainly for residential, business, industrial or manufacturing purposes, or any one or more of those purposes.

I believe the Government's decision was correct. However, I am sure members will readily appreciate that since 1957, following the Housing Trust's building in Elizabeth and Salisbury North and the greatly increased private subdivision and building activity in the Salisbury and Pooraka areas, the district has almost completely changed its character. There was a time when it was mainly rural, but now there is no doubt that it is mainly urban and that in the immediate years to come it will be practically completely urban in character.

I believe the genesis of this amendment has been the active move in Elizabeth for severance from the Salisbury district council. This movement was largely begun by the various progress associations, of which there are a number in the various neighbourhood areas. Let me say that I commend the work that has been done by these associations and also by a kindred organization in that area—the Ratepayers' Association. The procedure is that delegates go from the various progress associations to what is known as the Elizabeth Progress Council, at which meetings matters for the good of Elizabeth are debated. I take this opportunity to commend the activities over the past few years of the Elizabeth Progress Council. I publicly acknowledge the debt I owe it because matters it has brought to me have enabled me in many instances to assist the people in that area. By bringing matters before me that would otherwise have escaped my notice, it has helped me to help the people of Elizabeth.

I have already mentioned that many residents of Elizabeth have gone there with the idea that Elizabeth would eventually be a city. A few years ago investigations were made into the possibility of severance from the Salisbury district council. Months of work went into this move, and voluminous material was gathered. Early in the piece the people behind the move consulted Mr. Vernon Shephard (former Town Clerk of the Corporation of West Torrens) who, I believe, would be acknowledged as an authority on local government affairs in this State. Eventually a petition was drawn up for presentation to the Government seeking severance. I am not sure how many people signed this petition, but it was many thousands. As the member for the district, I was asked by the representatives of the progress council to introduce the petitioners to the Minister of Local Government, and I readily agreed to do so.

May I say at this juncture that in connection with the severance of Elizabeth I have at all times attempted to adopt an impartial attitude. I had the feeling that, if I came out strongly favouring or strongly opposing severance, it might, as is often the case when a member of Parliament represents not only his district but also a political Party in the House, have been regarded immediately as a political issue, and, if I had adopted a firm attitude either one way or the other, it could have influenced supporters or opponents of the movement. So I have endeavoured at all times in the interests of my constituents, some of whom support the movement and some of whom do not, to make it plain publicly that I have adopted an attitude of impartiality. I have never expressed an opinion publicly on this matter. I have discussed it privately with hundreds of constituents in the area but have never taken a stand on it one way or the other, lest it might be construed as a political movement.

So, when I was asked to present the petition to the Minister, I was happy to do so as member for the district. I know that many worthy citizens supported severance, and others just as worthy opposed it. I know also that some were lukewarm; some believed in severance but were not sure whether this was the time to have it or whether it should come later. But thousands of people in Elizabeth signed the petition seeking severance from the Salisbury District Council. This petition, in accordance with the Act, was presented to the Minister for his consideration.

Some time later, a counter-petition was organized, mainly by the Salisbury District Council itself because at that time a majority of the council opposed the severance of Elizabeth from the Salisbury District Council. Had I been asked, I should have been happy, in my capacity as member for the district, to present the counter-petitioners to the Government, but possibly because the council thought, as I had presented the petitioners on the severance issue, that I might be a supporter of severance (though when I presented the petitioners to the Minister of Local Government, Mr. Jude, I stated plainly to them and to the Minister that I was doing it as the member for the district), it apparently at that time took it for granted that I might be a supporter of severance and it requested the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), who represents a portion of this area (not the Elizabeth portion), to introduce the deputation. I hold no grudge over that.

Councils change from time to time. Later, some new councillors were elected, which changed the constitution of the council and its attitude towards severance. At the time of the hearing, under certain conditions the Salisbury District Council was prepared to support the severance of Elizabeth from Salisbury. The Government appointed Mr. L. F. Johnston, S.M., to take evidence for and against severance. He made an exhaustive inquiry into the matter. I do not want to take up the time of the House with the lengthy report he made but, in short, he said, "I consider that the prayer of the petition should not be granted"—of course, giving his reasons.

During the course of this severance inquiry, one of the most important, and certainly one of the most influential, witnesses who opposed the severance was the Chairman of the South Australian Housing Trust (Mr. Cartledge). It will readily be recognized by members that Mr. Cartledge represents the greatest landlord in the area—the Housing Trust. I will mention three points raised by Mr. Cartledge in his evidence when he opposed the severance of Elizabeth from the Salisbury District Council. He was representing the Housing Trust.

First, he said that the trust did not consider that the local government as at present constituted did justice to Elizabeth. Secondly, he said that the effect of severance would be to weaken Elizabeth. I can assure members that those two statements are not paradoxical because, with the great growth of numbers in Elizabeth, for the present set-up to be effective Elizabeth should be entitled to more representatives on the council. Members will realize that the possibility of increased numbers from Elizabeth would affect the Salisbury part of the area.

Thirdly—I want members to note this particularly—Mr. Cartledge specifically mentioned that, in his opinion, the area should be constituted a municipality. He went on to say that he felt the Government would be prepared to introduce legislation to provide for this. That was his evidence as Chairman of the Housing Trust. Mr. Johnston's report went to the Government and later, after Cabinet had studied it in detail, the Premier announced that severance was not recommended but that the Government felt that some action should be taken. He went on to say that the area's population already warranted the creation of a new city. The Government then asked Mr. Cartledge, not as Chairman of the Housing

Trust but as a representative of the Government, to act on behalf of the Government, negotiate with the Salisbury District Council, and place certain matters before it relative to the area's becoming a municipality or a city. The Salisbury District Council, after a keen debate, by a majority of one agreed to do this. The proposals suggested to the council are those contained in this amendment. I do not want to be misunderstood when I say that these are the very proposals that Mr. Cartledge, as Chairman of the Housing Trust, had foreshadowed in the course of his evidence to the severance inquiry.

In what I am about to say, I make it plain that I am not reflecting on Mr. Cartledge. In fact, with the Leader of the Opposition, I attended the official opening by the Premier on Friday of two new factories in the Elizabeth area, where we were entertained right royally, and I had the opportunity then of being in the company of both Mr. Cartledge and Mr. Gilchrist (Chairman of the Salisbury District Council). I took the opportunity of politely saying then to Mr. Cartledge what I am saying now: that I sincerely believe it was an error of judgment on the part of the Government to appoint Mr. Cartledge, as the very amendments he was suggesting were also the evidence he put forward as the views of the Housing Trust at the severance inquiry. Many people in Salisbury and Elizabeth believe, as a result of this, that when Mr. Cartledge gave evidence at the severance inquiry he was the spokesman of the Government. After all, when one regards the facts as I have dispassionately given them, there can be some justification for so thinking. I believe this is the root cause for most of the dissatisfaction now existing in the area on the issue. Many believe that the creation of a municipality will weaken the numerical strength of Salisbury's council representation and so be detrimental to Salisbury. I know, too, that many Elizabeth people believe that the creation of a municipality will deny Elizabeth city status in its own right, which they have always been led to believe could be expected.

Thousands signed the petition for severance. This amendment does not, as I see it, make it obligatory for the Salisbury council to petition for the status of a municipality or city; it merely gives it the right to do so. In fact I know that after this Bill has been passed this matter will be keenly debated in the Salisbury District Council. Some councillors could well be placed in an awkward position. In view of the general dissatisfaction I earnestly believe that it would be wise to take a poll of the ratepayers on this issue. If Salisbury and Elizabeth become a municipality or a city following this amendment, can the Minister say whether they can eventually be severed into two separate entities? With the growth of both towns it is obvious that in a few years severance will be inevitable. Just when that will be, only time can tell. There is enormous development south of Salisbury and around its perimeter. Before many years pass I believe we will see a city of Elizabeth and a city of Salisbury, both completely warranted. I have endeavoured to try to paint an unbiased picture this afternoon.

I know that my constituents have varying views on this matter. The only democratic means of determining it is by a poll of ratepayers. A large population is already concentrated in this area and within a few years it will double. I look forward to the day when, because of this increased population, additional Parliamentary representation will be given to these people. I have yet to be convinced that this amendment is absolutely necessary. I believe that in view of the changed character of the area since 1957, when a prior attempt was made to obtain municipal status, such status could have been granted without this amendment. I am prepared to support the amendment only if the Minister is prepared to give an assurance that if the Salisbury council petitions to become a municipality or have city status and it is granted, such action will not preclude the eventual separation of the two towns into separate municipalities or cities. I support the Bill in principle.

Mr. JENKINS (Stirling): Several of the amendments embodied in the Bill validate what several councils have been doing for many years. For example, by clauses 19 and 20, councils will be empowered to expend revenue for superannuation purposes. Section 287 of the Act enables the expenditure of revenue for pension funds for officers or employees or for retiring benefits, and section 290 empowers councils to reserve funds for retiring allowances and for long service leave for officers or employees. I know that the municipalities and district councils in my district have made provision for superannuation purposes, and these amendments validate that action.

Clause 22 recognizes the growth of towns in many district council areas—towns that

once were insignificant—and will enable such councils to regulate and control public stands for vehicles plying for hire. Clause 23, for similar reasons, will apply the present provisions regarding the declaration of prohibited areas to district councils. It is necessary to extend those powers.

Clause 24 amends section 339 of the Act and increases the penalty from £10 to £20 that may be imposed for breaches of by-laws designed for the protection of works. Clause 26 provides that rest homes shall be controlled as are private hospitals and maternity homes. I understand that the member for Burnside was responsible for this amendment and I congratulate her. The Bill tightens and tidies the Act and will make its administration easier for councils. I support the second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I am concerned about the matter raised by the member for Gawler. There is a need to recognize that many of the people who founded Elizabeth came here from the United Kingdom. Much literature has been circulated in the United Kingdom, particularly in London, about the wonderful features of Elizabeth. It appears that Elizabeth, because of its newness, is about the only town in South Australia that is recognized, and, if it is not given the status of a city, these people will be disgruntled. On the other hand, if it is within the boundaries of the Salisbury District Council, how can we ignore what that council stands for? I think the people of Elizabeth are paying well for the amenities provided for them.

Mr. Shannon: They have paid for footpaths and kerbings.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I doubt whether they are paying as much as people in new parts of the metropolitan area, or even outside. It is well-known that the trust is paying 30s. a linear foot for roadmaking, and that that is added to the cost of purchase houses on a 30 or 35-year term, so they are paying for roadmaking. Last year amendments were to be introduced to the Town Planning Act, but the Bill was adjourned and we have not seen it since: why, I do not know. The council can charge 10s. a linear foot for kerbing and water tables, which are recognized to cost 8s. 6d. a lineal foot.

Mr. Hall: You are saying that people at Elizabeth get a better deal than those in the inner areas?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I cannot say whether they do or do not; all I am concerned about is what is happening in my area, about any section of which I can speak with authority. When the trust has made roads in new areas at the cost of new owners, councils, overburdened with other work, have not been able to construct footpaths, but the householders can still be held responsible for 10s. a foot for footpaths if they cost as much as that. After looking at some of the roads in new areas, I wonder what specifications are provided under the Town Planning Act. Why are we so fearful about these matters? Why must we impose a further hardship on newly-weds who are going to these new areas? I know that the trust constructs roads in areas where it builds houses for rental. Mitchell Park is one of the nicest suburban areas, and it was created by the trust, which has constructed roads, kerbs and water tables to make the area attractive, and people have responded. However, in new areas where houses for sale have been constructed, 30s. a foot has been charged yet there has been no guarantee about the construction of water tables and kerbing.

This Bill also provides that councils will have to indicate whether they will rate on annual rental or unimproved land values. I refer members to what has happened this year under the Land Tax Act Assessment Bill. A council working under unimproved land values has only to go to the Land Tax Department to obtain a figure on which to assess. Where land is bought for private schools or churches in new areas, although some of the area may be rated on unimproved land values, the body buying the land may not want to build immediately, and under this Bill it will be rated on unimproved values and the land regarded as broad acres. Surely other ratepayers of the area cannot be expected to pay extra to compensate for the loss of rating on this land? However, I do not think the Government will deny that it is desirable to provide for these schools, as we are still a Christian people, so it should assist, perhaps by helping councils to meet the loss on rating on these properties. These people will be burdened with a hardship. It is time that there was a complete review in the interests of religious organizations in the circumstances that I have mentioned.

The Minister of Education will know that some land was bought by his department, I believe for more than £70,000, and the owner was paying at the primary producer's rate for

his normal council rate, but in addition he was in a ward where the rate was much lower than in the more developed areas. This owner saved most of that amount for many years, and I think that the council should have been entitled to some compensation out of it. I consider that some of the rake-off that has been gained by owners who subdivided their land should go into a pool to meet some of the additional costs that have cropped up and so relieve those organizations which pay rates on land that has been used for the erection of independent schools or churches.

I am rather perturbed at the ever-increasing council rates that the average suburban dweller has been called upon to pay, whether his property is assessed on unimproved value or rental value. With water and sewer rates and other charges, such people would have to pay about £1 a week. On Anzac Highway one sees houses for sale every day of the week, and this is only because of the increased rates resulting from the last assessment. The owners of flats and such commercial buildings can no doubt meet these charges, but many private householders are suffering. Some of the roads put down in subdivisional areas will be a liability on the local council because suitable primary metal has not been used and as a result there are numerous potholes at corners, despite the fact that they are practically new roads. I have already given an indication of the hardship imposed in new subdivisions where the owners are charged so much per lineal foot for the roads. I have drawn the attention of the local council to this matter and asked it to re-examine the question. I am surprised that the Government has not seen fit to have the question of road moiety considered, because this matter is long overdue and should have received attention earlier.

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

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I regard the Local Government Act as one of the most important Acts on our Statute Book, and it is good to see the regularity with which the Government introduces amendments to it. Decentralized government is, in my opinion, the best form of government. Looking at the scene generally in Australia, we have a national Government which has been given certain powers essentially of a national character by the State Parliaments in matters of foreign affairs, defence, immigration, post and telegraph, taxation, and so on; it has been delegated these powers, the States retaining their sovereignty and in turn delegating powers to more localized forms of government which they themselves control. The States have their part to play in matters essentially surrounding the immediate welfare of their interests on a State-wide level.

The localized form of government, aptly named local government, is, I consider, a system of government which is destined to grow in importance in this State with the passing of time, and again I say how pleased I am to see a Government prepared to make more resilient the powers of local government. The very essence of local government is embodied in its name, and when I note what is being achieved in such things as road construction by local government authorities at a reasonably competitive price, I consider that it indicates efficiency beyond that which could be attained in many instances if the same work were done by any other authority. I hope that with the passing of time more moneys will be allotted to councils to do more work, because these councils conduct their affairs in a very efficient manner.

Mr. Millhouse: Where do you expect the money to come from?

Mr. LAUCKE: From central Government. There could be a greater allocation to councils, allowing them to do more work with the passing of time, and possibly at the loss of such work to a more central form of government.

Mr. Millhouse: What work are you speaking of?

Mr. LAUCKE: Road works—maintenance and so on.

Mr. Millhouse: They do that now.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, but I should like to see more of it done, for it tends to decentralize industry. When we find in a country town a local council with good equipment and allocated much work by the Highways Department, we have the nucleus of a local industry. The men who tend the roads in a given area know the area and its requirements, for they become permanently resident in that area.

Mr. Loveday: As a rule, if they have good equipment they can do it more cheaply, too.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, that has been my observation.

Mr. Millhouse: They have to buy the equipment, and that may be uneconomical.

Mr. LAUCKE: I think that a generous approach by the central or State Government would enable district councils and corporations

to really equip themselves with modern machinery. Bearing in mind that the councils' affairs are directed by a body of men who give voluntarily of their time and effort to secure the maximum benefit from a given outlay, I maintain that the system is good. The more it is encouraged through the provision of machines and finance, the better it will be for the taxpayers generally in matters such as road construction, maintenance and so on.

Mr. Millhouse: If the money is still coming from the central Government and not being collected locally, how are we to be better off?

Mr. LAUCKE: There would be a more efficient approach by men who give their services voluntarily. I have in mind the chairmen and councillors who devote all their time to the affairs of their particular areas.

Mr. Millhouse: The purchase of the necessary machinery may be uneconomical.

Mr. LAUCKE: No, it is often the case that when councils have a given minimum of machinery there is less duplication, because the Highways Department must have much machinery on hand for use here and there spasmodically, whereas if machinery is in the hands of certain localized bodies it is, in my opinion, put to fuller use.

Mr. Coumbe: Decentralization!

Mr. LAUCKE: Absolutely.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you think we can take decentralization too far?

Mr. LAUCKE: Not in the cases to which I have referred. When I began my remarks I was uttering a word of commendation to the Government for the close attention it gives to the changing pattern in local government requirements by consistently introducing amendments to meet the needs of changing time and circumstance. The provisions of this amending Bill are remedial, in most instances, as good legislation should be. Their overall aim is to facilitate local government, not to impede it, and in this atmosphere localized direction can remain robust and progressive. I cannot over-emphasize the need for the retention of local government in full bloom and vigour. Enabling legislation is of the utmost importance in ensuring not dictation but permission to local authorities to do certain things if they so desire. For example, clause 3 of this Bill makes special provision for the Salisbury District Council, if it so desires, to petition for the constitution of the district council of Salisbury as a municipality. I refer to that particular clause to emphasize my point that enabling amendments such as these are good things; they are not dictating, but rather enabling, should a local council so desire.

I pay a tribute to the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) for his excellent dissertation on the situation as it exists in the Salisbury-Elizabeth area. In his all-embracing speech he emphasized that these powers were enabling, to be taken if the council so desired, possibly following a poll of ratepayers. I took much heed of that excellent speech. Clause 5 is another remedial clause. It amends section 100, which prescribes the number of persons who may be qualified to vote by reference to values of ratable property. The scale of values has not been amended for 74 years, and it is good to see this amendment on the files.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't you think it should have been done long ago?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, but the huge increase in ratable values and assessments has taken place more in recent years, and the need is much more definite now than possibly it was a decade ago. This Bill provides for remedial action and brings valuations into line with present-day money values in connection with voting powers. Clauses 19 and 20 (*a*) empower councils to spend revenue in superannuating their employees, which is a long overdue matter. Excellent men work for councils and are entitled to superannuation benefits. It has been a sore point for some time amongst clerks who have given almost a lifetime of service in councils without getting such benefits. This is a bad state of affairs and I welcome the clause, which will remedy a bad omission in the past. I shall have the opportunity to speak on the various clauses in Committee, so will not refer to them now.

Mr. Millhouse: What do you think of the clause making it obligatory for a council to appoint a qualified engineer?

Mr. LAUCKE: I think it is a satisfactory direction because a council with a revenue of £100,000 is doing much work requiring the employment of a skilful engineer. It is not mandatory to engage a qualified engineer, because there is an escape clause, which is a good thing. Local government is being given a greater and better place in the sun. It is recognized, and the employment of a qualified engineer shows that the council is reaching a higher status. I hope there will be a flow of revenue into local government, because councils are becoming better qualified to handle it. I support the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I, too, support the Bill. I commend the member for Gawler for his speech on it. He is closer to the development of Elizabeth and the northern areas of Salisbury than I am. I appreciate his outline of the progress that has taken place there. I go a little farther than he does and support clause 3, because other aspects must be considered. For instance, there is the major problem of drainage of the area. To overcome it millions of pounds must be spent, especially as the area becomes more developed. In time Salisbury and Elizabeth may each become a city, but to deal with the existing problems in the area it is desirable to have one council. If there were one administrative unit, there would be one set of planning and a better opportunity to co-operate with Government departments in overcoming the drainage problem. Clause 33 seems to be a machinery matter but a comparison between the conditions of country seaside councils and those of the Adelaide City Council shows a distinction. In Adelaide we have the banks of the River Torrens and in the country there are foreshores. Stringent conditions are laid down about the expenditure of money obtained from the foreshores, but no direction is given to the Adelaide City Council on how to spend money obtained from leasing land along the River Torrens. The law should be applied evenly and the City Council should be brought into line with the country seaside councils. In Committee I shall move to have the clause amended.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill, which contains many welcome amendments. I was interested to hear the member for Gouger refer to clause 33, which deals with the Adelaide City Council area, part of which I have the honour to represent in the electorate of Torrens. It is a good provision, and anyone who talks about the usurpation of the park lands by the City Council must appreciate that Parliament must approve any lease before it is accepted. That is the present position with the Adelaide Oval which, as members know, is the subject of some controversy because both the South Australian Cricket Association and the National Football League are vying with each other to try to gain the lease of this fine oval.

Mr. Millhouse: Where do you stand on that?

Mr. COUMBE: I believe that before any lease can be executed the matter should come before this Parliament for approval. This clause carries on the good principle that, before any part of the park lands can be given over to an enclosure or any lease entered into, Parliament should have some say in it.

Earlier in this debate mention was made of engineers being employed by local government. That was raised by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) directing a question to the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke). It is laid down that any council that has a general rate income of £100,000 or more shall appoint an engineer as a full-time or part-time officer or in a consultative capacity. I think it is a good thing because those of us who have been in local government have observed that some small councils have been able to employ only an overseer for this work, which has not been properly done and has to be done again. A wonderful job has been done by many overseers, who in that capacity have carried the councils for many years. Many councils that some years ago were regarded as small are today up in the £100,000 bracket, and this clause provides that they shall appoint an engineer as a full-time or part-time officer or in a consultative capacity. I hope that the word "shall" does not mean that the council shall employ a person in a consultative capacity even if he is not used. I hope it means that, if a certain work requiring the services of an engineer comes up, the council shall employ a consulting engineer and not any person without the necessary qualifications. Although there are plenty of doctors and lawyers about, it is hard to get qualified engineers. Rather belatedly, the profession is getting some recognition. As a result of the professional engineers award, some councils are faced with the problem that, if they employ a full-time city engineer, his salary in some cases will exceed that of the town clerk. Some councils are perturbed about that aspect of it and are trying to get over this problem of employing an engineer full time; they are rather seeking to employ one part time. Generally speaking, I think it is a move in the right direction that a graduate engineer fully qualified under the regulations set out shall be employed on major engineering works involving drainage, road construction, and what have you, by councils whose ratable income exceeds £100,000.

Clause 28, dealing with unsightly goods and chattels, interests me. I remember the long debate in this House several years ago when this clause was written into the Act. At that time we had great difficulty in defining what was "unsightly goods and chattels". I have since had an opportunity to see how this section

of the Act has worked. It has not worked as well as we had hoped it would. There is in my district on the Main North Road in Prospect a prominent block of land that has caused endless trouble not only to the Prospect council but also to successive Ministers. A situation has arisen where a ratepayer has defied the council, which has been rather hamstrung. Under the provisions of the Act it has not, in the interests of the ratepayers, been able to deal with a most unsightly situation on probably the busiest metropolitan road in Adelaide—the Main North Road. Although this clause does not go as far as it should (and I have no solution because it is an awkward thing to define), I think that the council now has some way of being recompensed.

Mr. Loveday: Do you think that local government gets the consideration it should from the Government?

Mr. COUMBE: I do not say that this Government has agreed to every request that the Municipal Association has put up to it but I think it has agreed to every reasonable proposition. As regards unsightly goods and chattels, it means that the councils can now legally dispose of the goods and chattels taken off properties under this Bill. Previously, it was rather vague, and they could only get compensation or repayment after recourse to the court itself. I shall have something further to say in Committee. I commend the Government for accepting and bringing in these amendments, which I know have been sought by the Municipal Association and the Local Government Association.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): It is a pity that some representatives of local government have not been present in the galleries this afternoon and this evening during the discussion of this Bill, because I am sure they would have been gratified to hear the nice compliments paid to them. As is the case with many other members of this House, I have the honour of representing two full municipalities within my own electorate, and a portion of the City of Kensington and Norwood. I am happy to say that my relations with these municipalities are most cordial. In fact, this evening I have, with the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), had the honour of being a guest at a reception given by the mayor, mayoress and councillors of the smallest municipality in the State—the Walkerville council. It was pleasant to meet there the councillors of that municipality and be associated with the people in the district who are giving service within that community.

I want to make one comment on the Bill, and it applies mostly to clause 26. I am pleased that this clause is included in the Bill. Prior to the introduction of this Bill to amend the Local Government Act, the Health Act required that private hospitals, maternity homes and rest homes be licensed by local boards of health, but the powers of municipal councils in this matter were restricted to the control and establishment of private hospitals and maternity homes. Under section 550 of the principal Act notice of intention to establish private hospitals and maternity homes has to be given to the council and a legible copy of the notice has to be exhibited prominently on the site so that owners or occupiers of ratable property can present a petition to the council within six weeks praying that the hospital or home be prohibited, and if no objection is received and the council has no grounds for objection the hospital or maternity home may be established subject to licensing under the Health Act.

The desirability of including rest homes in this section was drawn to my attention by the Burnside City Council. The council desired the words "or rest home" to be added after the words "private hospital or maternity home" in order that prior notice should be given to the council and adjoining owners of the intention to establish a rest home, as is required for private hospitals and maternity homes. When this was brought to my notice I went to see the Minister of Health and discussed the matter with him and with the Minister of Local Government. At the suggestion of these Ministers an appointment was arranged for me to discuss the matter with the Director-General of Public Health, Dr. Woodruff, and this I did. He had, in the meantime, looked at this matter and discussed it with the Burnside council, with the result that everyone agreed that this was a desirable amendment and it was put through in time for it to be introduced with the other amendments by the Minister of Local Government in the Legislative Council. I am certain that this amendment will meet with the general approval of all councils. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause dealing with the remission of rates.

I trust that this motion will receive the support of most members because this will be our only opportunity this session to discuss an amendment of this nature. I do not think it can be

suggested that we have too much business on our plate, which would prevent this amendment from being discussed. When we adjourned for dinner, as far as one could ascertain, only one more member was to speak on this Bill, but since then four members have spoken, which indicates that the House does not seem to be pressed for time. The member for Barossa has said that local government is a most important matter, that it should be discussed from every angle and that nothing should go by without proper attention. My amendment is not trivial, but is important to many people.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): At this stage of the session we obviously cannot open up the whole of the Local Government Act for discussion and I ask members to oppose the motion.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (12).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hughes, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday (teller), Ralston, Riches, Ryan, and Tapping.

Noes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Hall, and Harding, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. Jenkins, King, Laucke, Millhouse, Nankivell, Nicholson, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), and Mr. Shannon.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Casey, Hutchens, McKee, Frank Walsh, and Fred Walsh. Noes—Messrs. Brookman, Dunnage, Heaslip, and Pattinson, and Mrs. Steele.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Special provision for Salisbury District Council."

Mr. CLARK: I believe I am correct in assuming that, if the Salisbury District Council petitions that the district be made a municipality and if that request is granted, that will not at some future date debar the area from once again asking for severance.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I think the honourable member is correct in his assumption. I believe the authority could take appropriate action on future occasions.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Amendment of principal Act, section 244a."

Mr. LOVEDAY: I move:

After "by" in new subsection (3) to strike out "proclamation" and insert "regulation". If this amendment is accepted I have a consequential amendment in the same subsection. Clause 17 enables the Governor, by proclamation, to exempt a municipality from the provisions of the Act relating to urban farm lands. The purpose of the amendment is to alter the method from a proclamation by the Governor to a regulation so that the matter may come under the oversight of this House. If it be argued that this would cause undesirable delay I point out that, if there were a desire on the part of a municipality to be exempt, a regulation would come into force as soon as it was gazetted. It would lie on the table of the House for 14 days and then be referred to the Subordinate Legislation Committee. I believe it has been said that such a procedure might take nine months. However, all our legislation is subject to alteration by Parliament every 12 months or so; therefore, that is no barrier to my suggestion. A regulation is not likely to be made without due consideration, and a later recommendation for its disallowance is highly improbable. My amendment would keep the matter under Parliamentary control and surveillance. It has also been suggested elsewhere that this implies lack of confidence in local government. That argument cannot be sustained, because it simply means that a decision involving an important departure from the provisions of the Act would come under the surveillance of Parliament, which is a safeguard and a desirable procedure. It does not imply any lack of confidence in local government.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This matter has pros and cons, but I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment. There does not seem to be any very serious reason for the amendment and it could cause local governing bodies considerable embarrassment. A regulation might be made and it could wait until the House had been in session for a period before the council could be sure that its regulations would have force and effect. In the meantime the council might have made its assessment and sent out its accounts. If it could be argued in rebuttal of that comment that it would be infrequent, if not unheard of, for Parliament to disallow such a regulation, there is no virtue in having a regulation at all. It would be much better for the matter to be done by proclamation as the Bill provides. In that case the municipality knows where it is and goes ahead in the usual way. In actual practice the Governor certainly would not make a proclamation unless it had been requested by a council, which would therefore have the initiative in its hands. A request having been made and considered by the

Governor in Council, the proclamation would be made if in the opinion of the Governor it should be made. The matter would rest there and the council would proceed with its assessments in the ordinary way. I do not think it is adding to or taking anything from councils if this is dealt with by regulation.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What would be the position if assessments had been issued and the regulation were subsequently disallowed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It would be difficult if the council had received money to which it was not entitled, or if it waited for 12 months before issuing an assessment under the new standard. I suggest that the amendment is of no benefit to councils; instead, it could have bad effects on them.

Mr. RICHES: I hope the Committee will support the amendment. I think Parliament made a mistake when it provided for this to be done by proclamation. As long as there has been local government, principles of assessments and rating have been laid down, but to get around them the Government has in certain circumstances provided this differential system of assessment on urban lands. Apparently that has got the Government and local government into difficulty, and the Government now wants to get around it by giving the Governor power to exempt some municipalities from complying with the Act in this regard. This is an extraordinary set of circumstances; it is a most peculiar way to delegate powers to local government, and is most unsatisfactory. It would be in keeping with the principles if this provision were removed altogether. If there is a case for excluding some municipalities from this part of the Act, Parliament should examine it. Under the proclamation some municipalities are exempted from the provisions of the Act. If a municipality wants to be exempted there is no reason why this should not be done by regulation so that it can be examined by Parliament in the ordinary way. Parliament gives councils the right to make by-laws and hands over to them certain powers, but this is an entirely different matter.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (11).—Messrs. Bywaters, Clark, Dunstan, Hughes, Jennings, Lawn, Loveday (teller), Ralston, Riches, Ryan, and Tapping.

Noes (12).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, and Hall, Sir Cecil Hincks, Messrs. King, Laucke, Millhouse, Nankivell, Nicholson, and Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, and Mr. Shannon.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Hutchens, Fred Walsh, Casey, McKee, Frank Walsh, and Corcoran. Noes—Messrs. Brookman, Heaslip, Dunnage, Pattinson, and Harding, and Mrs. Steele.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—"Amendment of principal Act, section 666b."

Mr. RALSTON: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(2) Subsection (8) of the said section 666b is amended by striking out the words "which is unfit for use" where they occur in paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) thereof.

The reason for the amendment is because of what is happening with this section. Legal action has taken place between councils and owners of property on which there have been accumulations of trucks, cars and unsightly chattels. The councils have endeavoured to do something about their removal, but on all occasions where legal action was taken it has failed because the defendants have pleaded the defence that some part of the unsightly chattel still had some use. There should be a right to remove these unsightly chattels to protect the value of surrounding properties by compelling the owners to have them removed. My amendment does not give councils a determining right. The matter would still have to go before the court if the person who had received the notice desired to have it determined by the court.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: While the Government sympathizes with the desire of the honourable member to assist councils to have unsightly chattels cleared away from a place where they can be seen by the public, I think that on examination of the amendment the Committee will appreciate that it is far-reaching. Subsection (8) of section 666b defines "chattel" and it lays down the procedure for giving notice to the court for the removal of chattels. If the amendment were carried subsection (8) would read "In this section, chattel means (*a*) any vehicle or machinery; (*b*) any article of furniture." That strikes at the meaning of the word "chattel". The question of the removal of unsightly chattels was debated in Parliament not long ago and much discussion was involved in defining "chattel". I consider it would be unfair to the owner of premises which happened to be in a street or on the fringe of a town where the owner was involved in business

and he was prevented from parking his vehicles on his own land adjacent to his house. Anyone in business who owns a motor car could park it in front of or at the side of his house or wherever he desired, and it would not be considered to be unsightly unless it was a "bomb" of very old vintage. If a person were in business which involved the use of machinery, whatever its condition, it could be claimed by the council that it was a "chattel". This is a definition of "chattel" and not "unsightly". The amendment seeks to define the meaning of "chattel" and removes the qualification of the word which I think is desirable to define an unsightly chattel. This amendment goes far beyond that concept of the definition and includes any article of machinery or furniture. Whatever it may be, it comes up for scrutiny as a chattel.

Mr. Riches: Read the rest of it.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That is all there is to it. That is the definition of the term, and it would be applicable to every other section. The argument that has been advanced is illogical. If the other sections protect the definition, why do we need to consider this matter at all?

Mr. Riches: Because it nullifies all the other sections.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Then there is a very good reason for preserving the original intention. If this section is of no meaning, there is no point in the amendment; if it is of meaning, then I think we should preserve the definition that has already been established. I am satisfied that there would be much trouble in the administration of the section if it were amended as proposed, and I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Minister's reply to the argument put forward by the member for Mount Gambier is extremely weak. The definition section in section 666b is one which in these two subsections of that part of the section renders the section well nigh useless. Let me take an instance which occurred in my district only last week. As I was in the course of visiting my constituents a lady complained bitterly because a young man who was occupying premises next door to her—the lady's premises were satisfactory, valuable, and well-kept—had bought an old "bomb" of a car and parked it on his front lawn in full sight of his neighbours. It was extremely unsightly. However, it could not be said that it was unfit for use; he was in the course of doing it up, so under this section he could not be made to remove it. The local board of health could not have it removed because it could not be said to be creating an insanitary condition. The result was that there was this extremely unsightly thing, definitely prejudicial to the people in the area, and obviously affecting the values of their properties, because anyone who came there with the idea of buying a house would see this old car next door and would lose interest in the adjoining property. Yet the Minister says, "That is all right; that has to be left there, and these people whose property values are affected in this way are to have no redress at all."

I do not think that is reasonable. I think every protection is given in the remaining subsections of this section. The amendment of the member for Mount Gambier merely takes out from the definition of "chattel" the words "which is unfit for use." That means that any vehicle or machinery or any article of furniture is a chattel. That is the ordinary law, anyway. Let us see what happens with the rest of the section, which reads:

> If the council is of opinion that any chattel or structure upon any land within the municipality or any township within the district is unsightly and that its presence is likely to affect adversely the value of adjoining land—

this is not just parking a car in front of one's property—

> or be prejudicial to the interests of the public, the council may give notice in writing to the owner or occupier of the land to remove the chattel or structure from the land.
>
> If the notice is duly given, then the owner or occupier can appeal to the local court against the notice of the council. He has every protection in the world, so there cannot be any arbitrary action taken regarding those vehicles.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What would be his grounds of appeal?

Mr. DUNSTAN: That the chattel is not unsightly, that it is not prejudicial to the interests of the public, and that its presence is not likely to affect adversely the value of adjoining land.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I venture to say that is not his ground of appeal. He has to appeal against the opinion of the council, and the ground for appeal, namely, that it was not unfit for use, is taken away by the honourable member's amendment.

Mr. DUNSTAN: No, it is not. The Premier is not reading the words of the section, and I suggest he does so before he gets so aerated, as evidently he is at the moment. If, as the Premier said, the appeal is against the opinion of the council, what is the opinion of the council? It is that any chattel or structure

upon the land within a municipality or any township within the district is unsightly and that its presence is likely to affect adversely the value of adjoining land or be prejudicial to the interests of the public. That is what the council has to be of the opinion that it is. That is what the section says.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The definition of "chattel" obviously is important.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course. The whole thing hinges on the definition of "chattel", because as things stand the council has to be able to show that the chattel is of no further use: that it is unfit for use.

Mr. Hall: In this amendment it is any vehicle or machinery.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, but the council then has to show that it is unsightly and that it is prejudicial to the interests of the public.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: No, it does not: it has only to express an opinion and serve notice; it does not have to prove anything.

Mr. DUNSTAN: But then there is an appeal against it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The owner has to establish to the contrary.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Section 666b (4) states:

> The local court shall hear and determine the appeal and shall consider whether the chattel or structure is unsightly and whether its presence is likely to affect adversely the value of adjoining land.

Therefore, the Minister is talking nonsense. A few seconds ago the Minister said that the only thing that the local court could consider was whether the notice had been served and whether the object was unfit for use.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Minister said that all the council had to do was to come to an opinion and serve a notice.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Exactly.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Then there is an appeal against it.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: On what grounds?

Mr. DUNSTAN: The ground of appeal is clearly set forth. A person can appeal against the order on the ground that the chattel is not unsightly, that it does not affect adversely the values of property, and that it is not prejudicial to the public, and the local court shall determine these matters. That is provided specifically in subsection (4), which I quoted a moment ago.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The owner has to go to the court and establish all those things. All the council has to do is express an opinion and make an order.

Mr. DUNSTAN: We have heard eulogies during the debate upon this Bill. Member after member on the other side got up only a short time ago and said what a wonderful job local government was doing, how responsible it was to its ratepayers, how it kept in close touch with them, and what a good job it did in that way, yet now they say, "They are going to get down on every person around the place and deal with them in this unsatisfactory manner".

Mr. Coumbe: But you don't want local government. You believe in Greater Adelaide, don't you?

Mr. DUNSTAN: The member is drawing a red herring across the track. In the Minister's first statement on this subject he made it clear that he had not bothered to read the section carefully and his interjections since have made it clear that that was the position. The proposed definition of "chattel" is a perfectly normal definition, according to common law. In that case, why can we not consider the rest of the section which contains adequate safeguards? If the definition of "chattel" is left as it is, what redress has anyone in a case similar to the one I have mentioned?

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: None.

Mr. DUNSTAN: None whatsoever of protecting properties against action taken by a neighbour!

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I would not think that the owner of furniture had any redress.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Of course he has. In the instance I outlined there is redress in that, as a reasonable citizen, he should have had consideration for his neighbours. Why should a man put an extremely unsightly piece of machinery in his front garden and destroy the outlook of the people living around him?

Mr. Nankivell: If a man disapproved of his neighbour's putting a bed on the front verandah would that be an offence?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Does the honourable member consider that a council in his district would say that an article of furniture used as a bed on a front porch was an unsightly affair and destroyed the value of adjoining properties? If it did, does he consider the magistrate would not allow an appeal. The amendment is sensible and I commend it to the Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Norwood is often plausible and he did his best on this occasion, but if we look at section 666b (8) we see that what he said was demonstrably false. Paragraphs (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) refer to something that is normally regarded

as unsightly, unpleasant or useless. Paragraph (*c*) refers to a packing case, tin, drum, carton, box or other container, and paragraph (*d*) refers to rubbish or debris. As the subsection stands paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) are in the same category as they deal with things unfit for use. The amendment would make (*a*) and (*b*) deal with ordinary useful things, but (*c*) and (*d*) would be left as they are. That is a fallacy. We have these four sets of impedimenta that are unpleasant or unsightly, and the honourable member would destroy half of that. I am prepared to believe that this subsection may be a little restrictive and that perhaps it would be wise to widen it slightly, but the amendment widens it far too much.

The member for Norwood spoke about the old "bomb" in the front of the house next door, but if the amendment were carried it could be a good car left in a dirty condition. I do not believe that property owners should be put to the trouble of complying with section 666b. The member for Norwood suggests that it should be done, and he and I as members of the legal profession would reap some benefit from it if it were done, but as members of Parliament we should not allow people to be placed in such an oppressive position as would be created if the amendment were carried.

Mr. RICHES: The provision arose from the difficulty that all councils experience in dealing with people who clutter up land in township areas to the detriment of people living nearby. There was no power for councils to order the removal of unsightly chattels and structures. It was only after repeated requests by local government that the provision was included. Will the member for Mitcham deny that before any council can take action it must satisfy itself, and be prepared to satisfy a court, that the chattel or structure is unsightly and that its presence is likely to adversely affect the value of adjoining land? Unless it can be shown that the presence of these chattels, whether completely unfit for use or not, is prejudicial to the public and adversely affects the value of adjoining land, the council has no case and can take no action. If they do adversely affect the value of adjoining land is it not reasonable to expect that the council should protect the ratepayers?

Mr. Ryan: Who would be the best judge of that? The council?

Mr. RICHES: The council would not be the judge. The final judge would be the court. The council has to be first satisfied that the presence of the rubbish adversely affects the value of the adjoining land, which is not easy to prove. If the council serves a notice on an owner he has the option of clearing away the rubbish, or within 28 days of appealing to the court against the council's decision because it adversely affects the value of the adjacent land. Then the court decides whether or not it does, ultimately. This is not regarded lightly by any municipality in the State. It has long been discussed at municipal meetings. This kind of thing has a serious effect on land values and assessments.

The whole purport of this provision has been stultified by the words defining "chattel". It has been tested in the courts and the courts have held that no action can be taken so long as the owner can show that the chattels are of some use, no matter how unsightly they may be or how long they may have been there. If anybody can show that they have some use, then the whole section is inoperative. That is what the Act says, not what the court thinks is a reasonable attitude to adopt. I commend the member for Mount Gambier for submitting this amendment. Nobody associated with local government treats this matter lightly. Anybody living in an area where this happens knows that the whole area can be affected. Those who have seen an action defeated in the court because of technicalities like this are not in the habit of going to court about it. When the Minister addressed himself to this matter, he overlooked the fact that the councils will have to prove, before any action can be taken at all, that the adjoining land has been affected. If the position was as stated by the Minister, I should support him. If a council by resolution could require anybody to remove agricultural machinery or vehicles, I should support that because we are just as jealous of guarding the rights of the ordinary citizen as any member opposite is.

Ordinarily, the value of land can be reckoned by its distance from the centre of the municipality. The most highly rated area is generally near the post office and, within half a mile of the post office, the value would be relatively the same. I know of areas where the value of the land is as much as 100 per cent higher than the value of similar land that has deteriorated in value because of this sort

of thing. I invite the Minister the next time he goes through Port Augusta to cast his eye on some vacant land at Port Augusta West where he will see cars referred to by members of the Port Augusta council as resembling the retreat from El Alamein. Thousands of them make a scrap heap on the main road. Because it can be argued that the axle or some part of these wretched vehicles may have some value, it is impossible to take action under this clause. That is not the only place where this occurs. It is a dumping place for cars from garages on valuable property. I hope the Committee will seriously consider this amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: To assist in achieving what the member for Mount Gambier wants, I suggest we could improve this clause by allowing subsection (8) to stand as it is in the parent Act and, in section 666b (8), instead of taking out the words "which is unfit for use", as proposed by the member for Mount Gambier, we should add to those words, in paragraph (*a*), the words "as a vehicle or machinery", and, in paragraph (*b*), the words "as an article of furniture". So that section 666b (8) (*a*) would then read:

any vehicle or machinery which is unfit for use as a vehicle or machinery,

and paragraph (*b*) would read:

any article of furniture which is unfit for use as an article of furniture.

If the honourable member will withdraw his amendment, I will then move accordingly as I have outlined.

Mr. RALSTON: I think the Committee is trying to produce something out of the section that will be workable and will endeavour to do something for local government that local government itself is finding it difficult to get under this section. I have been informed by my legal adviser, the member for Norwood, that the Minister's proposed amendment is a forward step and will achieve my objective. I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(2) Subsection (8) of the said section 666b is amended—

(*a*) by inserting after the words "which is unfit for use" in paragraph (*a*) thereof the words "as a vehicle or machinery";

(*b*) by inserting after the words "which is unfit for use" in paragraph (*b*) thereof the words "as an article of furniture".

The amendment is perfectly plain and I ask the Committee to accept it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 29 to 32 passed.

Clause 33—"Amendment of principal Act, section 865."

Mr. HALL: I move:

At the end of new subsection (3) to add the following proviso:

> "Provided that all rents received under any lease granted under this subsection shall be set apart by the said council and expended for the purpose of effecting improvements to the banks or shores of the River Torrens."

The proposed new subsection enables the Adelaide City Council to lease portions of land adjacent to the River Torrens for recreational purposes. This is a good provision, but the conditions applying to the Adelaide City Council are entirely different from those applying to country councils which lease portion of their foreshores for recreational purposes. Country councils that want to initiate recreational reserves on Crown lands are obliged to pay revenue from the leasing thereof to the Lands Department. If a council permits shacks to be erected on its foreshore and it charges £5 a year as the rental for a shack site, £3 must be paid to the Lands Department. If the rental is £10, it must pay 50 per cent to the Lands Department. Country councils which are anxious to improve their local amenities to attract tourists and to increase their facilities are restricted by this condition. If such a condition applies to them, why not to the Adelaide City Council? All revenue derived from leasing recreational areas adjacent to the River Torrens should be used in improving sections of the River Torrens. My amendment will ensure that that is done and that the River Torrens banks are further improved.

Mr. COUMBE: I cannot agree with all that has been said about this proviso, and I doubt whether the amendment would be effective. The amendment provides that money received by the Adelaide City Council from leases should be entirely devoted to further improvements on the banks of the River Torrens. The Bill provides that the council may enter into leases with certain bodies for the erection of boatsheds, landing stages and similar constructions and that such leases may be entered into for certain periods up to 50 years. The leases are subject to Parliamentary sanction before they become binding. Why does the City Council want leases? The leases are necessary to enable the council to further improve

the surroundings of the River Torrens for the people desiring to use the vicinity of the river and the improvements.

The comments of the member for Gouger are out of proportion because moneys received by the City Council from leases that could be diverted to improvements would be infinitesimal compared with the moneys spent in the last two or three years by the council. The council may receive £50 or £100 a year, but I suggest that in the last two or three years it has spent about £250,000. One striking example of the work done may be seen at Pinky Flat. Other works are the weir cafe and the second illuminated fountain (soon to be erected). The sheet piling near the zoo, and near the Albert bridge, cost about £100,000, whereas here we are talking about a piffling £50 or £100. The council built the new nine-hole pitch-and-putt golf course and is developing further areas in the west park lands including more lakes beyond the weir. The provision contained in the Bill is correct; the amendment should not be considered because it is unnecessary and out of proportion. Since Mr. Veale (Town Clerk), returned from his overseas visit he has recommended improvements to the council that will result in many improvements in the city and surroundings and these suggestions have met with much commendation from many people. The improvements have been continued. I oppose the amendment and support the clause.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Government does not consider that there is much merit in the amendment. The member for Gouger looks at the position from the point of view of equity, but the Committee should agree with the member for Torrens who fairly set out the work done by the Adelaide City Council to improve and beautify the foreshore along the river banks. He has fairly credited the council for the work it has done and, indeed, the council deserves the highest commendation for its activities in that direction. It would be unfortunate if this Committee carried an amendment that would tend to rather throw out of perspective the worth of the work the council has done compared with the slight revenues it must have received. I suggest that the amendment be not accepted.

Mr. HALL: I see the good sense of the arguments of the member for Torrens and the Minister of Works. I raised this question to protest against what I consider is an unjust charge on country district councils in their provision of recreational sites. If I have convinced members that there is an injustice I am prepared to withdraw my amendment and I ask leave to do so.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. RICHES: The ordinary provisions of the Local Government Act in relation to leases are that Crown lands may be leased to public organizations for a period of 21 years after a meeting of ratepayers has signified approval. In this clause Parliament is embarking upon a totally different procedure in relation to the City of Adelaide. The council does not have to consult its ratepayers at all and there may be good reasons for that. It is as well to remember that we are substituting the scrutiny of the ratepayers by the scrutiny of Parliament. If the City Council had to obtain the consent of its ratepayers in connection with the leasing of portion of the River Torrens bank that would be cumbersome machinery. However, to lease land for 50 years is an important step. I do not object to the procedure because a safeguard is provided in that the lease will have to stand the scrutiny of Parliament. Is there any reason for extending the term from 21 years with right of renewal, as applies in all other cases, to this straight-out provision of 50 years? The draftsman must have had some reason, but it has not been given to Parliament. Does the Government intend that this could apply to other leases in other parts of the State? A period of 50 years is a long time to tie up the banks of the Torrens to a sporting body or school organization. Would not 21 years serve as well?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Section 865, which is a special section dealing with the Adelaide City Council and the River Torrens, deals with this matter. The clause is designed to allow the council to lease this land. In explaining the Bill, I said:

The present section 865 empowers the council to erect on those banks (or the parklands or any land under the control of the council), sheds, boathouses and the like, but only for the purpose of public use and recreation. The council from time to time receives applications from rowing clubs and the like either for a lease of a site for erection of their own boathouses or for the leasing of boathouses, to be erected by the council. Clause 30 will amend subsection (2) of section 865, by removing the limitation and this will enable the council to erect boathouses, etc., as it thinks fit. The clause adds a new subsection to section 865 which will empower the council to lease for a period of not more than 50 years either sites on which it has erected boathouses, etc., itself, or for the purposes of the erection of boathouses by the lessees for their own use.

I have no reason to advance for the long term, but this lease will be subject to the scrutiny of this House.

Mr. Shannon: Substantial improvements have been made, haven't they?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes, and the council may desire to extend the term of the lease to cover their cost. The safeguard is in the provision for Parliamentary approval. If, when leases were tabled, Parliament felt there was a good reason to reduce the period, it would have the right to review the matter, obtain the reasons of the council, and scrutinize those reasons.

Mr. LAWN: This clause will not apply to the Adelaide Oval, will it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think not. It refers to section 865, which deals with River Torrens improvements.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HOUSING AGREEMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ARTIFICIAL BREEDING BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.39 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 26, at 2 p.m.