HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, October 9, 1962.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: TICKERA RESERVES.

Mr. HUGHES presented a petition signed by 25 electors of the Tickera ward of the District Council of Bute and respectfully praying that action be taken to prevent the removal of trees and the cultivation of the reserve and vacant blocks in the township of Tickera.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS.

SPRINGBANK HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Recently, when I accompanied other interested people on an inspection of the Mitcham council area, a discussion arose about the name of the new high school to be built near the corner of Daw Road and Goodwood Road. Some time ago the Mitcham council asked the Postmaster-General's Department to apply the name Daw Park to the area that extends beyond the old Mitcham Park area, which takes in part of Springbank and Centennial Park. As the new high school will be situated at Daw Park, will the Minister of Education take steps to have it known as the Daw Park High School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As soon as we decided to establish a high school, it was necessary in the preliminary stages to give it a name. The Superintendent of High Schools recommended that the school should be called the Springbank High School, and this name was recommended to me by the Director of Education. These two officers thought that Daw Park or Centennial Park was not as good a name as Springbank, and I approved their recommendation. We thought that the name Springbank had a significance and that it was a well-sounding name, whereas Centennial Park was too closely associated with the cemetery and Daw Park had no local connotation. As, apparently, the Mitcham Council can supply proper arguments on why we should reconsider the name, I shall be only too pleased to reconsider the matter and discuss it with the Director, the appropriate officers, and the Leader.

LOAN COUNCIL.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier seen a recent press report that the Premier of Victoria (Mr. Bolte) is approaching the Commonwealth Government for additional Loan Funds on the surmise that the Loan market is more buoyant? If so, will he comment on this statement and say whether, on behalf of South Australia, he contemplates approaching the Commonwealth Government similarly?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under the Financial Agreement, which, of course, is part of the Constitution, if three States requisition for a Loan Council meeting, a meeting must be called. However, I understand that the action being taken by the Premier of Victoria is along the lines not of requisitioning for a Loan Council meeting but of writing a letter to the Prime Minister suggesting that the Loan Council meeting that would normally be held in January or early February be called earlier this financial year, and that consideration be given to making additional Loan funds available through the Loan Council. I understand that the reason for this action is that Mr. Bolte considers there is at present a buoyancy in the market that would warrant a larger appropriation than has yet been made. Of the total of £250,000,000 for this year, the Loan Council has raised about £80,000,000 in Australia, and I think that negotiations are progressing fairly favourably for a loan of £20,000,000 or £25,000,000 in New York, so the Commonwealth Government is not half-way in its loan-raising this year. I think that the Commonwealth Government will reply to Mr. Bolte that the Loan Council will go back to meeting at the traditional time of January or February, which I think is advisable.

TRAFFIC DIVERSION.

Mr. CLARK: I think members will have read that last night there was what could be classed as a most severe traffic blockage through the town of Gawler, which was, in the main, caused by a huge crowd of motorists coming back from the Marrabel rodeo and the motor sports at Mallala. I was rather surprised that traffic was diverted (as I am told it was) from Mallala so that it would come through Gawler when it must have been well known that at about the same time a large crowd would be coming back from Marrabel. Will the Premier ascertain from the Chief Secretary why the police diverted a big section of the Mallala traffic through Gawler?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, provided that my answer in the affirmative is not taken as being conclusive that the police diverted traffic that way, for I am not sure that they did. Normally traffic on the highway chooses its own route.

Mr. CLARK: One person who told me that traffic was diverted was the member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) who, I am sure the Premier will know, is a man of his word. I should not like it to be thought that I was casting any reflection on the work on the by-pass road being done by the department because it is doing an excellent job there; but it has been pointed out to me that, had this road been in operation, last night's trouble would, in the main, have been alleviated. Will the Premier, as Acting Minister of Roads, ascertain from the department whether it will be possible to expedite the opening of the diversion road around Gawler?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

RESERVOIR INTAKES.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Following the recent bountiful rains, can the Minister of Works say whether there has been any appreciable intake of water into any of the State's reservoirs and, in particular, can he say what quantity of water is at present held in the Warren reservoir, which serves my district?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am sure that all members will join with the member for Angas in expressing thanks that the rains have come at a most opportune time. However, they are most beneficial to the southern areas of the State; therefore, the intake into the reservoirs is confined mainly to those in the southern parts of the State and in the hills. Today, the Warren reservoir is full. It filled to capacity on Saturday night, so that any further run-off in this area will go down to South Para and augment the intakes into that reservoir.

For the interest of the House, I indicate that the rains over the weekend have given us a total increase in the metropolitan reservoirs of just over 1,000,000,000 gallons. Mount Bold received 482,000,000 gallons, Happy Valley 70,000,000 gallons, Myponga 83,000,000 gallons and Millbrook 387,000,000 gallons. As I have already said, the Warren reservoir is filled to capacity. The South Para reservoir received an intake of 120,000,000 gallons. So far as I am aware, there has been no intake into the northern reservoirs of the State or into the Tod River reservoir. A useful intake has been received in metropolitan reservoirs.

RAILWAY BEARINGS.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, a reply to a question I asked on September 19 about roller bearings in rail freight vehicles?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Late last week, before my colleague the Minister of Railways (Hon. N. L. Jude) left for overseas, he furnished this reply:

(1) The biggest proportion of railway goods-carrying vehicles in South Australia is still equipped with plain bearings.

(2) The main advantages of roller bearings are—(*a*) the incidence of hot boxes is greatly reduced; (*b*) the cost of lubrication is reduced; (*c*) greater wheel flange life is obtained; (*d*) they are more suitable for high continuous speeds than the plain bearings. These advantages must be weighed against the additional cost of the roller bearing.

(3) It is the present policy of the Railways Department to fit all new freight vehicles with roller bearings, and when it is necessary to replace existing bar frame bogies—as they become worn out—the new bogies will be provided with roller bearings.

(4) Although the resistance of a roller bearing at starting is less than half that of the plain bearing, the rolling resistance of a roller bearing is only 10 per cent lower than that of a plain bearing when travelling at speed. This does provide a further advantage, although a less important one than the main advantages enumerated above.

PUBLIC RELIEF.

Mr. RYAN: My question concerns Government policy, a constituent of mine, and a reply she received from the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department. My constituent writes:

On June 20 this year my brother-in-law died suddenly. He has left six children, one a girl aged 15 years, mentally weak, and their own mother, my sister, died in November, 1961. My unmarried sister and I had no alternative but to accept the guardianship of these girls. I am on a widow's pension and this child (the girl concerned) is on a child endowment of 5s. a week.

She then wrote to the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department seeking assistance from that department, and was granted about £6 a month for the upkeep of this girl. When she approached the department for further assistance because the children needed clothing, she received this reply:

Dear Madam, It has been suggested that you try some of the church social service depots for shoes for this child. You could try the Church of Christ Social Service Office, 189 Gawler Place; the Central Methodist Mission, Franklin Street; or the Salvation Army Women's Social Depot, Pirie Street. It is hoped these organizations may be of assistance to you.

In view of the approaches made by this person, the circumstances in which she is keeping these children, and the reply she received from the department, will the Premier have this matter fully investigated so that cases such as this

can receive worthwhile assistance? In this case the person concerned is saving the Government much money by looking after these children instead of allowing them to become State wards. She is facing up to a financial obligation that would otherwise fall on the Government.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will see that the matter is investigated.

VICTOR HARBOUR SCHOOL.

Mr. JENKINS: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply to my recent question about the Victor Harbour Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director of the Public Buildings Department has informed me that the school buildings at the Victor Harbour Primary School (that is, the school itself and the residence) are scheduled for external painting early in 1963 and that some internal painting will be done also.

COUNTRY LEAVING HONOURS CLASSES.

Mr. CORCORAN: Over the weekend a statement was made by the Minister of Education in the press as regards the proposed establishment of Leaving Honours classes in country areas. He said these classes would be established at Whyalla, Port Pirie, Nuriootpa and Glossop. No mention was made of Mount Gambier. As a result of this, I conferred with the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston) yesterday and he informed me that he would contact the Minister today on this matter. I have also received a letter this morning from the Mayor of Mount Gambier (Mr. S. H. Elliott) in which was enclosed a copy of a letter sent to the Minister. A copy of this letter, I believe, was sent also to the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding). This letter clearly indicates the general disappointment felt when Mount Gambier was not included in the list. I realize at this moment that I am not permitted to debate this question, but, if I were able to, I am sure I could convince this House that this matter interests not only the member for Mount Gambier but also the member for Victoria and myself. The fact that Nuriootpa is only 50 miles from Adelaide as opposed to Mount Gambier 300 miles would provide meat for discussion. In view of this, can the Minister of Education say why Mount Gambier was not included in the list? In the hope that Mount Gambier will be included, will the Minister review the decision?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have always considered that if and when Leaving Honours classes were established at country high schools, Mount Gambier would be either at the top of the list or near the top, primarily because of its geographical situation. However, I received the surprising information from the Director of Education that the likely number of qualified students from the city of Mount Gambier proper would be only about 12, which would be supplemented by probably two from Millicent and two from Penola, and that even the students from Millicent and Penola would probably prefer to come to Adelaide. Because of that, and because Cabinet decided to fix a minimum of 20 qualified students before Leaving Honours classes could be established, Mount Gambier was not included in the list.

Several experts, incidentally, have already strongly criticized me and claimed that the minimum of 20 students is far too small. Mr. Wybert Symonds (Principal of the Adelaide Boys High School), who has had about 10 years' experience as principal at Norwood and Adelaide Boys High Schools and previously 20 years' experience as headmaster of high schools at Kapunda, Renmark, Port Pirie and Port Lincoln, holds the definite opinion that the minimum should be 40. In fact, he gave that evidence before the Industries Development Special Committee. He said that even with 40 students he considered it over-expensive and that it would be better for the students to come to the city where their capacities would be stretched to the utmost by competition in larger classes. That opinion is shared by several competent people who have had practical teaching experience in the country and the city. That has been forcibly expressed to me over many years, but I have rejected that opinion in the interests of decentralization. I do not think we can have real decentralization unless we have decentralization of higher education. Cabinet has agreed with that view and despite the opinion of experts —whose opinion I respect—we have fixed the minimum as 20. The information I have received up to and including this morning is that Mount Gambier does not measure up, even to that minimum. I received that information after receiving the letter from the Mayor of Mount Gambier and after having a lengthy discussion with the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Ralston). I was delighted to have a discussion with Mr. Ralston because he has made written and verbal representations to me over a long

period on this matter, and his representations have always been couched in gentlemanly language—I might add in contrast to some other communications I have received—but very vigorous at the same time. I am anxious for a class to be established at Mount Gambier if it can measure up to the minimum qualifications laid down by Cabinet.

Mr. HARDING: My district takes in a portion of the Mount Gambier district council area. I am just as staggered as is the Minister at the numbers quoted from Mount Gambier. Will he obtain a report on how many students in the lower South-East attend Leaving Honours classes in Adelaide, and will he recommend that the school councils of the four high schools concerned obtain an estimate from the scholars attending those schools of the number that would remain in their districts and not come to Adelaide or go to Victoria to finish their studies?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I think that is a sensible and constructive suggestion. There is ample time for that to be done, for the councils of the four high schools to be consulted, and for them to provide me with reliable information as to the probable numbers. From the outset I was most anxious for Mount Gambier to be included: in fact, I thought it would top the list. I am still anxious that Mount Gambier be included. I think it would be in the best interests of South-Eastern parents if a large number of their children could study for their matriculation and their Leaving Honours certificates in or adjacent to their own district rather than having to go to the city. I join issue with the learned gentlemen in the Education Department and the teaching profession who express a contrary opinion. However, I cannot make bricks with straw, and I cannot supply the numbers, but if the numbers are available I shall be only too pleased to have Leaving Honours classes established in these areas.

Mr. CURREN: I am pleased at the announcement that a Leaving Honours class will be established at the Glossop High School. Can the Minister say whether this class is intended to cater for students from the Renmark, Loxton and Waikerie High Schools as well as Glossop and, if so, whether transport facilities will be provided?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: It is so intended. Here again, the best advice available to me is that Glossop could not supply the minimum of 20 students without being supplemented by students from Renmark, Loxton and Waikerie, and that it would be necessary to provide some transport assistance, the particular nature of which I am not able to state at present because the problem will not arise until next February. I have no doubt that adequate transport assistance will be available.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Naturally, I am delighted that Nuriootpa High School has been included in the country high schools where it is intended to commence Leaving Honours classes next year. Can the Minister say in which subjects Leaving Honours tuition will be given in the high schools he referred to?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Just at the moment I cannot give the honourable member the exact subjects, but there will be a wide spread of subjects sufficient for those students to do a full course for Leaving Honours.

PENSIONERS' MEDICAL SCHEMES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about pensioners' medical benefit schemes?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have to obtain this report from an outside authority. It is not yet to hand, but I will inform the honourable member as soon as it is available.

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS.

Mr. CASEY: My question may concern several country primary schools as it relates to the classification of primary schools. In 1958 the Peterborough Primary School was classified as a class II school because of its enrolments, but I have been informed by the Peterborough Primary School Committee that next year it will be reclassified as a class III school. Apparently this arises from the increasing number of metropolitan primary schools that are being upgraded to the detriment of country primary schools. I understand that it is the Government's policy to have 40 class I and 50 class II primary schools. In view of increasing school enrolments, I believe that the number of schools in these classifications should be increased. Will the Minister of Education refer this matter to Cabinet to see whether the number of classified schools can be increased in order to permit country primary schools to remain as class II schools and thus get the benefit of better teachers?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: There has been some departmental discussion about another reclassification of primary schools, but I am not anxious to embark on that because we

have had several reclassifications of various types of schools—primary, high, technical high and area schools. On the other hand, I think it would be a retrograde step if some country primary schools were downgraded. I shall be pleased to investigate the matter to see whether they can remain, unless there is a substantial fall in attendances—

Mr. Frank Walsh: You would rather upgrade them than downgrade them?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I do not want any large primary school in the country to be downgraded unless there is a substantial drop in the attendance.

LATE SHOPPING DAY.

Mr. RICHES: Last Thursday I asked the Premier a question regarding permission for shops to remain open at Christmas. The Premier said he would be able to say today what representations had been made and what information was available on the decision that was made. Has he that information?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Before a proclamation was issued the Government inquired widely as to which night was desired as the late shopping night. All the retailers concerned replied that they desired to have the late shopping night on a Friday, and a proclamation giving effect to that was made. Christmas Day this year falls on a Tuesday, and it was the previous Friday night that was asked for by the various retail organizations. Since the proclamation was made, Port Augusta and Burra have requested that the late shopping night be on the Monday. The Government has no views on which night it should be, but it would oppose having two late shopping nights in one centre because that would be unfair to the employees. It is intended to make a supplementary proclamation in respect of Monday night where that is desired, but that can only be on condition that the same centre does not also have a shopping night on the Friday.

CENTRAL MARKET.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 15 about negotiations between the Adelaide City Council and the Lewis Group concerning the Adelaide Central Market site?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Town Clerk states:

On May 28, 1962, the council advised the Lewis Group of Companies:

(1) That the council was prepared to consider a modified scheme.

(2) That the period of lease would not exceed 99 years.

(3) That the council would accept a direct conveyance of the freehold of P.T.A. 335, at the south-western intersection of Victoria Square and Grote Street.

(4) That city rates would be payable on all tenanted property prior to and after reconstruction, the programme of which is to be completed in two sections, the first three-fifths within 12 months and the second, or the whole, with the exception of a multi-storey office building, within two years.

(5) That if possible roads would be closed on property now owned by the City Council, but no assurance could be given in respect to public roads.

(6) That the equation of the ground rent and that of the market hall, whilst appearing to possess considerable merit, could be the subject of further review after the final firm proposals had been submitted, but the council gave no assurance that it would agree to the market being placed on the first floor, in lieu of the ground floor, as at present positioned.

The developer submitted an amended design on July 16, 1962, and stated that the question of the location of the new market hall had been the subject of a very long and careful study and the conclusion had been reached that despite the much increased cost involved, compared with a market hall at first floor level as originally proposed by the Lewis Group, the only solution satisfactory to all the interests concerned was to locate the market at lower ground floor level. This was in reply to the council's decision that no assurance could be given to agreeing to the market being placed on the first floor.

The Lewis Group of Companies proposes that the council lease the existing four-acre site to the developer for a period of 99 years on a building lease; any lesser period would prevent the economic redevelopment of the area. The developer would demolish the existing buildings and replace them with new and much larger accommodation. The developer would purchase town acre 335 at the corner of Victoria Square and Grote Street, and the freehold of this acre would be vested in the City Council free of charge, subject to its occupancy by the developer for a period of 99 years at a nominal rent. The present buildings would be replaced to link up with the redevelopment of the four-acre site. The first stage of the redevelopment includes the construction of the lower ground floor and the ground floor over the four-acre section, with first floor level car parking and a three-storey building on the acre to be acquired. This work will cost about £3,500,000.

The second stage, in due course, provides for an additional car-parking floor above the four-acre section and three multi-storey office blocks. The developer considers that the scale of the development will attract more customers and any plan which locates the market hall at ground floor level would limit the space available for other shop tenants. For economic reasons, the market is located in the lower

ground floor, with access by wide escalators. The City Council on August 20, 1962, decided to approach the Government for an amendment to the Local Government Act to enable the city market area to be leased for a term not exceeding 99 years, a produce department to be incorporated in the redevelopment scheme, to function other than on the ground floor.

WOOLCLASSERS' BRANDS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question relates to the use by woolclassers of distinguishing brands on bales of wool. Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether these brands are recognized by woolbrokers and woolbuyers and, if they are, what qualifications woolclassers must have to be entitled to use them?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understand that these qualifications are recognized by woolbuyers, but I will get the full list of qualifications necessary for a woolclasser to possess for him to be permitted to use one of these brands.

BANK CHARGES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: On August 28 I asked the Premier a question about bank charges, and he promised to obtain a report, if possible, from the Manager of the State Bank. Has he obtained that report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, the report is not yet to hand.

MURRAY BRIDGE SCHOOL.

Mr. BYWATERS: Earlier this year I asked a question about the Murray Bridge Primary School and an area given by the Murray Bridge corporation to the Education Department for certain obligations of the department in relation to fencing, sealing, levelling, etc. Some work has been done, but the area has not been sealed or fenced. Also, two adjacent areas need levelling. One of these is for the proposed oval, which I believe has been surveyed but on which no work has yet been carried out. Will the Minister of Education take up this matter with his department to ascertain how the work is progressing?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be only too pleased to do so. I well recall the matter; I think that most, if not all, of the requests were approved and that they would have gone on to the Public Buildings Department, but I am indebted to the honourable member for reminding me. I will bring myself up to date on this to find out what the position is, and see if I can expedite the work.

ALLPEST (S.A.).

Mr. JENNINGS: I recently asked the Minister of Education a question about a firm that styles itself "Allpest", and the Minister promised he would have the matter raised with the Attorney-General. Since I asked the question, I have received further complaints, including some from the Minister's own district (only as a result of press publicity, of course), about the activities of this firm. Has the Minister of Education received a reply from the Attorney-General, and will he refer to him the further complaints I have received about this firm if I give him details?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so. I have referred the previous cases to the Attorney-General, and I have no doubt that he is having them investigated. I think, from memory, that there was some reference to other States, and this has probably caused the delay. I will ask my colleague to let me have a reply as soon as possible, and I will give it to the honourable member in this House.

HOSPITAL RECORDS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked during the debate on the Estimates about the criticism by an honorary at the Royal Adelaide Hospital regarding lost records?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received a report from Mr. Rankin (Administrator of the Royal Adelaide Hospital). The Leader's question related to a statement issued by Dr. Crompton which was reported in the *Advertiser* as follows:

"A request for suitable staff for reorganization of the medical records service resulted in an inquiry by the Public Service Commissioner and a 28-page report which refused the request and was totally irrelevant," said Dr. Crompton. "Certain partial administrative changes resulted in a great increase in lost and unavailable files, with resultant disorganization of the professional work of the hospital, and inconvenience, danger and distress to many patients. Since December 13, 1960, I have sent 30 letters to the administration of the Royal Adelaide Hospital regarding case notes missing from my eye outpatient clinic. These letters record the names and details of 93 patients whose treatment was delayed and thereby jeopardized." Dr. Crompton said that as a result of worsening chaos in the records department the eye surgeons of his clinic were constantly frustrated in their attempts to do their best for their patients. In his reply to a complaint, the Minister of Health (Sir Lyell McEwin) had referred to "human error in filing" and, incredibly, to "relatively few missing records".

The following is Mr. Rankin's report:

The foregoing suggests that nothing was done in response to the board's request for staff to reorganize the medical records service. In fact, Dr. Crompton's remarks have reference to happenings in 1958. In 1960 the

Government gave approval for increased staff in accordance with the board's request and new quarters and equipment were provided for the medical record service. None of the board's requests during the last three years for staff for the medical record service have been refused. It is inevitable that some medical records will be misfiled, and that delay occurs while a search is made to locate them.

A large proportion of the case records of 93 patients which Dr. Crompton suggests were "missing" from his clinic were those of patients attending without appointment and whose records would therefore not have been pulled from file ready for the clinic session. In very few cases were the records not made available on request and it is most extravagant and misleading to suggest that the treatment of 93 patients was delayed and jeopardized.

During the month of September a total of 464 patients attended Dr. Crompton's clinic, an average of 58 each session. Fifty of these patients attended without prior appointment—i.e. an average of six for each session. Of the total of 464 attendances, only in one instance was the relevant medical record not made available and that was for a patient attending without appointment. During the last two years changes have been made in the medical record procedures and these new arrangements have resulted in considerable improvement. There is no particular shortage of staff, but there is a need for training and experience and these requirements are being given particular attention.

RENTAL HOUSES.

Mr. TAPPING: I understand the Premier has a reply to my question of September 27 about the possibility of Housing Trust tenants buying double-unit houses?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Chairman of the trust reports:

Whilst, on the face of it, the idea of selling double-unit houses to tenants of the Housing Trust appears attractive, there are compelling reasons against so doing and the trust considers that it should not follow such a course. There is a number of more or less technical difficulties which would militate against the issue of certificates of title on sale or create other difficulties, which are as follows:

(1) Most of the double-unit houses are built on allotments of a size smaller than that now required by regulations under the Town Planning Act and the Building Act.

(2) As the double-unit houses were not designed with a view to their sale, the party wall dividing two houses is not designed as a party wall suitable for separate ownership.

(3) Some pairs of houses have common sewers and water piping.

(4) If each half of a pair of houses is owned separately there could be different standards of maintenance.

However, the most important matter influencing the trust's decision is as follows:

When the rental-purchase scheme for the sale of houses on a minimum deposit of £50 is in operation the building of double-unit rental houses will virtually come to an end. Whilst the rental-purchase scheme will cater for many people who would otherwise be applicants for rental houses, there will still be a very considerable number of people seeking rental accommodation and who can, in large measure, only look to the trust for this accommodation. There are very many wage earners who for some reason or other do not wish or cannot commit themselves to house purchase whilst there is a large number of people such as widows, deserted wives, persons under disability and the like who can, in practice, only be housed at appropriate rentals by the trust in its rental houses.

In the future, the trust must look after those people by means of vacancies in its double-unit houses when the houses can be let at rentals within the means of the applicants. With a substantial number of double-unit houses it is expected that the vacancy rate will be adequate for this purpose. The trust, in putting forward the rental-purchase scheme, considered that an absolute essential to that scheme was that the trust should always have double-unit houses and a vacancy rate in these houses sufficient to provide for the needs of those requiring rental accommodation. Accordingly, the trust is strongly of opinion that it should not reduce its bank of double-unit houses by selling them to tenants. If a tenant wishes to buy his own home, he can do so under the rental-purchase scheme and thus provide a rental vacancy for someone else.

The following statistics reinforce the opinion of the trust. At the census of 1933, when the population of the State was 580,949, there were 48,178 houses in the State which were let. At the time of the 1961 census, the population was 969,340 and the number of houses 59,269. Thus the population increased by 67 per cent and rental houses by 23 per cent. However, since 1937, the trust built 22,423 rental houses. Accordingly, exclusive of trust rental houses, whilst there were 48,178 private rental houses in 1933, this number had fallen to 36,846 by 1961. The inevitable conclusion is that for some years virtually the only building of new houses for rental purposes has been that carried out by the trust. Under present economic circumstances, it is unlikely that there will be any significant private building of rental accommodation apart from flats which, by reason of their type of accommodation and rents, are unsuitable for the families looking to the trust for rental accommodation. It is therefore imperative that the trust should conserve its double-unit houses to provide in the future for the accommodation of those sections of the community for whom rental housing is an essential need.

PORT PIRIE RAILWAY FACILITIES.

Mr. McKEE: Earlier this session I asked the Minister of Works whether he would take up with the Railways Commissioner the provision of better drinking facilities in the Port Pirie railway yards. The reply I received was unsatisfactory and referred to the availability

of water bags. During the Budget debate I asked the Minister to refer this matter to the Commissioner for reconsideration. Will the Minister have this matter further examined?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will obtain a report.

HAMPSTEAD ROAD.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question concerning Hampstead Road?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Acting Minister of Roads, has received the following report from the Commissioner of Highways:

Half the section of Hampstead Road, between the Enfield council chambers and the North-East Road, was completed during the last financial year, and the remaining section is now in course of reconstruction by the Enfield council with funds provided by this department. It is anticipated that the work will be completed, except possibly for the section at the Hampstead Hotel intersection, by the end of this year.

TAILEM BEND WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BYWATERS: I have asked several questions about the Tailem Bend to Keith water scheme and the siting of the pumping station. I understand that a survey of the area has been completed. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether the site has been determined for the pumping station and the location of the proposed route of the main?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think the route has been fairly well determined. In response to requests from the honourable member and from the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell), I have undertaken that as each section of the route is determined plans will be made available to the officials of the various water boards that were established. I know that the pumping station site has been investigated. I presume that the Engineer-in-Chief is considering the information he has received, but I have not received a report yet. When I do I will let the honourable member have the advantage of it.

BRANDY EXCISE.

Mr. CURREN: Recently, statements have been made by the Wine and Brandy Producers Association, the Australian Wine Board, and the Co-operative Wineries and Distilleries Association regarding the recent vintage and the outlook for the coming season. In view of the excessively large stocks of wine and brandy now being held by winemakers, will the Premier make representations to the Commonwealth Treasurer to have the excise on brandy reduced with the object of increasing sales, thus assisting in disposing of stocks? I point out that several years ago the excise on brandy was reduced below that on other spirits and this resulted in increased sales without any overall reduction in excise revenue.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If my information is correct, the reductions that were made several years ago have not been readjusted. I will refer the question to the Commonwealth Treasurer.

BEACHPORT PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN: I understand that the Minister of Education has a reply to my recent question about levelling the school playing area at the Beachport Primary School.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The Director, Public Buildings Department, has advised that a plan has now been prepared detailing the minimum amount of work required to achieve a satisfactory playing area at the Beachport school, and that the estimated cost of this work would be £1,598. The Education Department has recommended that it is necessary for this work to be carried out, and the Public Buildings Department has been asked to take the necessary steps. The school will be informed accordingly.

MURRAY BRIDGE SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. BYWATERS: The committee of the new Murray Bridge South Primary School has expressed concern to me regarding the erection of what was a Radium Hill house on the site of the school. It is fearful lest the house is not brought to a good standard, that it may curtail activities on the playing area at the school, and that it will detract from the appearance of the new school. Can the Minister of Education say whether the practice of using houses from Radium Hill as school residences is widely followed, and what the department's policy is in purchasing these houses and using them for such purposes?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am not aware of the situation at the Murray Bridge South Primary School. I know that in some cases some of the honourable member's colleagues have urged the department to purchase these houses for use as school residences in country areas, mainly on the grounds of urgency. It may well be that that was the impelling force in this case.

Mr. Bywaters: There was no urgency here.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to investigate the matter. It normally would not come before me. In any

event, the house has been placed there and I shall endeavour to ensure that it conforms to every reasonable standard.

SOLICITORS' SUBPOENAS.

Mr. Hutchens, for Mr. DUNSTAN (on notice):

1. Is it the policy of the Government to subpoena legal practitioners to give evidence in criminal proceedings in proof of orders made by courts previously against their clients?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to reconsider this policy, so that the confidence of clients in practitioners is not adversely affected?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The reply to both questions is "No".

UNIVERSITY FEES.

Mr. HUTCHENS (on notice):

1. How much additional revenue will the University of Adelaide receive from the proposed increase in students' fees?

2. What number of students is attending this university on Commonwealth scholarships?

3. How many students, both part-time and full-time, are paying their own fees?

4. How many students are attending as "hardship cases"?

5. What amount was paid by the Government last year to the university to aid students who had difficulty in paying fees?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The replies are:

1. The new fees to be charged by the University of Adelaide in 1963 are expected to effect an increase of between £90,000 and £95,000 over what the 1962 fees would have realized.

2. There are 1,102 students in the university in 1962 holding Commonwealth scholarships. In addition, 2,843 students hold other awards which either meet their fees in full or entitle the students to partial reduction in their fees.

3. Excluding students in the Elder Conservatorium of Music and those proceeding to higher degrees, the following numbers of students are paying their own fees:

Full-time	1,283
Part-time	1,196
External	27
	2,506

4. In 1962 the university has afforded relief to 59 students on the ground of financial hardship. The sums involved are £968 for tuition and £422 for ancillary fees. In addition, the university has made interest-free loans aggregating £1,017 to nine students.

5. The total sum of £1,390 referred to in the answer above is effectively met by the South Australian Government, as the reduction in the university's income from fees is approximately balanced by an increase in the State's grant to the university.

GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to construct a graving dock in South Australia to avoid the necessity for docking of vessels in other States?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Dry docking facilities are included in the Greater Port Adelaide Plan (project No. 14) and their provision is under constant review. Serious consideration of such a scheme cannot be contemplated, however, until it is economically justified. Slipping facilities for vessels of up to 1,500 tons displacement (230ft. maximum length) already exist in Port Adelaide and these meet all the demands of intrastate shipping with the exception of the *Troubridge*. Interstate and overseas shipowners prefer using dry docks at terminal ports for obvious reasons, and as Port Adelaide is more of a through port it is under some disadvantage in this respect.

FREIGHT CONCESSIONS.

Mr. RYAN (on notice): Are concessions or subsidies being granted by the South Australian Railways Department for the carriage of primary products, including grain, superphosphate and livestock?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Railways Commissioner reports:

With the exception of a rebate on flour gristed in country mills, there are no concessions or subsidies being granted by the South Australian Railways Department for the carriage of superphosphate and primary products, including grain and livestock. These commodities are carried at by-law rates.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ORIENTAL FRUIT MOTH CONTROL BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

THE ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA (TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION) BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to vest in the Electricity Trust of South Australia portion of Torrens Island and to authorize the trust to construct certain embankments, barrages, bridges and other works, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It vests portion of Torrens Island down to low water mark in the Electricity Trust and authorizes the trust to carry out certain works on the Port River in connection with the establishment of a power station on Torrens Island. By 1965 both the Thomas Playford power station and the Osborne power station will be completed, and by the winter of 1967 it will be necessary for the Electricity Trust to have the first machine in its next station installed and ready for use. I have been advised by the trust that it takes about five years to install and commission the first machine in a new power station. Certain preliminary planning for a new power station is common, irrespective of its location, and the trust has, for some time, been proceeding with this preliminary work. Tenders have been called for a 120,000 kilowatt turbo-alternator and a boiler.

After intensive investigation, on which I will comment later, the trust requested the Government to permit it to construct its new power station on Torrens Island. Cabinet is satisfied that the Torrens Island site selected by the trust is the best available in the interests of the State and the electricity undertaking. This Bill therefore provides that the area at the southern end of Torrens Island, consisting of about 1,300 acres, be vested in the Electricity Trust for the construction of a power station and associated works. When the Loan Estimates were before this House there was considerable discussion on the best site for the next trust power station. I indicated at that time that I would give the House a complete report on the matters raised by members when I introduced a Bill later. I therefore propose at this stage to inform the House why the Torrens Island site has been selected. The trust, in requesting consideration for Torrens Island, reported to me that its technical staff, assisted by overseas consultants and directed by its Chief Engineer, had investigated seven prospective power station sites. The sites investigated were:

1. Along the coast south of Adelaide, particularly Port Stanvac;
2. The River Murray;
3. Port Pirie;
4. Wallaroo;
5. Osborne (north of the S.A. Gas Company works);
6. On the southern bank of the North Arm; and
7. Torrens Island.

In addition, the trust considered the possibilities of constructing a pumped storage scheme, and the General Manager was sent overseas to gather information on this type of scheme from other countries and to ascertain the latest practices in regard to power station planning. On his recommendation, the trust decided to defer construction of a pumped storage scheme and to proceed with the construction of a large power station.

Early in the investigation referred to above it became obvious that, of the sites away from the metropolitan area, one of the best would be Wallaroo. Therefore, the possibility of constructing a station in this locality was considered in detail. The other country sites mentioned—Port Pirie, along the coast south of Adelaide, and the River Murray—were considered in less detail but sufficiently to compare them with Wallaroo. The following summary gives the conclusions of the trust's senior management and its Chief Engineer and his technical staff, and it has been accepted by the board of the trust.

Adequate area: Recent developments have made it practicable to install much larger boilers and turbo-alternators than was envisaged a few years ago. Machines can now be purchased in sizes up to 500,000 kilowatts and, although these are at present too large for the Electricity Trust's system, it is proposed that the first machines in the new power station shall be of 120,000 kilowatts capacity and that later machines will be even larger. These large machines are cheaper per kilowatt to install and more efficient to operate than small plant, and it is most desirable that advantage should be taken of these economies. It is therefore proposed that the new power station shall be planned initially for 1,000,000 kilowatts capacity and be capable of expansion to 2,000,000 kilowatts or more. Such a station requires a site of about 250 acres with an

additional area, if possible, for disposal of ashes.

Adequate and accessible cooling water: It is essential that adequate and accessible cooling water be available for the power station. The water temperature is of vital importance to the efficiency of the power station, and cold water is essential. Water which is warmed by tidal flats is not suitable. At a station capacity of 2,000,000 kilowatts, about 80,000,000 gallons an hour of cooling water must be circulated through the plant and returned to the sea at about 14 degrees higher temperature than the inlet water. This large volume of warm water must be prevented from mixing with the inlet water.

Access for shipping for import of fuel: The fuel cost is the largest single item of power station operating expenditure, and first-class facilities must be available to bring in the fuel and unload it rapidly and economically.

Proximity to load centre: A power station of the size envisaged will require transmission lines costing more than £50,000 a mile to transmit the power to where it will be used.

Disposal of ash: Over the life of a power station, which may be 40 years or more, large quantities of ash from the burning of coal must be disposed of. The ideal method is to reclaim swampland adjacent to the power station, and a large area of such land is required.

Soil and foundation condition: The site must be such that adequate foundations can be used to support the heavy equipment of the power station.

Having given a general outline of the requirements of a power station of the type I have mentioned, I shall now go into detail about the site selected.

South Coast site: The advantage of a site south of Adelaide would be that transmission lines would enter the metropolitan area from the south and supplement those now coming from Port Augusta in the north. The Thomas Playford power station at Port Augusta has sufficient capacity to provide all power requirements to the north of Adelaide in the foreseeable future. Wherever a new power station is built, it must transmit its power to Adelaide or south of Adelaide. It would be desirable from this point of view to site a power station south of Adelaide. However, because of the generally rugged coastline it would be very costly to develop a port for unloading coal, and to provide cooling water facilities to withstand the rougher seas. Despite the longer transmission distance from Wallaroo, a power station on the South Coast would be more expensive than one at Wallaroo.

Adjacent to Port Stanvac: Although adequate cooling water is available, the rugged coastline would mean that the civil works required for the power station and the cooling water system would be much more expensive than on Torrens Island. Fuel oil would be readily obtainable, but considerable cost would be involved in making provision to obtain coal at the station, and the trust is of the opinion that it should not build a large station which would be wholly dependent on one class of imported fuel.

The River Murray: The efficiency of a power station built on the River Murray would be less than of one on the sea because of the higher average temperature of the water. In addition, the imported fuel would have to be transported to the site. At 1,000,000 kilowatts capacity, the station will burn the equivalent of 2,000,000 tons of coal per annum. Even at the nominal figure of 10s. a ton for transport, this would add £1,000,000 per annum to operating costs, and transmission costs would add to this figure. The quantity and class of coal at Moorlands would be inadequate for a large power station. The trust is emphatic that the next station must be a large one to take advantage of the economies available from the larger machines.

Port Pirie: Port Pirie is farther from Adelaide than Wallaroo, involving additional cost of transmission. Furthermore, the flat seashore means shallow water, which involves loss of generating efficiency and additional cost of civil works to provide adequate cold water. It may be noted that costly earthworks were required at Port Augusta to build the power station close to deep water, and the position would be worse at Port Pirie. The Port Augusta site was justified by the fact that this was the closest available cooling water to the Leigh Creek coalfield. The savings obtained by burning cheap Leigh Creek coal at Port Augusta more than offset the cost of transmission of power and the expense of the civil works at the site. No such advantages are available in the case of a station situated in the country that is to use fuel imported into the State. A power station at Port Pirie to deliver power to Adelaide would be considerably more expensive than one at Wallaroo, and there are no compensating advantages.

Wallaroo: The possibility of building a power station at Wallaroo was considered in detail in comparison with the metropolitan area.

It is estimated that, at the 1,000,000 kilowatt stage of development, the capital cost of the Wallaroo station would be £7,900,000 in excess of that of a similar power station at Osborne or south of North Arm which are adjacent to Adelaide. Of this extra cost, £5,400,000 is for transmission costs.

North of Osborne or south of North Arm: Two sites on the Port River, apart from Torrens Island, were considered—one on LeFevre Peninsula north of Osborne, and one on the southern bank of the River at North Arm. The site on LeFevre Peninsula presents a cooling water problem which could be properly solved only by cutting an expensive channel for the outlet water across the peninsula to the sea. The site near the North Arm is more restricted in area than Torrens Island and, to solve the cooling water problem, it would be necessary to have a continuous embankment across North Arm so that the inlet and outlet cooling water could be completely separated. Neither of these sites would provide the economies available from the Torrens Island site.

Torrens Island: This site presents many advantages. A causeway across Angas Inlet will completely separate the inlet and outlet cooling water at comparatively small expense. There is available adequate land for the power station proper, and swampland for reclamation by ash disposal. The site is adjacent to the metropolitan area, where the power will mainly be used. Of all the sites, metropolitan and country, this provides the best features for cooling water and is the most economical site available. The capital savings compared with Osborne or the North Arm site will be at least £1,500,000; hence the capital saving compared with Wallaroo is £9,400,000 and the annual saving approximately £1,000,000. The advantages of the Torrens Island site are so clear-cut that the trust had no hesitation in asking the Government to make Torrens Island available for the new station.

Decentralization: The members of the board controlling the trust have reported to me that they are particularly conscious of the fact that an undertaking such as the trust can contribute to decentralization, and this aspect is always considered when they are taking important decisions on localities for major works. The trust has already played a very important part in decentralization in this State by the development of the power stations at Port Augusta, Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln, and the coalfield at Leigh Creek. A recent decision to establish the trust's Northern Regional headquarters at Port Augusta is a further step in decentralization by the trust. In the case of the next power station site, the differences in capital and operating costs in favour of the Torrens Island site (nearly £10,000,000 capital and £1,000,000 per annum operating costs) are such that the trust is of the opinion that the best country site at Wallaroo could not be justified with such a great difference in cost. The Government has every confidence in the ability of the trust's technical staff to properly investigate problems such as I have just explained, and we also have adequate proof over the last 16 years that the members of the board do not make decisions on important matters without having the problems thoroughly investigated in a proper manner and by capable people.

Turning now to the Bill before the House, I point out that clause 2 withdraws Harbors Board reserves on Torrens Island and on Garden Island. The areas concerned in the Torrens Island reserves will be vested in the trust by this Act. The Garden Island reserve will become Crown lands, and the whole of Garden Island will, by administrative procedure, be handed over to the control of the Harbors Board. A small area of land on Torrens Island reserved for stock quarantine is also withdrawn. This reserve has not been used for quarantine purposes for many years, and the area will also be vested in the trust. Full descriptions of the reserves referred to are given in the First, Second and Third Schedules to this Bill.

Clause 3 vests the southern portion of Torrens Island, containing an area of about 1,300 acres and extending to low water mark, in the Electricity Trust. Clause 4 authorizes the trust to construct and operate a power station on the land vested in it by this Act.

Clause 5 authorizes the trust to construct a temporary barrage across Angas Inlet from Torrens Island to Garden Island. This barrage will be used to ascertain the effect on the tides from closing Angas Inlet. It is not expected that this test will disclose any major difficulties from closing Angas Inlet. If results are as expected, a permanent embankment will be constructed across Angas Inlet at approximately the position shown on the plan attached to this Bill. If the test should disclose difficulties which are not foreseen at present and which cannot be overcome, then a bridge will be constructed across this channel leaving the flow of water unrestricted. The cooling water discharge point would then have

to be moved farther north. It is also provided that, for the purpose of gaining access to Torrens Island for preliminary site work, the trust may construct a temporary bridge from the mainland on the south side of the North Arm to Torrens Island. This clause also provides for the construction of the bridge or embankment across Angas Inlet to which I have already referred. Provision is also made for the trust to construct a permanent bridge from Garden Island across the North Arm to the mainland. In the event of an embankment being constructed across Angas Inlet, the roadway will be continued on the embankment.

Attached to this Bill is a plan of the locality referred to in the Bill and the works that it authorizes. These are shown on the plan in the approximate positions they will occupy, and are designated as follows:

(A) Temporary barrage,
(B) Temporary bridge,
(C) Permanent bridge or embankment across Angas Inlet, and
(D) Permanent bridge across North Arm.

The Bill authorizes the trust to construct the works detailed in the Bill notwithstanding that the effect of such construction may be to prevent navigation through Angas Inlet and the North Arm. Clause 6 provides that the trust shall not be liable for any cost, charges or damages to any person arising from the constructions authorized by this Bill. It is planned that about 10ft. clearance above mean high water spring tides will be provided under the permanent bridge over the North Arm. This will permit the smaller fishing boats to pass under the bridge. Some of these boats with masts too high to permit passage already have hinged masts, and those that have not could be so provided. The valuable area of Torrens Island can be exploited only by connecting it to the mainland. This proposal means that the connecting bridges will be provided by the Electricity Trust without cost to the Government and with little inconvenience to users of the waterway. In Perth all types of boats are required to have hinged masts to get under the old bridge across the Swan River, and this is not a difficult matter to arrange. If owners do not desire to do this they can use a route up Lipsons Reach and over the flats to the north of Torrens Island. This entails only waiting for high tides. Ketches that use Angas Inlet and St. Kilda Reach can all be directed through the Outer Harbour. They use St. Kilda Reach and the shallow near-coast waters further north to avoid the rougher seas of the centre of the gulf, but it is reported to me that the ketches are quite large enough to use the Outer Harbour route. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important measure which will make an important contribution to the future economy of the State.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPANIES BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1292.)

Clauses 150 to 159 passed.

Clause 160—"Exemption of certain companies."

Mr. SHANNON: Can the Minister explain why this clause relates to 500 members of a public company? I understand that in Victoria the number is 3,000 and in some other States 1,000. I cannot understand why a company should have to list its shareholding in its annual report, particularly when it has to register its shareholding with the Registrar of Companies. This provision could result in hardship to small companies. I realize that this legislation is designed to combat those companies that are doing the wrong thing. However, this clause will create a problem for those using the Central Share Registry, which, I understand, will not benefit from this because it cannot ask for a fee for preparing lists for annual reports. The Central Share Registry is performing a useful function for public companies in South Australia and throughout the Commonwealth, and, unless this clause will be of real value in restricting the operations of those companies at which the legislation is directed, I believe the exemption to companies with more than 500 members may be unnecessary. The Government should examine this clause to see whether we are not overloading this legislation and creating unnecessary work that will not benefit the community as a whole.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I have been informed that this clause has been copied from the Victorian and Tasmanian Bills which have now become Acts.

Mr. Shannon: Is it suggested that the number of members is the same?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I do not know whether the honourable member's information is correct—

Mr. Shannon: I want to know why 500 members.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: The same question may be asked about the 3,000 in Victoria and the 1,000 elsewhere. It is

probably just an arbitrary figure regarded as wise by those experts who co-operated in framing this Bill.

Mr. Shannon: I suggest that its implications on the Central Share Registry may well have been overlooked.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: That may well be, but the clause does not impose a liability; it provides an exemption.

Mr. Shannon: Yes, but those companies that are not exempt will be put to much work. What is the value of the clause?

Mr. Coumbe: It will increase the work for several companies.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have no information as to why the figure should be 500, or why it should vary from the figures in other States. The Bill has been prepared by experts, and the consensus of opinion among them is that 500 would be a reasonable figure for South Australia.

Mr. SHANNON: As all companies of necessity have to register their shareholdings with the Registrar of Companies, and as this clause relates to annual returns, what is the real value in forcing a company to supply a list of its shareholdings in its annual returns? Is there some real value in that to the community? After all, by paying a small fee, any person can obtain a list of a company's shareholdings. What is the value to the investing public in imposing this additional burden on small companies? Generally speaking, it will be the smaller companies that will be involved in this extra cost. I consider that the furnishing of a list of shareholders to the Registrar of Companies ensures adequate protection for the public. Why should we make companies publish these lists with their annual returns?

Clause passed.

Clauses 161 to 173 passed.

Clause 174—''Suspension of actions and proceedings by company, etc.''

Mr. SHANNON: I know of an instance where a company arranged finance for the sale of certain stock for an overseas firm. The document that came from overseas was in order, but when the moneys were paid in and the credits were secured, the bank immediately released its directors from responsibility for a guarantee that was current almost up to the time of the receipt of those credits, and the company that was acting as the financial agents in Australia went into voluntary liquidation. I do not know whether this clause is intended to protect that type of financial skulduggery. The overseas buyer put up his money in good faith, and the people who supplied the stock supplied it in good faith; it was in the intervening financial arrangements in Australia where things went adrift. I doubt whether this clause takes care of that problem. Those overseas credits were destined in the first instance for another channel entirely and not for the benefit of releasing the bank from the obligation that it had entered into with its customer in Australia. If that sort of practice is to be permitted to continue, it seems to me that an inspector should be appointed at the appropriate moment, and all court actions should be held in abeyance. The law sets out time factors regarding undue preference, and any creditor can be made to release his moneys for the benefit of the general creditors of the company. However, in this case it appears that the bank has accepted its opportunity to clear up what was apparently a very doubtful guarantee by the directors of the company concerned, and left the people supplying the stock lamenting. Although my company was concerned, it was only one of a number and was, I must admit, one of the smallest involved: others were much more capable of withstanding the shock. However, all the companies concerned felt aggrieved about it. Can the Minister of Education explain whether or not this clause, providing for the appointment of an inspector in the case of a company on the verge of being wound up, affords some protection for a creditor company? In the case I mentioned, I believe that certain assets were immediately taken overseas for distribution, and it is questionable whether those proceeds were returned. Are we making provision in this Bill for the protection of honest trading and the prevention of undue preference being taken by a financial institution—in this instance a bank—by virtue of its golden opportunity of taking cash from the overseas buyer and not devoting it to the purpose the overseas buyer intended it should be devoted?

Clause passed.

Clauses 175 to 291 passed.

Clause 292—''Priorities.''

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In subclause (1) (*b*) to strike out ''Three'' and insert ''Five''.

I shall also move to amend paragraph (*b*) further by striking out ''four'' and inserting the word ''six''; and to amend paragraph (*c*) by striking out ''not exceeding in any particular case one thousand pounds''. I have a

further amendment to the same clause on the next page. The clause reads:

. . . in a winding-up there shall be paid in priority to all other unsecured debts—

A similar provision is found in section 279 of the present Act, where a £50 limit was raised to £300. Company legislation was discussed by the State Attorneys-General in Adelaide in July, 1960, when it was more or less agreed that some freedom should be allowed in formulating these provisions. The problem of piece-work arises here. Whether we shall define "piece-work" in some other way I do not know, but already a tendency has arisen in industry to provide what is known as "labour only". A certain group tenders and sublets. In many cases the principal contractor sublets to another contractor who, in turn, sublets to somebody else. It is difficult to keep pace with some of this contracting work. Whichever way we may view this matter, it is important to realize that a certain freedom was recognized by the State Attorneys-General in this matter. Some States have gone for the upper limit in workmen's compensation and wages. My amendment seeks a priority; it is not a nation-rocking amendment, but it is important as regards piece-work.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I support the Leader's remarks and draw attention to the fact that a principle is involved here in respect of priorities on the occasion of the winding-up of a company. The principle is that, after the taxed costs of the petitioner, the remuneration of the liquidator and the costs of any audit have been taken into account, wages and salaries are the first priority. As this clause establishes that principle, the object is to ensure that all wages that may be owing are established in that priority. That is made clear by the fact that an amount of £300 is mentioned here, and four months before the commencement of the winding-up is given as the period. That is done in order to catch any wages or salaries that may be owing over a considerable period and give them that priority.

Our amendment is moved for this reason: that the amount and the period are not, in the one case, high enough and, in the other case, long enough, because, where a company may be in financial difficulties, there can obviously be a stalling off of payments to people who are owed wages and salaries, particularly in regard to piece-work. This would not occur in the case of people being paid weekly or fortnightly, but we can visualize that, where piece-work is involved and possibly money is passing through two or three hands by way of sub-contractors, six months and £500 may be involved before the actual winding-up of the company. That sum is arrived at by taking the average earnings in secondary industry at £20 a week over a period of 25 weeks. The object of the amendment is to ensure that, when there is a winding-up, any wages and salaries, in accordance with the clause, do establish that priority, the principle of which is established by the clause itself.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I support the amendment. It has been a recognized principle that after costs and expenses have been deducted, wages and salaries should have first priority. The amendment will enable the payment of £500 for wages, which represents £20 a week for a six months' period. I know of two instances where employees worked for an employer who kept stalling to such an extent that when his business was wound up he owed them between £370 and £380. Members might ask, "Why did they let him go that far?" For many years he was a good employer and the employees hoped that he would come good, but he failed to do so. We should enable employees to claim their rights, and the amendment will not impose unfair conditions on employers. Employers can get into financial difficulties and if they have treated their employees well for many years the employees may agree to carry on under an arrangement which is not strictly legal, but when the employers finally go bankrupt the employees are owed substantial amounts. The amendment is fair.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I have no strong personal views on this but I should not like it to be thought that this clause seeks to impose some new limit. As members know, the limit for wages and salaries has been increased from £50 to £300 and for workmen's compensation from £100 to £1,000, which is a substantial liberalization. I have never been able to see any value in uniformity merely for the sake of uniformity, and I point out that in addition to the attention given to this legislation by experts, some State Governments have applied the proposed limits. The New South Wales Heffron Government—which is the same political Party as the Opposition here—has applied them. It may be that there is some peculiar wisdom in the Party in this State which is not given to their colleagues in other States, so I am going to give the Leader of the Opposition the compliment of not violently opposing his amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In subclause (1) (*b*) to strike out "four" and insert "six".

I have explained this amendment. It increases the period relating to work performed before the commencement of a company's winding-up.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In subclause (1) (*c*) to strike out "not exceeding in any particular case one thousand pounds".

In other words, the amount payable for compensation shall not exceed the amount payable under the Workmen's Compensation Act. We are removing the limitation. Whatever amount is due for workmen's compensation shall be the amount payable.

Mr. LOVEDAY: We are reliably informed that at the meeting of Attorneys-General in Adelaide in 1960 it was agreed that the States could depart from the model Bill and go to the maximum workmen's compensation provided for in their own States if they so desired. I can quote the pages of the transcript where that was agreed to. The schedule in the Workmen's Compensation Act lists 23 injuries, only eight of which would receive full compensation under this clause. The compensation payable for the loss of a thumb is 30 per cent of £3,250, or about £1,000, so every person who sustains a more serious injury would not receive full compensation. Persons who received the most serious injuries would be the worst affected by this clause. For example, a man who lost both eyes, both hands, or both feet would receive only £1,000, assuming, of course, that no negligence was involved in the accident.

It is a recognized principle that workmen's compensation should be paid in full, because of the great disability involved in a serious accident. Other creditors would suffer some financial setback, but the man who received a serious injury that would adversely affect his whole earning power for the rest of his life would receive, under this clause, only £1,000 instead of the £3,250 to which he would be entitled ordinarily. I think that is manifestly wrong. Obviously, this man is a creditor, and he is in a totally different position from that of all other creditors. Compared with the temporary setback others would receive, he would receive a major financial setback for the whole of his life, and therefore he should be able to get everything he is entitled to under the Workmen's Compensation Act. I do not think anyone would claim that any Workmen's Compensation Act contains a maximum amount that really compensates a person for very serious injury.

Mr. Coumbe: Is the honourable member referring to common law claims as opposed to claims covered by insurance companies?

Mr. LOVEDAY: No, I am referring to the ordinary Workmen's Compensation Act provisions, because this clause refers to that. The amount covered by the insurance company is another matter entirely. I mentioned earlier that I was not referring to those cases where there was negligence on the part of the company, as a result of which there might be a claim for damages at common law. This debt has a particular significance because of the impact on the injured person. Both Tasmania and Victoria departed from the model Bill. The Tasmanian Act provides:

Thirdly, all amounts not exceeding in any particular case £4,000 due in respect of workers' compensation, under any law relating to workers' compensation, accrued before the commencement of the winding-up.

The comparable section in the Victorian Act states:

All amounts due in respect of worker's compensation, under any law relating to worker's compensation, accrued before the commencement of the winding-up.

In other words, this point was recognized and acted upon in both those States. Our amendment seeks a provision similar to the Victorian legislation, and this would get over the difficulty that might arise in any future amendment of the Workmen's Compensation Act, and would keep the principle in line throughout. This is a worthy amendment and in accordance with the principles of compensating people for injury.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: With the greatest respect, I draw the Committee's attention to the fact that there seems to be an unlimited and almost uninhibited use of the word "limited", as if by this Bill we were seeking to impose some narrow and restrictive limits, whereas this clause seeks to raise the limit from £100 to £1,000. It is a liberal, not a limited, provision. It is interesting to me that the Leader and the member for Whyalla seek to follow the Liberal Government of Victoria on this occasion and to oppose the provision of the New South Wales Labor Government.

Mr. Loveday: We seek to follow the Labor Government in Tasmania, too.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am merely calling attention to a set of facts, because £1,000 is the limit imposed by New South Wales and the other States. The only departures are Tasmania, which has increased

the limit to £4,000, and Victoria, which for historical reasons has never had a limit. The Opposition is departing from the views of its colleagues in other States and copying Liberal administration, and it is departing from the principle of uniformity in moving the amendment. I do not oppose the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In subclause (1) (*d*) to strike out "both" and insert "sick leave, or all three".

The paragraph would then read:

All remuneration payable to any employee in respect of annual leave or long service leave or sick leave, or all three.

It is recognized today that provision is made for these three types of leave.

Mr. LOVEDAY: This is really an omission because the latest provisions for sick leave in many instances have an accrual of benefit, whereas some years ago there was no suggestion of sick leave benefit. Now in many cases there is. It is obvious that this clause refers to accruals over a period in respect of both annual and long service leave. If such accruals are right then surely the accrual of sick leave benefits is right. Once again, it is the acknowledgment of a principle.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I agree with the member for Whyalla. Sick leave may have been overlooked in the drafting of this clause. If so, I hope the omission will be rectified in Committee by this amendment. Cumulative sick leave is provided for in all wages boards' determinations and in all awards. In most cases it is for a period of up to five years while in some cases the period is unlimited. One or two agreements provide for the payment or sick leave after the termination of one's employment. But no provision is made for sick leave in this Bill. The inclusion of sick leave would impose no hardship on anyone.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I see no logical reason why sick leave should not be included in the list of priorities. Therefore, I do not oppose the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 293 to 397 passed.

Clause 398—"Exemption of prescribed proprietary and private companies from lodging accounts."

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON moved:

In subclause (1) (*a*) to strike out "individuals" first occurring and insert "natural persons".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON moved:

In subclause (1) (*a*) to strike out "individuals" second occurring and insert "natural persons".

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister explain the precise difference between these two terms?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: These amendments will make the language in this clause consistent with that in other clauses.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON moved:

In subclause (1) (*a*) after "companies" fourth occurring to insert "and neither a public company nor a foreign company, directly or indirectly, owns a beneficial interest in a share in any of such companies or in any corporation that, by virtue of subsection (5) of section 6, is deemed to be related to any of them".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON moved:

In subclause (2) (*b*) (i) to strike out "and".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON moved:

In subclause (2) (*b*) (ii) after "(as the case may be)" to insert "; and

(iii) that, to the best of the knowledge and belief of the persons giving the certificate, the beneficial interests in the shares in the company are held and, since the date, incorporation or commencement, as the case may be, referred to in subparagraph (ii) of this paragraph, have been held solely by natural persons or by other prescribed proprietary companies or prescribed private companies or by a combination of such companies or of natural persons and such companies, and a public company or foreign company, directly or indirectly, does not own and, since the date, incorporation or commencement, as the case may be, referred to in subparagraph (ii) of this paragraph, has not owned a beneficial interest in a share in any of such companies or in any corporation that, by virtue of subsection (5) of section 6, is deemed to be related to any of them.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 399 passed.

Schedules 1 to 7 passed.

Eighth schedule.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I move:

After paragraph (*f*) of the certificate to insert the following paragraph:

(*f*1) (7) that, to the best of our knowledge and belief—

(i) The beneficial interests in the shares in the company are held and since the—

{ date of the previous return (6)
incorporation of the company (6)
commencement of the Companies Act 1962 (6)

have been held solely by natural persons or by other prescribed proprietary companies or prescribed private companies or by a combination of such companies or of natural persons and such companies; and

(ii) a public company or a foreign company does not own and since such date (6)/incorporation (6)/commencement (6) has not owned a beneficial interest in a share in any of such companies or in any corporation that, by virtue of subsection (5) of section 6 of the Act, is deemed to be related to any of them.

This amendment is consequential on the amendments to clause 398 (1) and (2).

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Schedules 9 and 10 and title passed.

Read a third time and passed.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1961.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In asking Parliament to agree to an extension of the Prices Act for a further twelve months until the end of 1963, the Government is satisfied that it is in the best interests of the State that this legislation be retained. The Government's decision has been actuated not only after considering the past value of this legislation and its continued value under existing conditions but also after giving consideration to a number of matters which could have a marked bearing on our economy in the near future. I now propose to outline to honourable members more specifically some of the reasons for the Government's decision to retain price control.

Living Costs: The consumer price index, which embraces a much wider range of consumer goods and services than did the old C series index which it replaced, discloses the following total cost movements a week in the various capital cities for the twelve months ended June 30, 1962:

Adelaide	Reduction of 6s. 0d. a week
Melbourne	Reduction of 3s. 0d. a week
Sydney	Reduction of 2s. 9d. a week
Brisbane	Increase of 3s. 0d. a week
Perth	Reduction of 1s. 6d. a week
Hobart	Reduction of 3s. 6d. a week

These figures disclose that the fall in living costs in Adelaide was from 2s. 6d. to 9s. a week greater than in the other capital cities and, when these figures are further viewed in conjunction with the basic wage increase of 12s. a week which employees received in July, 1961, it will be seen that the increase in real spending power, which is a vital consideration under present economic conditions, has been considerably greater in Adelaide than in any other capital city.

Employment Position: Figures released by the Department of Labour and National Service show that each month during 1962 the registered number of unemployed expressed as a percentage of the total work force has in South Australia been as low as, or lower than, in any other State. The respective percentages shown for January and August, 1962, for each State are:

Registered unemployed as a percentage of the work force.

1962.	S.A.	N.S.W.	Vic.	Q'land.	W.A.	Tas.
Jan. .	2.5	2.9	2.5	5.0	2.6	4.0
Aug. .	1.5	2.0	1.8	2.2	1.7	2.8

Although the figures quoted indicate that the employment position in South Australia is better than that in any other State, there is no room for complacency. In addition to finding work for those still unemployed, this State, along with the rest of Australia, will be faced with the task of making provision for a large additional work force within the next two or three years, including many thousands of youths and girls who will be leaving school and seeking employment. With South Australia the most progressive State in the Commonwealth, this problem may well become more acute in this State than in the others unless steps are taken to maintain and extend employment and production. The problem will not only require the ability to find new export markets and increase exports but will also require local prices to be held at levels

reasonable to all sections of the community, thus preserving spending power and enabling maximum rates of production and consumption to be achieved.

European Common Market: Whatever may be the ultimate effect if the United Kingdom joins the European Common Market, it does seem certain that Australia will have to seek new export markets, particularly for some primary products. The most likely source of new markets appears to be in Asia and the Pacific but it must be borne in mind that, whilst the potential of these areas is very great, markets would have to be procured in competition with low cost of production countries. We must also realize that in a number of these northern areas purchasing power is low. It is obvious, therefore, that our own goods must be produced at the most efficient and economic levels if any worthwhile penetrations of these markets are to be achieved.

Primary producers: Over recent years, in particular, production costs have been a matter of ever-increasing importance and concern to primary producers. Export markets have become competitive and will probably become increasingly so and, if primary producers are to continue to work the land and obtain a fair return, they will need every assistance to keep production costs within reasonable limits. The savings over a wide range of commodities and services which the Prices Department has been able to effect for primary producers have been a valuable help in this regard and it is now more than ever necessary that this assistance be retained.

Savings: Reference has been made in previous years to the substantial savings which have resulted from investigations carried out by the department and affecting such important commodities as petroleum products, superphosphate and timber, to mention three only. Let me point out that not only are the savings of these commodities continuing to accrue but the department is also effecting savings on many other goods and services.

(1) To a lesser degree considered as savings, but just as important to a section of the community, are, for example, hearing aids which, although not subject to price control, are used largely by pensioners who are on fixed and limited incomes and therefore are deserving of every consideration. Through the efforts of the department it was recently able to negotiate an agreement which resulted in some very favourable price savings for South Australian pensioners embracing aged, widowed, invalid and totally and permanently incapacitated persons. Some examples of the more substantial price savings which will be enjoyed by pensioners as a result of the department's action on hearing aids are:—

	Normal price.	Concessional price to pensioners.	Saving to pensioners.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Model A	67 10 0	44 11 0	22 19 0
Model B	77 10 0	55 10 0	22 0 0
Model C	115 0 0	92 10 0	22 10 0
Model D	92 10 0	74 4 0	18 6 0

(2) Parents of infant and school-going children are another section of the community to be considered and children's footwear provides another typical example of savings effected by the department. Under control, prices of children's shoes in this State average several shillings a pair less than in any other State. Men's and women's footwear in this State is also several shillings a pair lower than in any other State.

Numerous other examples of savings effected could be cited, but the instances I have quoted will serve to show the value of the department's work in this direction. Apart from prices, most members of the House are already conversant with special investigations carried out by the department and the results that have been obtained. Similarly, the action that has been taken from time to time in a number of cases concerning exploitation is also well known to members. Whilst it would be far too lengthy for me to go into detail on the department's activities, it will be appreciated from what I have outlined that the prices legislation continues to benefit the community, in view of which it would not be in the interests of the

State to allow this legislation to lapse. I therefore ask members to vote for a continuation of this legislation for a further 12 months. The present Bill (which is in the same form as those introduced in the past) so provides.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is to enable the making of satisfactory administrative arrangements in connection with the various mental institutions. As honourable members know, responsibility for the administration of the Mental Health Act is vested in the Director-General of Medical Services (section 11). Section 11a of the Act empowers the Director-General, with the Minister's approval, to delegate to the superintendent of any institution any of his powers. Nowhere in the Act is there any reference to a Director of Mental Health as such. The present position is that Dr. Cramond occupies the position of Director of Mental Health and Superintendent of Institutions, the persons in charge of each of the institutions being a deputy superintendent. It follows that, as the Act stands, the Director-General can delegate his powers only to Dr. Cramond in his capacity of Superintendent.

With a view to more efficient administration, it is proposed to appoint Dr. Cramond as Director of Mental Health and to raise the status of the officers in charge of each mental institution to that of superintendent. This will enable the Director of Mental Health to have the general oversight of all institutions with superintendents performing specified administrative functions in relation to their respective institutions. However, as I have said, there is no reference to a Director of Mental Health as such in the Act and the Director-General of Medical Services can delegate only to superintendents. Accordingly, clause 3 introduces a new section into the principal Act providing for the appointment of a Director of Mental Health under the Public Service Act and empowering the Director-General of Medical services to delegate particular functions and authorities to him in the same way as specific functions can be delegated to superintendents. The amendment will enable more effective administrative arrangements to be made and will, I believe, result in greater efficiency. Clause 4 is merely consequential.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINES AND WORKS INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is to make provision to enable the oversight and control of machinery on, and reporting of accidents occurring at, the wharves at Port Pirie adjoining Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited when no shiploading is in progress. The principal Act provides for the general control and oversight of machinery and mines including "works". A "mine" is a place where mining operations are being carried on, and "works" is defined as including any works in which operations are carried on for the treatment of the products of mining operations. The second schedule of the principal Act covers the subject matter of regulations which may be made, and includes among other things power to make regulations concerning accidents in or about mines including notification, steps to be taken, and procedure at inquiries.

As I have said, the Act covers mines as such, and works. The Act and the regulations made under it clearly apply to operations taking place inside or within the limits of a mine or works attached to it. Actual loading or unloading to or from ships is covered by Commonwealth regulations. It will thus be seen that operations inside a mine or actual loading operations outside a mine are covered by either State or Commonwealth provisions. However, the Smelters wharf at Port Pirie occupies an anomalous position—it is not part of a mine nor is it included in the definition of "works", and the company has brought to the attention of the Government that, when lead is being handled from point to point on its wharf at Port Pirie, the operations are uncontrolled; and the company has sought an amendment to our regulations to cover these operations, in particular to require the reporting of accidents occurring on the wharf. The Bill will extend the existing definition of works to include the wharves adjoining the company's smelting works at Port Pirie used for or in connection with loading of ships and all apparatus thereon. The amendment is of a

technical character, designed to fill a gap in the law and will, I believe, be supported in the interests of general safety.

Mr. McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes several amendments to the principal Act which are best dealt with in the order in which they are set out in the Bill, and accordingly I deal with it clause by clause. Clause 3 amends section 23b of the principal Act which deals with the basis of royalties under leases. The section provides that where a royalty is based on gross proceeds of sale certain expenditure can be deducted by the lessee. In particular paragraph (*a*) of subsection (1) permits the licensee to deduct expenditure incurred on treatment of his material obtained from the land before delivery to the buyer other than any treatment necessary in order to make the substance a marketable product. The disallowance of treatment necessary to make the substance marketable operates unfairly and appears to be anomalous because it really means that royalty can be levied on what may be unsaleable material. The best way to illustrate how the paragraph works is to take a hypothetical case. If an ore carrying say 2 per cent of copper is mined, the royalty payable on 100 tons of ore would be based on the value of two tons of copper less costs and transport. In actual practice, however, it is necessary for the mine operator to treat the 2 per cent copper ore to produce a concentrate carrying, say, 20 per cent copper before he can sell the material to the smelter; and in treating the ore a small proportion of the copper would not be recovered at all. The proposed amendment will provide that the licensee can deduct expenditure incurred by him on treatment of the substance before delivery to the buyer other than any treatment effected after it first becomes marketable. In other words, the operator can deduct the actual cost of treatment of the ore up to the stage at which it first becomes saleable. In the hypothetical example which I have given, royalty would be payable on the actual value of the recovered copper less cost of treatment and transport. This provision appears to be reasonable and much fairer than the existing one.

Clause 4 deals with section 23d of the Act, which empowers the Minister on the recommendation of the Auditor-General to agree with a lessee upon a royalty based on the weight or volume of the substance mined instead of a royalty fixed under the lease. This provision covers the case where a lessee uses the substance himself, in which case the Minister may agree upon the "flat rate" royalty. But the operation of the section is limited to cases where the lessee uses the substance in manufacturing or to cases in which the substance mined is salt or gypsum. The amendment will remove these limitations and permit the Minister to agree on a "flat rate" royalty in relation to any lease. The present provision has proved valuable in the case of salt and gypsum for both the producer and the Government, as both parties know in advance what royalties are payable. It is considered that similar provisions should apply to all minerals.

Clause 5 inserts a new section in the principal Act dealing with precious stones claims. At present the holder of a miner's right may among other things prospect for precious stones and peg out a precious stones claim. He must register his claim within 30 days after pegging it out, the only condition of registration being production of his miner's right and payment of a nominal fee of 2s. 6d. for registration. While a miner's right is renewable every year, there is no time limit upon registration of a precious stones claim.

New section 41a (inserted by clause 5) will provide for the payment upon registration of a precious stones claim of £5. Such claims are to remain in force for only one year and are to be renewed from year to year on payment of a fee of £10. In connection with this amendment, I would mention that the Government has stationed officers on the opal fields at Andamooka and Coober Pedy at the request and to meet the convenience of opal miners. The Government considers it not unreasonable that an appropriate registration fee should be paid by those who register and enjoy the benefits of precious stones claims; accordingly, this amendment is introduced.

Clauses 6 and 7 deal with the covenants which may be contained in a mineral lease or a coal lease. Sections 53 and 56 set out what covenants may be included. Clauses 6 and 7 will add to the sections a covenant to ensure that a lessee will make good any damage to the leased land arising from his operations. The covenant may not often be required but in some circumstances damage done to land may outweigh the value of the product. For

example, certain types of sand mining for filling sand in the metropolitan area may cause damage through excavations being dug below general ground level, requiring the return of filling to render the land usable. The amendment to section 53 will enable the Minister to require a covenant from the lessee that the land will be restored to a satisfactory condition, and clause 6 makes a similar provision in relation to coal leases.

I come now to clause 8, which is the most important of the amendments. It deals with section 69d of the principal Act relating to mining on private land. Under the principal Act, any person may obtain an authority to enter private lands by agreement with the occupier or, if agreement is not forthcoming, upon application to a warden. If application is made to a warden, the occupier has 14 days in which to lodge an objection, and in determining the warden may have regard to the character of the applicant and whether there are payable substances capable of being mined on the land. An authority to enter does not give the holder any exclusive right, and any number of persons can simultaneously obtain authority to enter private land for the purpose of prospecting or pegging a claim. Moreover, no time limit is placed on the currency of any authority and the occupier receives no compensation other than compensation for any actual damage done. There is some doubt whether the Minister can obtain an authority. Further, the Minister has no rights or powers in relation to minerals located by departmental activities and this means that the Crown, which has the major prospecting organization in the State, has no rights or security in regard to private land on which it may have expended large sums of money in prospecting or drilling.

Clause 8 amends section 69d of the principal Act in various ways. In the first place, by paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) it will require a warden in considering an application for an authority to enter private land to have regard to the matters already mentioned in section 69d—that is, the character of the applicant and whether there are payable substances on the land—and, in addition, to the exploration programme submitted by the applicant.

Paragraph (*c*) inserts five new subsections into section 69d. The first of these will make an authority to enter private land exclusive to the holder. New subsection (10) will limit the currency of an authority to enter to two years with the possibility of renewal. New subsection (11) will enable the warden in issuing an authority to enter to fix a rental to be paid to the occupier of the land, thus giving him some compensation, other than compensation for actual damage, for inconvenience and the like. Because of extremely wide variations in the areas involved and the numbers of landholders affected, it is not thought possible or desirable to fix a rate of rental applicable in all cases. The subsection therefore leaves the amount to be fixed by the warden in each case.

New subsection (12) will make it clear that an authority will be granted or issued to the Minister, and new subsection (13) will empower the holder of an authority to enter to assign the authority to another person. In this connection it should be noted that under the Bill authorities to enter will in future confer exclusive rights. One of the effects of subsections (12) and (13) will be to enable the Minister to transfer his rights to other persons on such terms as he thinks fit. This will enable the Government to undertake mineral exploration on private lands and ensure the development of any discoveries that are made. The Government already undertakes exploration of this kind but is restricted at present to mineral lands. The amendments will enable Government experts to undertake works in any area of the State and to make the necessary arrangements for protection of its rights.

Clause 9 increases the penalty for unauthorized mining from £1 a day to a maximum period of imprisonment of two years, a fine of £300, or both. The present penalty of £1 a day is quite unrealistic and does not operate as a deterrent having regard to the substantial profit which can be obtained through unauthorized mining. This has particular application in opal mining where there have been several recent cases of unauthorized mining.

Mr. LOVEDAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 726.)

Mr. TAPPING (Semaphore): Although I support the second reading, I will take appropriate action in the Committee stages regarding certain clauses relating to courts of marine inquiry. This Bill has not been amended since 1957, when minor amendments were made; prior to that the legislation had not been considered since 1936. It is evident that the desire of the Minister and of the authorities in this matter is for uniformity, and I agree that that is necessary. I think

all members will agree that the move in Australia for uniformity in other matters is a step in the right direction. Last year the Commonwealth Government introduced uniform divorce laws, and the general reaction mainly was that this was desirable. That legislation went beyond the borders of South Australia and in fact became international in character. Those who seek a dissolution of marriage under that law can take action even though a party may live in another part of the world.

We have also found a clamour throughout Australia for uniformity in traffic laws, and there again we agree that that is a progressive step, for people who cross the interstate border find difficulty because of the lack of uniformity in those laws. Another instance of uniformity arises in the case of the Civil Aviation (Carriers' Liability) Bill now before the House. That legislation deals with uniformity not only throughout Australia but internationally regarding compensation of passengers, loss of luggage, merchandise, and other things. I consider that uniformity in almost every sphere is essential.

I consider that the two important clauses in this Bill concern stability tests for new boats and the alteration of the present set-up of the court of marine inquiry. Clause 8 refers to stability tests. This provision is long overdue. In October, 1959, we had the very sad happening of the *Milford Crouch* turning over off Cowell, with the loss of five lives, and it behoves Parliament to take cognizance of the need to amend the Act in order to ensure, as much as possible, that such a happening does not recur. I am informed that, although in 1959 there was no prescribed stability test for this type of boat, some type of test was made of the *Milford Crouch.* However, it was not a rigid test, hence the trouble that occurred. Boats built in another State generally come within the provisions of the Commonwealth legislation if they are to ply around the Australian coastline. This and similar legislation aims at uniformity in the Acts of the Commonwealth and the States, with the exception of Victoria, which is in a somewhat different category because of its comparatively short coastline. I think the desire here is that a boat that has just been completed and taken from the slip will undergo tests, first without ballast, then with ballast. The boat will be tilted first to starboard and then to port to make certain that it can cope with boisterous and even unprecedented weather. I think we all agree that such a provision must be supported because it aims to avoid loss of life along our coastline.

I draw members' attention to clauses 9 to 13 inclusive referring to courts of marine inquiry. These clauses effect a drastic alteration in the present set-up. Since 1936 we have had the very good system in South Australia whereby this court consists of a magistrate and two assessors who are selected from a panel. The present magistrate (Mr. L. F. J. Johnston) has sat on these cases for many years. No-one can fault his marine and nautical knowledge or his fairness: because of his background over so many years he knows these matters well. However, because of his ability and the service he has rendered I predict that he will be elevated to a higher office. Mr. Johnston is held in high esteem in the Port Adelaide and Semaphore districts.

We are bound to look to the future and also to reflect on whether this court of marine inquiry procedure has been entirely satisfactory. I have never heard of an instance of grumbling because of the way the court has been conducted. Under the present set-up, the magistrate and the two assessors have equal say and an equal vote in determining compensation, in some instances involving the loss of a boat, and also in instances where officers are charged with neglect. This is a very important decision to make. We know of cases where men have lost their tickets. A few years ago the *Yandra* went on the rocks on the West Coast and as a result the captain was demoted to the ranks. This indicates that the evidence on that occasion must have been definite enough for such a determination to be made. It is because of the very fine understanding between the special magistrate and the assessors that such a satisfactory state of affairs exists. I think that in the last five years there have been three inquiries. I have mentioned the instances of the *Milford Crouch* and the *Yandra.* The third case concerned an impact between a ketch and a boat in the main channel of the Outer Harbour. On each of those occasions the court of marine inquiry made determinations or prescribed disqualifications, or whatever was necessary.

I emphasize that although Mr. Johnston has all the necessary ability it is only fair that the present set-up should be continued. I am a layman, but with my colleague, the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan), I have made many inquiries from those well qualified to state a case. For obvious reasons, I shall not refer to the experts from whom I have sought information, because that may embarrass them,

but I assure the House that those men have ability and are experienced and most impartial. I am told that those men, without exception, desire the present system retained. If the proposed system is introduced full power will be given to the magistrate. Under the present system the magistrate interrogates the witnesses, and the two assessors have the right to do likewise, whereas under the proposed set-up the magistrate would have the sole right to do that and the assessors would take part only when the determination was being discussed. I can imagine how these men of vast experience will feel if they are restricted in this way. I think it would be a retrograde step to introduce this new procedure.

The Act of 1936 lays it down that the assessors to be appointed from a panel of possibly 10 or 12 must be experts in nautical and marine engineering. This means that the time may well come when something of a delicate and specialized nature is being considered and it will be essential that the magistrate be guided by these assessors in this important and specialized work. If we are going to concede that the magistrate must call upon the two assessors for guidance, then I claim that those gentlemen must have the same right as the magistrate to agree upon the result of the inquiry. As I mentioned before and emphasize again, this inquiry pays heed to insurance claims, individual crew members' rights and wrongs and the loss, or possible loss, of a ticket through some misdemeanour by an officer.

I conclude on this note and appeal to the Minister to consider this matter seriously because there are two important aspects in the Bill. I have dealt with stability (we all agree upon the desirability of that) but, in regard to the court of marine inquiry, let us and the Minister be guided by experts who have sat on inquiries and have the knowledge and desire to serve the State. When an assessor sits on this type of inquiry, where the possible loss of a ticket by a master is involved, the assessor must have the courage and determination to give an opinion that may cost the man his position as a captain for the remainder of his life. I support the second reading, but will oppose clauses 9 to 13 in Committee.

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): I, too, support the second reading, but in Committee I intend to oppose clauses 9 to 13. I agree with the member for Semaphore that uniformity in the various State Acts is essential because the court has found in the past that, where it has jurisdiction and control over certain people as regards intrastate trading, it has no control over them as regards interstate trading. One anomaly revealed from a number of cases in the past is that, where a person holds a ticket (especially a master's ticket) that has been issued in some other State, he transfers his activities to South Australia, he is dealt with by a court of marine inquiry in South Australia and it is found necessary to take some action against him, the court finds itself in the position that it can take no action for the cancellation of his ticket as it has been issued in another State. The same applies in reverse, where a person is issued with a master's ticket in South Australia and is dealt with in some other State. The amending legislation brings some degree of uniformity to the control, issuing and cancellation of certificates.

We have been told that it is desirable to amend the Act in South Australia so that it will be uniform with similar Acts in other States, but the Minister himself said that uniformity would occur in all States except Victoria. Even at this stage, whilst Victoria has indicated that it desires some uniformity, the Victorian Parliament has, so far, made no move towards creating a uniform system. The court of inquiry system operates differently in each State. The Commonwealth has a system that is at variance even with the uniformity achieved by this Bill. The person presiding over such a court in the Commonwealth is a judge. In other States, even if this Bill passes as at present drafted, there will not be absolute uniformity in courts of inquiry.

In the original Marine Act of 1936, section 107, which it is intended to amend, reads:

(1) The court of marine inquiry shall consist of the special magistrates of South Australia and assessors.

(2) The assessors shall be persons of nautical, engineering, or other special skill or knowledge.

No-one can deny that a court of marine inquiry is vastly different from any other court. It is common knowledge among those who are experts in the industry that a special magistrate could be absolutely at sea in his knowledge of a court of marine inquiry. I remember one occasion when a court of marine inquiry was being held and the terms "forrard" and "aft" arose. The special magistrate had to seek advice on what those nautical terms meant; in other words, he did not know the "forrard" from the "aft" of a ship, yet he was an expert on legal matters. Courts of marine inquiry apply, generally, only to seaports, but there was once a period of nearly 20 years when no court of marine

inquiry sat in South Australia. That is good, not bad, because a court of marine inquiry is set up only when an accident occurs. Unfortunately, in most cases where it is necessary to constitute such a court, loss of life is involved in the accident under consideration, and no-one likes cases of that sort.

Then we had four or five courts of marine inquiry within a period of two years, but we were fortunate in this, that the magistrate who was presiding at that court had spent practically all his lifetime in an area where seafaring was the principal occupation. He was well conversant with the activities there and was a seafaring man himself to a certain degree, though probably only amateur, but he had a good knowledge of seafaring. Of course, he was guided on all occasions by professional and expert assessors who became part and parcel of the court. They heard the case, assisted in it and ultimately arrived at decisions. Like the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping), I have made many inquiries and find that there has never, on any occasion under the present set-up when the court has given its decision, been any dissension, whether official or unofficial, over the decision arrived at by the court, which speaks volumes for its personnel.

If the set-up is changed and it comprises a magistrate, and the assessors are to be there only in an advisory capacity, it will mean that they will have no power to cross-examine, in their official capacity as a part of the court of inquiry, people appearing before the court as witnesses. If the magistrate wants to stick strictly to legal terms in questions or the cross-examining of witnesses appearing before the court, it will be done through the magistrate himself. Imagine the predicament of expert and professional men being placed on the court without any voice in its affairs and being in a position where, if they want to ask professional questions, they will have to ask them secondhand through somebody else.

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

Mr. RYAN: Whilst I can agree with much that is contained in this Bill I oppose those clauses to which I have referred. I object to the proposal that will remove the assessors from membership of the court and make them merely advisers to the court. In the past the assessor members of the court have rendered good service, and the companies by which they have been employed have permitted them to act as members of the court. It would certainly restrict them if they were simply advisers. In our democracy justice must not only be done but it must appear to be done. If the amendments are carried the court will comprise one member. No longer will it be possible for members of the court to disagree. On several occasions decisions of the court have not been unanimous. Frequently the magistrate and one member have presented a majority report and the other member a minority report. If the amendments are carried a magistrate will constitute the court and he may report contrary to the recommendations of his advisers. He could ignore their recommendations and bring down a decision based on legal grounds. Whilst the Government may seek uniformity in legislation—and we have been told that when considering uniform legislation it is the sovereign right of this Parliament to accept it with slight variations—the present situation should not be altered. Assessors were appointed to the court because of their knowledge of maritime conditions. I have attended courts of inquiry and listened to witnesses giving evidence. The assessors have been able to ask the questions that would not be permitted in a court of law. If the Bill is carried the assessors will have to direct their questions to witnesses through the magistrate and the value of the present set-up will be lost. I support the second reading, but in Committee will oppose those clauses I have mentioned because I believe the *status quo* should be preserved.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Amendment of principal Act, section 107."

Mr. TAPPING: I oppose clauses 9 to 13, but assume that the vote on this clause will be regarded as a test vote. I agree with the comments of the member for Port Adelaide. Before we adopt any legislation we should be sure that it has the support of those affected by it. Experts have indicated that they would prefer the present position to be retained and we should be guided by them. The present Chairman has many years of experience and can perform his duties extremely well, but in the near future he may be elevated to a higher rank, so it is essential that the court should continue to consist of a magistrate and two assessors. With Mr. Ryan, I have interviewed experts, and no person with marine knowledge favours the proposed amendment.

The existing situation has been entirely satisfactory and I oppose the clause.

Mr. RYAN: For the reasons I gave during the second reading debate, I oppose this clause. To ask experts to advise the court but prevent them from adjudicating or participating in any decision goes against the grain. Experts who have operated for many years, and legal men and others who have appeared before the court and have had much experience in these matters, oppose this clause because there is nothing wrong with the present provision. I ask the Committee to allow the present method to continue.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Marine): I do not want to prolong discussion on this matter, but I want to correct one or two misconceptions under which I think members opposite have been labouring. Both members who have spoken have said that under the Bill assessors will be deprived of the right to direct expert questions to witnesses, which has been their function until now, but I am sure that they are wrong. The amendment provides that assessors shall sit in the court as part of the court and that they shall assist it. That means (and I am reinforced in this opinion by reference to authorities) that they will have the right as heretofore to question witnesses and to elicit information based on expert questions they will direct to technical officers, and that their functions in that respect will not be curtailed. Members will see that this clause provides that their function shall be to assist the court; the only difference between this and the existing legislation is that they shall not formulate the judgment. As I understand it, the function of a presiding judge in any court is to determine and deliver the judgment. If he is to perform his duties properly and fully, he will and must have recourse to expert opinion available to him.

Mr. Shannon: It would be embarrassing for him if these people tried to tell him what to decide.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. Assessors of the court will be able to furnish the magistrate with all the information he requires regarding technical matters. Magistrates are called upon frequently to adjudicate in technical matters and to assess damages in civil actions, but nobody assumes that they could be experts in all fields. However, they are obliged to seek opinion, sort it out, and come to a decision. That is a function of any judge, and it is preserved in this legislation. Under the existing legislation, of course, assessors had the privilege of assisting to determine the judgment. I do not know if this has happened in other States, or it has happened in Victoria, or that is why other States have sought to amend the Act: the two assessors could possibly overrule the magistrate in his decision.

Mr. Shannon: That is contrary to law.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I agree. It devolves on the magistrate to determine the judgment. The member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) said that so far legislation on these lines had not been introduced in Victoria, and that may be so. He implied that South Australia should wait until Victoria had moved, but I point out that we should not be the last State to take remedial action. Having been requested so to do, I undertook that when this Act came before Parliament I would seek to have this provision inserted. The primary need for this legislation is to have stability tests carried out in the interests of safety, and all members are in agreement on this. For the reasons I have outlined, which I think are probably reassuring in relation to the functions of assessors, I ask the Committee to accept this clause.

Mr. TAPPING: I believe the member for Port Adelaide and I have submitted a case for the retention of the *status quo*, and we have been guided by marine experts. Will the Minister say why this Bill was introduced? The member for Port Adelaide and I have questioned the highest authorities on marine matters but have not found anyone to agree with this provision.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Will you tell me who your authority was?

Mr. Ryan: The marine assessors.

Mr. TAPPING: I could disclose the names of eight or 10 men, but it would not be fair to do so. I assure members that the opinion I have given was that of experts. Will the Minister say from whom he obtained advice?

Mr. RYAN: The member for Onkaparinga said that assessors might try to tell the court what to decide. If that indicates the opinion of some members opposite, they should wipe out the provision relating to assessors, whether acting as members of the court or to assist the court. The Minister said he had been advised by experts. I have consulted marine experts. These people do not become experts until they have served a considerable time and have had much experience in marine matters: this is necessary to obtain the qualifications required in the principal Act. I have also sought the opinion of legal men who are familiar with the original legislation. I

challenge the Minister to name a legal representative or a person who is qualified to act as an assessor under this legislation who has suggested the amendment. I know that uniformity was requested by other States, but we should not accept uniformity just for the sake of uniformity, though if uniformity achieves something I am all for it. The Bill contains much that is good, but I oppose anything that may result in a departure from the justice that has been meted out by this court as constituted over a long period of years. There has been no criticism whatever of the conduct of the court, of the appearance of any persons in the court, or of the decisions ultimately arrived at. I know of one case where the majority decision was arrived at by the magistrate and one assessor, with the other assessor giving a minority decision. The legal advice I have had is that the ultimate judgment is arrived at not only on the legal aspect but as a result of the experience of the experts assisting the court. If we are to dispense with these assessors and allow the whole matter to be decided on a legal basis, then I am sure there will be dissatisfaction with the future judgments of the court.

If we are to ask these men to leave high and lucrative posts for some considerable period purely to assist the court, without having any status whatever, I think they will be reluctant to act. If they are to participate, we should let them participate fully and retain the *status quo*. Let these men act as members of the court and not be merely like reserves in a football team, without any incentive to play.

Mr. SHANNON: It is rather unusual for anyone to expound the theory that if we live by the law we shall run into trouble. If I correctly understood the member for Port Adelaide, he said that if we leave this matter purely to legal interpretation, we can expect trouble in this field. That remark discloses a lack of responsibility to a Parliament that is charged with the duty of making the law. Quite obviously, other States have seen fit to adopt a legal approach to this matter. To suggest that an assessor might just as well stay at home as appear in the court, if he is not going to sit on the bench and take an active part in reaching the ultimate judgment, is just begging the question. I do not think that any court that deals with abstruse problems would fail to call expert witnesses to assist it in deciding the facts of a case. The facts may establish the fundamental principles regarding damages, but the law is a matter for the judiciary.

The Minister has made out an excellent case on this point. I think the present proposal will have a solidifying effect amongst the marine community, for those people will know that they will be abiding by the rule of law. The member for Port Adelaide referred to the instance where the magistrate and one assessor gave a majority decision, and surely that is sufficient evidence that one of those assessors was out of step. If both those assessors had been out of step and had out-voted the magistrate, I do not know whether justice would have been done. I suggest that the magistrate is better qualified to interpret the Act than the two laymen who are assisting purely on questions of fact.

Mr. TAPPING: I should like the Minister to tell the Committee by whom he was guided in this drastic amendment. From the numerous inquiries I have made I know that the experts, the men who sit on this court, have no desire to see a change. Those people believe that the present system is in the best interests of the people and the shipowners.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In courtesy to the member for Semaphore, I can say that the port authorities of Australia are in constant conference and discussion over matters relating to their industry. Those authorities meet at regular intervals and exchange views on all matters affecting the functions of their boards and on all matters regarding marine affairs generally, and, if my memory is correct, that is how this matter arose. This matter has been discussed by those authorities over a period of years, and that is probably how this amendment originated.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Can I assume that the Minister is emphasizing the desirability of uniformity in this matter? He has stated that his recollection is that the matter arose as a result of conferences held from time to time by representatives of this State and other States. If the present Act has proved satisfactory in the past, why must we adopt something different? That is my point. If our only concern is to make this uniform throughout Australia, I see no necessity for this clause, having listened to my colleagues and to the Minister.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Jenkins, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, and Mrs. Steele.

Noes (17).—Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Pair.—Aye—Sir Cecil Hincks. No—Mr. Ralston.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 17 Ayes and 17 Noes. I cast my vote in favour of the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 15) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

BANKS STATUTORY OBLIGATIONS AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 18. Page 935.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Earlier this year, on behalf of my Party, I made a public announcement that part of our policy would be to favour the Savings Bank of South Australia opening and operating cheque accounts for ordinary personal depositors. The Succession Duties Act and the Stamp Duties Act are involved in this. I shall not debate the relative merits of those Acts, but I shall seek information on some amendments on the file. This Bill is essential. It will enable the Savings Bank to offer cheque accounts to those people seeking them. Its charges will be on the same basis as those applied by trading banks. Admittedly the stamp duty charges will not be applied to trust estates, insolvent estates or companies in liquidation. Exemptions from stamp duty will continue in respect of local councils, trade unions and non-profitmaking organizations.

It is necessary to enable the Savings Bank to provide this facility because of the competition it receives from other banks. The Bank of New South Wales, for instance, is in a position to have an extensive clientele and it can attract customers to its savings bank activities. The Savings Bank is now to be enabled to compete with trading banks for savings accounts and cheque accounts, and this will be to the advantage of the general public. Earlier this session I obtained leave to introduce legislation amending the principal Act, but I have not proceeded with it because I believe this Bill will meet my requirements. I support the second reading but will seek further information on the amendments in Committee.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I wholeheartedly support the legislation which is designed to amend and extend the authority and obligation of banks, including savings banks in various respects. It is logical that the Savings Bank of South Australia should seek authority to give the added service of cheque account facilities to its clients, and so recover a competitive disadvantage which has developed with the entry of trading banks into the savings bank field. This entry has enabled the trading banks to provide both current and savings account facilities simultaneously—under the same roof in most instances—and this necessitates the Savings Bank extending its services in respect of current accounts to put in on a competitive footing with the other banks. The proposals in this legislation are realistic and desirable. It is of prime importance that the people's bank—which has, since its foundation in 1848, rendered invaluable service to its clients and the community generally—be given equal facility with other banking institutions to advance with and meet the needs of the day, and to continue to grow in stature and in service to the community.

Few governmental instrumentalities have done more for the people of this State than has the Savings Bank over the years. Materially, in taking care of savings since 1848—and it was the first institution in this State to provide the facility for saving—it has not only provided a completely safe repository at consistently higher interest rates than other States' savings banks, but has also played a major part in the State's development. As at the end of last financial year no less than £25,294,754 was on loan to statutory bodies and £4,598,428 to local government authorities. During the year £1,050,000 was made available to the Electricity Trust, £638,000 to local government authorities and £875,000 to the Housing Trust. During the past 10 years the bank has advanced £45,000,000 to purchasers of property. At the end of last financial year it had 19,107 mortgage loans with balances totalling £37,858,105.

Apart from the material gains that the Savings Bank has conferred on the people and on the State's economy, it has rendered sterling service in promoting thrift and consequently a sense of personal responsibility. It begins by encouraging the practice of thrift among our schoolchildren. Today in South Australia it has 866 school bank agencies, which last year added £71,557 to the deposits in school savings accounts, bringing the total balance to the amazing figure of £1,549,574—a huge sum to be

deposited by the very young folk in our community. It encourages our youngsters to save, and this is vitally important. Each year gifts of books and pennants are made to the schools recording outstanding per capita savings. I have no doubt that the encouragement given to thrift and the extolling of its virtues to our youngsters have a direct association with the pleasing fact that the average amount deposited with savings banks per capita in South Australia is the highest in Australia.

As I see the definite need for this worthy bank to meet current competition and as I can see the need for it to supply cheque facilities, I keenly support this legislation. I have no doubt that with the growth of this bank, offering both savings and current facilities, the good of the State will be furthered, and I commend the Government for being prepared quickly, in order to meet a situation arising from the entry to the savings field of other organizations, to allow the Savings Bank to have facilities necessary to ensure its continued growth. I warmly support the Bill.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I support this Bill. About three years ago, when legislation of this type was introduced in Victoria, I asked the Premier whether it was intended that similar legislation should be introduced here, and he promised to discuss the matter with the Manager of the Savings Bank of South Australia and to let me have a reply, but that was the last I heard of it.

Mr. Ryan: This is the reply!

Mr. FRED WALSH: It is. The same applied when I asked a question about bank charges recently. I tried to obtain an answer to that question today, because it is most important and has a bearing on this legislation. I am anxious to know whether the Savings Bank of South Australia intends to apply the charges that other banks are applying on cheque accounts, as well as other charges. If the Savings Bank is going to be tied up with other banks the same as is the Commonwealth Bank, it appears that there is no independence for our State instrumentalities. I would have believed that at least the Commonwealth Bank and our State banks would be free of those people. Trading banks claim in literature and over the radio and television that they are independent and that people have a choice, but I have yet to find out what the choice is—the charges and rates of interest are the same, and it has been proved conclusively in recent weeks that there is no choice at all. I was hoping that at least our banks would be different and that the people would have a choice. I hope the Premier will be able to inform us that the State Bank is not tied up in any way with the other banks.

There is no competition; these people meet in conference and come to a decision. However, it could be expected that the State banking institution would have no association with them. It is commendable that at least the Savings Bank of South Australia is able to offer a higher rate of interest than are the other savings banks. We hope that the Savings Bank of South Australia will be able to keep free of any association with these people as to bank charges. It is not certain whether the cheque account section of the Savings Bank of Victoria is showing a profit. It may or it may not be, but at least it is offering a service to its customers and this service will probably bring in additional customers.

I have a small cheque account with the Commonwealth Trading Bank. It is possible, as the result of the Savings Bank of South Australia opening a cheque account section that I may transfer my cheque account there. I have been a customer of this bank since before the First World War. My war gratuity was paid into this bank on my return from the war. I am not associated with any private banking institution and I am proud of that fact. I want the Premier's assurance that there will be no tie-up with the private banks as to the charges. I support the Bill.

Mr. LOVEDAY (Whyalla): Although pleased to support this Bill, I cannot but describe it as rather belated. It is interesting to notice the tardiness in bringing the Savings Bank into the position where it can compete adequately with the private trading banks in their saving bank activities. A considerable time ago the trading banks invaded a field that was not regarded as their own. As the result of the delay in the introduction of this Bill there is not the slightest doubt that the Savings Bank of South Australia has already lost many customers, because pressure was put on its customers by the private banks to bring their savings bank into line with cheque accounts. Undoubtedly, the private savings banks could offer a service to take away from the Savings Bank some of its customers. When the private banks went into the savings bank field, this legislation should have been introduced immediately so that our Savings Bank could be on the same footing as and competitive with trading banks. The introduction of cheque accounts

to the Savings Bank customers will be of considerable advantage to country depositors with accounts in the city for goods bought on hire-purchase requiring the transmission of money each month, because the cost of sending money to the city will be considerably less.

Mr. Quirke: They will have to have two accounts.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Admittedly, by having a cheque account with the Savings Bank they will be able to transmit their payments more cheaply than in the past and in the aggregate it will be of much advantage to country people who have deposited their money with the Savings Bank of South Australia.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): It gives me much pleasure to support any measure that will strengthen the Savings Bank of South Australia, because I believe it has rendered very valuable service to the State. Some of us would like to feel that it had invested more of its money in South Australia instead of investing so much in Commonwealth securities. I hope that the bank will give some thought to that suggestion. I pay a tribute to the bank for the fact that it has stood behind the Government in difficult periods, when finance was required for housing and other works, finance which had not been readily forthcoming from other banks or other sources. South Australia has benefited from the fact that the bank has a Government guarantee behind it to enable it to serve the community. It would be a sad thing for South Australia if anything happened to weaken the people's bank so that it could not stand behind Government works and undertakings, as well as local government works, for which finance is not so readily obtained from other sources, particularly from banks that are controlled from outside South Australia. It is in the interests of the people to have as much local control as possible. This Bill will enable them to give more support to the Savings Bank than hitherto and enable it to compete more equitably with other banks.

Those banks were not slow in asking for the inclusion of clauses in this measure that would take away any advantages the Savings Bank might have had in other directions. As indicated by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday), we seem to have experienced a considerable lapse of time in giving the Savings Bank the right to enter into the cheque business, at least on a competitive footing with other banks. I believe from information that I have been able to gather, that because of the arrangements made by large employing institutions, considerable inroads have been made into the business of the Savings Bank. I hope that this measure will enable the bank to recapture that business, because I believe it is in the interests of the State. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of Savings Bank of South Australia Act, section 9."

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

In paragraph (*a*) to strike out "husband parent or child" and insert "widower, ancestor, or descendant".

It is a slightly wider definition and is in accordance with what appears in another part of the Bill.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

In paragraph (*b*) to strike out "husband, parent or child" and insert "widower, ancestor or descendant".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Amendment of Succession Duties Act, section 63a."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

In new subsection (3) (*b*) to strike out "parent or child" and insert "ancestor or descendant".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Amendment of Stamp Duties Act, second schedule."

Mr. FRED WALSH: Certain charges have been laid down by various trading banks to apply to cheque accounts. Will similar charges apply to cheque accounts operated by the Savings Bank of South Australia?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is inevitable that these charges will apply to the Savings Bank because the Savings Bank has no clearing house of its own, and I think it would have to comply with the steps taken by the other banks if it is to give the same service as the other banks. The private banks have agreed to charge on cheque accounts according to a formula to be generally applied. A cheque account will not be operated through an ordinary savings bank account, but will apply only to a special account. Interest will not be paid on a cheque account. I believe it is inevitable that these charges will apply in the case of the Savings Bank, because the Commonwealth Banks are conforming to the general

rule. If the bank does not conform honourable members will not be able to have their cheques handled there.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EXCHANGE OF LAND (HUNDRED OF TICKERA).

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Acting Minister of Lands): I move:

That the proposed exchange of allotments 34 and 68, Town of Alford, as shown on the plan and in the statement laid before Parliament in terms of Section 238 of the Crown Lands Act, 1949-1962, be approved.

The existing school reserve at Alford is not large enough to enable adequate playing space to be provided, and a proposal has been put forward to increase the area by the addition of allotments 33, 34, 39 and 40, and an area of closed road. This would enable a satisfactory oval to be provided for football, cricket and other sports, and the Minister of Education has approved of steps being taken with this object in view. Allotment 33 is Crown land, and can readily be made available, and it is anticipated that allotments 39 and 40 will be obtained by way of gift. Allotment 34, which adjoins the existing school reserve, is freehold, but the owner, Mr. William Peters, has agreed to make it available provided he can obtain nearby allotment 68, which is Crown lands. The area of each of these allotments is one rood. The proposal has been investigated by the Land Board, which has recommended the exchange of allotments 34 and 68 as the most satisfactory way of achieving the desired result. The board's valuation of each allotment is £10. I therefore ask members to agree to the motion.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support the motion. The school reserve at Alford is not large enough for a playing field and, therefore, it is proposed to enlarge the playing area, which can be done by making available several blocks of land, namely, allotments 33, 34, 39 and 40. In addition to these blocks, an area of a closed road will be taken in. Allotment 33 is Crown land and this can be readily made available. Allotment 34 is freehold and necessitates some arrangements being made between both parties to allow the allotment to be used as a school reserve and playing area, which I understand is to be made into an oval. Allotment 68 is Crown land, as intimated by the Minister, and I understand that the Lands Department is prepared to negotiate with the owner of allotment 34 to take over allotment 68 in exchange for that allotment. Allotments 39 and 40 will be obtained by way of a gift to the department and that is a fine gesture. I remember inspecting that area with members of the Bute District Council when it was intimated that Mrs. Sharples (now deceased) was to make this land available to the school reserve. The Minister might be able to explain where allotment 40 is, because I cannot see it on the plan.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber.

Mr. HUGHES: I cannot find allotment 40 and I ask the Minister to tell the House where it is located.

Motion carried.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: HUNDRED OF FINNISS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Acting Minister of Lands): I move:

That the Travelling Stock Reserve (Camping Ground) in the hundred of Finniss, shown on the plan laid before Parliament on July 17, 1962, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1960, for the purpose of being dealt with as Crown lands.

This reserve is at Caloote, on the River Murray, and in this particular locality the Mannum District Council has for many years been issuing licences to campers and holidaymakers for shack sites. This locality, which is ideal for camping, is becoming increasingly popular with holidaymakers and weekend visitors, and the council has been unable to provide sites for all who have applied for them. Towards the end of 1959 the council approached the Department of Lands for additional land to enable the camping area to be extended. On subsequent inspection by the department it was found that whilst most of the sites are on the landing reserve, which the council leases from the Harbors Board for the purpose, and others are on portion of a three-chain road under the control of the council, some are actually on the travelling stock reserve that is the subject of this motion. Therefore, the position should be put in order from that aspect, quite apart from the desirability of providing for additional camping and shack sites, for which portion of the reserve would be suitable.

The Pastoral Board has reported that the reserve is no longer required as a camping ground for travelling stock because there are now no travelling stock routes in the district. The Stockowners' Association, which has been consulted on the proposal, does not raise any objection. It is proposed that in the event

of the reserve being resumed, certain unusable roads will be closed, and a new road to the landing opened over the track now used. The question of the landing reserve, which does not appear to be needed, would be taken up with the Harbors Board, so that the area used and suitable for shack sites could be surveyed and the district council given proper control, thus correcting what is now a rather irregular situation. These proposals would be of benefit to the locality, and as the resumption of the travelling stock reserve is the first step, I ask members to agree to the motion.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the motion. I am pleased that this matter has at last been brought before the House. I remember seeing a docket and reading that in 1923 the Mannum District Council requested that this travelling stock reserve be closed, as even in those days it was not used extensively. On that occasion the late Mr. Collins, who was the then member for the district, made several representations to have this travelling stock reserve closed and put in the hands of the district council. The idea then was that the land could be used for shack sites, as is now proposed. However, on each occasion the honourable member brought this matter before the Minister it was strongly opposed by the late Honourable John Cowan, who was then a representative for the Southern District in the Legislative Council. That gentleman was a grazier, and at that time he was supported to some extent by the Stockowners' Association. He was strongly opposed to the closing of this reserve.

This area has been a worry to the district council, particularly because of noxious weeds and vermin. Now the council will be able to control the area and it will be an asset rather than the liability it has been over recent years. It is evident that the River Murray is becoming increasingly popular for holiday shack sites. Right along the various camping reserves shacks are being built by people who are anxious to get away from the hustle and bustle of city life. Here will be an opportunity for the District Council of Mannum to make available an area of land for shack sites so that people can enjoy the leisure to which they are so justly entitled. I know that the district council has been most anxious that this matter be agreed to, and I commend the Minister for his action in this regard.

Motion carried.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 4. Page 1285.)

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): This Bill makes several desirable amendments, mainly regarding long service leave provisions. I refer particularly to subclauses (*a*) and (*b*) of clause 3. At present Public Service officers under the Public Service Act have as one of their rights concerning long service leave the right to take double their long service leave period on half salary instead of taking their leave on full salary, and this amendment grants the same rights to teachers. It could be of distinct assistance in certain cases, and I support it.

The most important amendment in my opinion is contained in subclauses (*c*) and (*d*) of clause 3. These amendments give to teachers who teach for more than 35 years an additional right that could be a very valuable one. At present teachers are limited to 270 days' long service leave, but under this amendment those who teach for more than 35 years will be entitled to an extra nine days' leave for every year beyond 35 years' service. Members will see that if a teacher began teaching at the age of 20, at 55 he would have had 35 years as a teacher, and if he retired at 65, as is normal, he would be entitled to an additional 90 days' long service leave. I know that this amendment will be much appreciated by teachers who retire at the age of 65.

The only other amendment I should like to mention is contained in clause 4 (*d*). This allows officers of the Public Service who transfer to the Education Department—and a number of them do—to carry over from the Public Service their long service leave rights. I think the Minister mentioned in his second reading speech that this has happened on a number of occasions with officers from the Institute of Technology who have become teachers. Other minor amendments clarify long service leave provisions and correct certain anomalies. I entirely favour all the provisions in this Bill, which I wholeheartedly support.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 9.02 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 10, at 2 p.m.