

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, August 15, 1963.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive members for the presentation of the Address in Reply at 2.10 p.m. today, and I ask the mover and the seconder of the motion and other members to accompany me to Government House for that purpose.

At 2.03 p.m. the Speaker and members proceeded to Government House. They returned at 2.20 p.m.

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that, accompanied by the mover and the seconder of the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Address adopted by this House on August 13, to which His Excellency has been pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which I opened the second session of the thirty-seventh Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon the proceedings of the session.

QUESTIONS.**MODBURY HOUSING PROJECT.**

Mr. HUTCHENS: On behalf and at the request of the Leader of the Opposition, I desire to ask the Premier if his attention has been drawn to an announcement in this morning's *Advertiser* under the heading "£10,000,000 Modbury Project: 2,000 Houses". In the first instance, we can all agree on the desirability of stepping up the house-building programme in this State. Is it possible for the Government to insist upon the local council of that area making provision for the carrying into effect of the appropriate foundations for the type of soil in the Modbury area? Will he also undertake that there will not be any preference extended concerning the advancement of loans to anyone who may be purchasing these houses when erected as against those who may be making applications for assistance through the normal channels?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall be pleased to have some general inquiry made into the type of soil that is being built upon not only in this area but in other areas that may be of some concern to the house purchaser. Honourable members will recall that the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) raised this matter in the House the other day. That was another example of this problem and there is not the slightest doubt that much of the problem arises from the fact that the land is unsuitable for the type of foundation being laid upon it. Although the foundation would appear to conform to the Building Act, it certainly would not be satisfactory if used on that type of land. I will discuss this general problem to see whether it is possible to give some service of this sort to builders, who, I believe, would be most anxious to produce satisfactory houses as they, after all, are liable to some extent for the success of the building operations. I will examine the first part of the honourable member's question to see what service could be given regarding advice on the suitability of land for certain types of buildings.

I presume that in the second part of his question the honourable member is referring to advances under the Advances for Homes Act or those that may be made through the Savings Bank or other lending institutions under the Homes Act. I assure the honourable member that the State Bank deals with applications for advances strictly in the order in which they are received. We have no control over institutions that are lending their own money, and I should not be surprised if some preference were given by these institutions to applicants who could put up a large deposit. That is not entirely unfair, because it means that more money is going back into the pool to enable further advances to be made. I will examine that side of the matter also.

MYPONGA RESERVOIR.

Mr. JENKINS: Last Sunday when I visited the Myponga reservoir the traffic was reminiscent of Rundle Street on busy days; all the bays and look-out points were full of people. Last year I asked the Minister of Works whether he intended to have the perimeter of this reservoir, which is now about high water mark, planted with trees. Has the Minister further considered this matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The Government and the department are conscious of the interest taken by the public in our major undertakings, particularly reservoirs, and

beautification schemes have been undertaken at each of them in various ways that are suited to the particular locality and the contour of the country. A programme has been discussed for Myponga and it will be put in hand, probably next year, for it is now a little late to plant trees this year. The honourable member will appreciate that we have only just completed the construction and cleaning-up work at this reservoir. I would expect that the Engineer-in-Chief would be able to make progress with the beautification work next year.

FISH PROCESSING FACTORY.

Mr. LAWN: Last week I asked the Premier to state the Government's attitude regarding the application by the South Australian Fishing Co-operative Limited to extend its premises in Mill Street adjacent to the Supreme Court building, but the Premier was not able to give me an answer at that time. On Monday, when the matter came before the referees, the Government was represented at the hearing. Can the Premier say whether or not the Government will be represented at future hearings?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The representative who attended on behalf of the Government had no specific instructions. The matter came to the notice of two Cabinet members on Friday, and as there was no possibility of obtaining a Cabinet decision on this issue then, those two Ministers sent a representative to the inquiry for the purpose of seeking an adjournment, if necessary, so that he could receive instructions. That representative had no instructions either to support or to oppose the application. Actually, the referees did not come to a decision but referred the matter back to the City Council, for obviously it is a matter for the council to determine. About 60 people are involved in the market, and a number of industries associated with it have been located nearby. It appears to me that many people who signed the petition requesting that the building be not erected have now signified to the Government their desire to reverse their previous decision and support the move, because they did not realize fully the implications associated with taking the market from the area. Of course, it is necessary for a market to be established and for the large fish industry to have an outlet for its produce, just as it is necessary for the city to be able conveniently to get a distribution of fish throughout the year. As far as I know, and I have not gone into the matter closely, there will be much less nuisance, if there is any, under the proposal than there was

previously. Although a city may be able to dispense with many things, I do not know of any city that has been able to dispense with a central fish market. While it is a matter for the City Council, I think the servicing of the city requires reasonable and adequate facilities for this type of commerce, which is essential to the community.

BREATHALYSERS.

Mr. HARDING: On August 13 I asked a question regarding deaths from motor accidents on our highways. In Victoria in 1961 legislation was brought in for breathalyser tests to be made. Does the Premier know anything about this matter, and can he say whether such tests have been tried in South Australia, in view of the fact that they have been made successfully, apparently, in Victoria during the last two years?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter has been the subject of communications from the Police Commissioner, and it has been considered by Cabinet on a couple of occasions. When it was first considered some doubt had been expressed as to the accuracy of the tests under certain circumstances. Indeed, I believe there was some litigation in Victoria on whether they were accurate and reliable. I will check the position and inform the honourable member whether it is intended to take any action.

WHYALLA TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. LOVEDAY: As a result of correspondence between the Minister of Education and me regarding the early development of the new oval for the Whyalla Technical High School, the Minister informed me that the matter was now in the hands of the Public Buildings Department, which had been given authority to proceed with the work. The matter is urgent because of the fact that the Whyalla South Football Club agreed to maintain the oval on the understanding that it would be seeded this year and because of the school's need for the extra space. As the time for seeding is passing quickly will the Minister of Works have this work expedited so that the seeding may be accomplished this year?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Certainly.

RAILWAY POLICY.

Mr. HALL: Yesterday I asked two questions of the Premier and obtained answers which were not expansive but which were very direct. My question now is directed to the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways, and to illustrate this question I refer the

Minister to my questions yesterday. From the contents of those questions I think the Minister will realize that there is a need to improve the standing of the Railways Department and its operations in the eyes of the public. Will the Minister ask his colleague whether it is desirable (and I maintain that it is) to establish within the Railways Department a public relations office in order to enhance the public image of the department in this State?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

GLENELG TO PORT ADELAIDE BUS SERVICE.

Mr. TAPPING: For some years a private bus service has functioned between Glenelg and Port Adelaide but from August 12 the operator has decided, for economic reasons, to function only from Monday to Friday each week, excluding public holidays. This has been a blow to people living at Semaphore South with no other means of public transport, and they have asked me to appeal to the Minister and the Tramways Trust to see whether alternative transport can be provided on Saturdays, Sundays, and public holidays. If this cannot be provided will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads or the Tramways Trust to consider a subsidy for the private bus operator?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will refer those matters to the General Manager of the Tramways Trust for a report.

FISHING BOATS.

Mr. CORCORAN: I believe the Minister of Marine has a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday in relation to the marine inspection of fishing boats in the South-East.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The General Manager of the Harbors Board has supplied me with the information the honourable member desired. The honourable member asked me a series of questions and I ask permission to have the reply, which is really a series of answers, incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

FISHING BOAT INSPECTIONS.

1. After October 1, 1963, at the owner's convenience. Owners have been asked to submit a group request for initial surveys.

2. Yes. Vessels will be inspected internally and externally.

3. (a) Only linings and copper sheathing of the hull will be required to be removed at vital spots and generally only at the discretion of Surveyor (*i.e.*, no removal would be required in the case of a new vessel).

(b) Only at the discretion of the Surveyor who will take into account the age and condition of the vessel.

(c) Rudders will only have to be lifted not removed as required by the Surveyor if any wear is suspected. Propeller shafts will have to be withdrawn at every survey.

(d) At the discretion of the Surveyor after an engine running test.

4. (a) The owner. (b) The owner.
5. and 6.

Under 50ft.

	£	s.	d.
1 Lifebuoy	7	8	8
2 Lifebelts	3	12	0
6 Flares	2	14	0
2 Flats N & C	1	10	0
Lebradio installed	173	0	0
5 lb. Dry powder Fire Extinguisher	16	7	6
First-aid Kit	7	0	0
Holmes Light	3	6	8
Barometer	5	0	0
Klaxon Horn	8	0	0
Signal Torch	1	0	0
Onazote Raft for two persons	5	0	0

£233 18 10

Over 50ft.

	£	s.	d.
2 Lifebuoys	14	17	4
3 Lifebelts	5	18	0
6 Flares	2	14	0
6 Rockets	5	11	0
Lebradio	173	0	0
2 Fire Extinguishers	32	15	0
First-aid Kit	7	0	0
Holmes Light	3	6	8
Barometer	5	0	0
Klaxon Horn	8	0	0
Signal Torch	1	0	0
Onazote Raft for four persons	10	0	0

£268 12 0

SCHOOL BUSES.

Mr. CURREN: Some time ago I approached the Transport Officer of the Education Department regarding an increase in the payment to private bus contractors operating to the Glossop and Renmark High Schools. At the time the department was not prepared to grant the increase but in view of the dissatisfaction that has been expressed to me by the contractors will the Minister of Education ask the Transport Officer to reconsider the request? The operators claim that they have not had an increase since 1954.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to the Transport Officer and also the Transport Committee consisting of the Deputy Director, the Secretary and the Accountant of the department.

FAULTY BUILDINGS.

Mrs. STEELE: My question is on the same subject as that referred to by the member for

Hindmarsh, but is on somewhat different lines. In recent weeks my colleague, the member for Barossa, and I have received complaints from owners of new houses in parts of our district that suffer the disadvantages of soil instability as a consequence of which houses are cracking badly and subsiding. Will the Premier consider amending the Building Act to provide for a soil survey by the Mines Department as a prerequisite to building in such areas, and also to make it an obligation for the builder or his agent to produce to a prospective buyer a certificate showing the type and depth, etc., of the foundations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member's question is a continuation of one asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. At present I should hesitate to go as far as she is asking until I have a specific report. If the action she is suggesting is taken we, as a State, would almost be underwriting, for stability purposes, the purchase of every house in the metropolitan area. That would obviously require serious consideration. I will have this question, and that of the Deputy Leader, investigated to see what can be done in this respect.

SCHOOL CANTEENS.

Mr. McKEE: I was pleased with the information given me on Tuesday by the Minister of Education about school canteens, but he was unable to give me the information I sought. Will he ask the inspectors who visit schools to check the balance sheets of the canteens, to report to the Director of Education, who, I believe, would then be able to supply the information I seek?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so, as I consider the honourable member's suggestion is valuable. I was surprised that the information was not readily available in the department to enable me to reply to the honourable member's question. I think there is something lacking and I shall be pleased to adopt the member's suggestion.

MIGRANTS' QUALIFICATIONS.

Mr. JENNINGS: On Tuesday last I asked the Premier about the negotiations between his department and the South Australian Division of the Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draftsmen of Australia. In my explanation I pointed out that according to newspaper reports the Premier had referred the matter to the Minister of Labour and

Industry. Has the Premier any further information?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Mr. Bowes reports:

The Federal Conference of the Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draftsmen of Australia resolved in April last that all State Governments should be approached to form appropriate bodies to evaluate and advise migrants on their qualification equivalents in each State. In communicating this resolution to the honourable the Premier the State Secretary of the Association claimed that apart from those in professions which are registered and who are already subject to certain examination before practising in a State, there are many migrants, both English and European, who have found it extremely difficult to establish their academic qualification status.

The association felt that a properly constituted Government body would be recognized by both industry and Government departments alike and indicated that if such a body was established then his association would request that a qualified technical member of the association should be included as a member of such body.

Up to the present time the evaluation of overseas qualifications to their Australian equivalents has been undertaken by the appropriate authorities, viz., by the University of Adelaide or the South Australian Institute of Technology, or in the case of tradesmen by the appropriate trade committee established under the Commonwealth Tradesmen's Rights Regulation Act. These arrangements have apparently operated quite satisfactorily and there does not appear to be any reason why a special body should be constituted. In fact, because of the diverse nature of professions and trades of migrants, it appears that persons intimately connected with the profession or trade concerned are in a better position to evaluate overseas qualifications than would one body constituted to consider such matters in respect of all migrants. Had there been any dissatisfaction with the present arrangements, I would have imagined that the Good Neighbour Council would have made representations in connection therewith.

Obviously I have not had time to put this to Cabinet, but in view of the information that has come forward I doubt whether Cabinet would, under the circumstances, proceed with the request.

SCHOOL CROSSINGS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently, many motorists have been apprehended for exceeding the speed limit of 15 miles an hour within 75 feet of a school crossing. As many motorists consider that the speed limit applies only at the school crossing itself, will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Roads to consider installing suitable signs to adequately warn motorists of their responsibilities?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will refer the question to my colleague.

DENTAL CHARGES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Press reports indicate that the Australian Medical Association is taking steps to stabilize charges to patients for consultations and so forth, but I understand from reports made to me that the amounts charged by dentists for dentures frequently represent more than twice the amount paid to the dental mechanics who manufacture the teeth, and that fillings sometimes cost more than £2. As the general health of a person is often determined by the condition of his teeth, will the Premier take this matter up with the appropriate authority to see whether dental charges cannot be stabilized?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will refer the question to the Minister of Health for examination and ask him to take any necessary action.

SUCCESSION DUTIES.

Mr. HARDING: I address my question to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General. It has been reported that the Attorney-General has said that the Government is considering a possible relaxation of succession duties. Can the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, report on the matter and, if not, will he get a report?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This is a special matter that is the subject of discussion by Cabinet at present, and in due course the Premier will make an announcement.

WATER CATCHMENT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: During a comparatively recent visit to the Snowy Mountains Hydro-Electric Scheme I noticed near many large dams several small streams that would not, if allowed to run their natural course, flow into these dams, and the practice of the Snowy Mountains Authority is to dam these off and convey the water by small pipes and channels to the main dams. It occurred to me that this may not have been done in South Australia in connection with dams in the hills. Can the Minister of Works say whether such a thorough collection of water has been made in South Australia or whether it might be done in order to get the maximum quantity of water into our catchments?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member's question has much interest in it, but I must not develop a reply to it, Mr. Speaker. It is correct, however, that the Guthega dam in the Snowy Mountains scheme has a series of drains which are downstream from the dam itself, but which can feed the

water back to a level above the dam by taking advantage of the altitude of the mountain side. That principle is not disregarded in South Australia. It is the principle on which the Tod River reservoir at Eyre Peninsula is constructed. I am unable to say whether the suggestion could be adopted profitably in our Adelaide Hills catchment areas, but I will ask the Engineer-in-Chief to comment on it so that the honourable member may know his views.

SUPERPHOSPHATE SUBSIDIES.

Mr. HALL: It was announced recently by the Commonwealth Treasurer that there would be a subsidy on the purchase of superphosphate by primary producers. I understand that the Minister of Agriculture has already commented on the desirable aspects of this subsidy, and that the Agriculture Department intends to initiate a campaign for the growing of legumes which will necessitate a greater use of superphosphate fertilizer. Can the Premier say how much of this subsidy will be passed on to the consumers and how much is likely to be retained by the companies?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Many honourable members, including Mr. Heaslip, have mentioned this matter to me. I have a report from the Prices Commissioner, which reads as follows:

There are two things arising out of this matter. In the first place this season, to encourage early deliveries superphosphate manufacturers have decided to give a rebate of 10s. a ton on deliveries from September 1 to December 31. The rebate will replace a deferred payment plan under which payment for deliveries during August to October was due on December 1 (normal payment within 30 days). Last year only 10 per cent of the sales were delivered between July 1 and December 31. Superphosphate manufacturers have been advised by the Department of Trade and Customs that the bounty of £3 a ton announced by the Commonwealth Government will apply as from August 14 and that all invoices on and after that date must show the full price for the superphosphate less the bounty at the rate of £3 a ton.

Purchasers will pay only the net price, and manufacturers will submit monthly returns of sales to the Department of Trade and Customs for payment of the bounty due to them. On approved 1962-63 season prices, the price approved by the Prices Commissioner for superphosphate in farmers' own sacks will be £11 12s., less the bounty of £3, so that the price to the farmer will be £8 12s.; and for superphosphate in new cornsacks the price approved by the Prices Commissioner will be £12 13s., less the bounty of £3, so the price to the farmer will be £9 13s.

The annual review of superphosphate prices has been commenced by the department and when this is completed in about six weeks the new season's price will be subject to a reduction of £3 a ton bounty and to a rebate of 10s. a ton if it is delivered between September 1 and December 31. Incidentally, the reduction of £3 a ton will mean an annual saving to farmers in this State of about £1,320,000.

IMPORTED FISH.

Mr. CORCORAN: I understand that the Commonwealth Government has removed sales tax on imported fish. Fishermen in this State will be greatly concerned about the effect this may have on their industry. Will the Minister of Agriculture say whether the South Australian Government will oppose the measure?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have already been approached on this matter and have mentioned it to Cabinet, but I cannot give a considered reply now. I will do so as soon as possible.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE CHARGES.

Mr. BYWATERS: The widow of a constituent who died two weeks ago asked me if I would assist her with some of the papers, and I suggested that she put the matter in the hands of the Public Trustee. On visiting the Public Trustee at her request, I was told that by filling in a form "U", which I was able to purchase for 8d., I could save her £3 3s. by getting a small account that was in joint names transferred straight to her name and by completing a form and getting a certificate from the succession duties authorities. I was told that the Public Trustee was compelled to charge £3 3s., which is rather a large sum for such a small service, and that this had to be done to comply with a regulation. Will the Minister of Education refer this matter to his colleague, the Attorney-General, to see whether this charge can be included in the overall charge for administering an estate rather than there being a £3 3s. charge for what appears to be a small amount of work?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to do so.

HECTORVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: My attention has been drawn to the need for replacing toilet facilities at the Hectorville Primary School, as the present system is old and insanitary and could be detrimental to the health of pupils. High-level cisterns are at present in use and are badly in need of repair in both the girls' and the boys' lavatories. It was suggested to me by the secretary of the local board of health

that low-level type cisterns would be much more suitable, as they were easily operated and not subject to corrosion, and very little maintenance was required. Will the Minister of Education have this matter investigated with a view to having more modern cisterns installed?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to refer the matter to the Director of the Public Buildings Department for investigation and report.

SOLDIER SETTLEMENT.

Mr. HARDING: In the absence of the Minister of Lands and Repatriation, my question is directed to the Minister of Works. Has the Minister noticed that the Commonwealth Government is making available about \$4,255,000 for soldier settlement and that South Australia's share is £1,229,000? I presume that the money will be made available to bring farms that are now being developed up to standard. Can the Minister of Works say whether this is so? If he cannot, will he get the information by Tuesday next?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not able to confirm or deny whether the honourable member's suggestions about the use to which these funds will be put are correct, but I shall have the matter brought to the notice of the Minister of Lands with a request that he furnish the information on Tuesday next.

EXECUTOR COMPANIES.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General in this Chamber, say whether the Government is aware that at the moment an agent for one of the largest executor companies in South Australia is going from house to house toutting for the business of drawing up wills? I have had many reports, including reports from people in the district represented by the Minister of Education, that this is happening, and that the agent is suggesting that the interests of the householders will be best served by their making a will with the executor company concerned and that it will be done at a lower cost than would be charged by a solicitor. It is apparent on questioning this particular agent that he draws the wills and that he is unqualified to do this. In these circumstances, will the Minister of Education take up with the Attorney-General the matter of the continuance of this practice? As the Minister knows, lawyers are not permitted to tout for business.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member realizes he cannot debate the question?

Mr. DUNSTAN: I realize that. I am just explaining a point with which I am sure the Minister will agree. He will realize that much of the revenue of the legal profession in the probate division and the testamentary causes jurisdiction arises from the fact that people who are not qualified to do so have drawn up wills. Often, the estate then bears heavy costs, which are paid to the legal profession. Will the Minister take up this matter with his colleague to see whether some influence cannot be brought to bear by his colleague on the executor company concerned to stop this undesirable practice?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes; I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague, the Attorney-General, but it seems to me that it is not a new practice. The honourable member refers to the fact that this is taking place in the district that I represent in Parliament at present, but I can remember many years ago it was a practice in the district that I represented on Yorke Peninsula, much to my annoyance at that time. But I have ceased to worry about that matter. I think the case to which the honourable member refers is probably just an excess of zeal on the part of the particular agent.

I understand that this is a practice of all trustee and executor companies, although I should not like to use the word "touting", but they offer to prepare wills not only at reduced prices but free of cost altogether. However, I shall be only too pleased to ask the Attorney-General to have a discussion on the matter. I do not think it is any reprehensible practice. I think it is only private enterprise carrying on a quite legitimate practice.

SLAUGHTERING LICENCES.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last year's amendment to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Act made provision for the Minister of Agriculture to grant licences to persons to slaughter stock elsewhere than on the premises of the Abattoirs Board and to have a share in the metropolitan meat market. How many applications has the Minister received for these licences, and is he likely to be granting further licences in the near future?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I could not say offhand the number of applications. There would be a dozen or so, but I should add that what is often regarded as an application resolves itself, when investigated, into being just an inquiry. It is difficult to say statistically what the position is, but the committee appointed to examine all these applications

has considered them so far and has recommended the issue of a licence to Noarlunga Meat Ltd. Accordingly, that licence was granted some months ago. The company began to operate on it almost immediately and is at present going ahead. Some applications are still being considered. I think that in one or two cases they are second applications, where new factors have arisen for consideration. But, broadly speaking, the policy in the issuing of these licences is fairly simple: they will be issued in the public interest if it is considered that the public interest is best served by those works that can give the greatest amount of assistance to export slaughtering during the export season.

LAND SETTLEMENT.

Mr. CURREN: My questions relate to the recently announced proposal of Government assistance for the acquisition of farms. Will the proposed scheme operate on lines similar to the single unit purchase scheme under war service land settlement? Also, will the scheme apply to horticultural properties?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Although the matter has not yet been resolved, I think in some respects it is correct to say that the legislation will operate somewhat along the lines indicated by the honourable member's questions. But, of course, there will be substantial differences in the administration of the proposals. I suggest to the honourable member that he ask his questions again later when the matter has been more specifically determined. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, has just suggested to me that almost certainly horticulture would not be ruled out as ineligible: it would apply to horticultural properties. But, there again, I speak with no final knowledge of the details of the scheme. If the honourable member will raise the matter again at a later date, I shall be able to give him more specific information.

FOOD PRICES.

Mr. FRED WALSH: Since the decision of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission and State tribunals to increase margins by 10 per cent, and to increase annual leave, there have been considerable increases in the prices of certain commodities and services. Also, as a result of the Commonwealth Budget announced on Tuesday, there should be some reductions in food prices with the removal of the sales tax from items of food. It has been suggested that certain applications for price increases were made prior to the

decision of the Commonwealth Government to remove sales tax on food. I believe that certain people connected with food commodities and services were released from price control on the understanding that they would not take an unfair advantage of such release. Will the Minister of Works ask the Premier to call for a report from the Prices Commissioner on the advisability of re-controlling certain commodities and services that were released from price control on the assurance that undue advantage would not be taken of that release?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Government policy on matters relating to price control has been consistent and, I think, for the most part effective. Where items have been released from price control, it has always been on the terms that the honourable member has recited—that the retailers of those goods should conform to reasonable mark-ups and not take advantage of the release of their items from price control by pricing them unduly highly to the public. The two things that the honourable member has mentioned (the increase in margins of 10 per cent and the impact of the Commonwealth Budget) are matters that the Prices Commissioner would automatically pay great attention to in any surveillance of the price structure of retail goods. I am sure that the Prices Commissioner's officers will be watching the effect of these two factors.

It has been clearly established in practice that it is not necessary, at least in most cases, to reinstate price control on a line of goods merely to achieve fair trading. The fact that the Prices Commissioner's office exists and that his officers are constantly checking on prices charged to the public is in itself an effective deterrent to overcharging. Having said that in general terms, I think I can assure the honourable member that the Prices Commissioner will exercise very close oversight on any move of retail prices as a result of all the relevant factors and particularly the two factors mentioned. I will bring the question to the Premier's notice so that it will come before the Prices Commissioner, and if there are any reports that throw any light on this matter the honourable member will be advised.

SCAFFOLDING INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Scaffolding Inspection Act, 1934-1961.

Read a first time.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

In Committee.

(Continued from August 14. Page 514.)

Grand total, £32,914,000.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I have much pleasure in supporting the adoption of the first line of these Estimates. This Loan programme emphasizes the tremendous economic strength to which this State has attained. It is the largest programme ever put before this Committee, and it reflects the rapidity and the efficiency of the development of South Australia. Just a few years ago we could not have thought of having a programme such as the one now before us. In 1958-59 the sum total of the Loan programme was £31,700,000.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think it has anything to do with the falling value of money?

Mr. LAUCKE: To some degree, but that does not account for the doubling of the programme in a matter of a few years. The present Loan programme is for £60,000,000. This embraces the original new money (a figure of £37,000,000), an amount of £10,000,000 from the major statutory bodies such as the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust and the State Bank—

Mr. Millhouse: What was it 10 years ago?

Mr. LAUCKE: It was about £30,000,000. It has grown in the last five years, mainly through the generation of funds within past investment, and that is the part that really appeals to me. We have, Mr. Chairman, a total before us of about £60,000,000. The sum of £13,000,000, which is by way of depreciations, reserves, and that type of increment and surplus, assists the total to reach this gigantic figure of £60,000,000.

Mr. Ryan: Of course, our population has grown in the last 10 years.

Mr. LAUCKE: It definitely has, by about 2.6 per cent each year. My point is that through past very wise expenditure of capital funds there has been generated a facility to produce further wealth.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't it natural to assume that with an increase in population there must be an increase in expenditure also?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, but it also means that before we can have money to spend there must have been earlier good investment of capital to ensure employment and to provide basic facilities in the community to support a rising population. I maintain that the situation we are in today is in no small measure due to sound financial practice over the last couple of decades, and I pay my tribute to this very sound financial direction of the State's affairs.

I wish to say a few words on education. This year we are to spend no less than £5,400,000 on new school buildings. This includes a new primary school at Steventon in the Tea Tree Gully district and a high school at Modbury, and I am very happy to see these lines on the Estimates. At present 185,000 students attend our State schools, and it is expected that by 1968 this figure will be no less than 218,600. It is obvious that as a State we have done and are doing everything possible to meet the challenge of educational requirements. However, I cannot see that we can hope to meet the challenge completely in the future unless we receive further moneys for education from the Commonwealth sphere. Thus far we have allocated the moneys that we receive to the various requirements within the State, but we are reaching a stage now where these very big allocations to education cannot rise much higher without eventually having a deleterious effect on other worthy and necessary State activities.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you advocating grants specifically for education from the Commonwealth Government?

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes, but without any tags on those grants. I know our population rise in South Australia is in no small measure due to a most excellent policy of migration, which I applaud. I am happy to see that this year it is expected that we shall have 10,000 more migrants coming to Australia than we had last year—an increase from 125,000 to 135,000. That is a very good thing, because we need a greater population to develop our resources, to create home markets and a general buoyancy in our economy, and to provide employment opportunities. Population itself generates demand and so leads to a great continuous labour force. Coming back to the honourable member's question about whether I suggest a direct grant from the Commonwealth, my answer to that is "Yes". The sovereign rights of the State should not be infringed if such grants are made.

Mr. Millhouse: Aren't you asking for something that will not happen? You want the money but you also want to control the position.

Mr. LAUCKE: I want to see improvements in our education, but I can also see a need for financial assistance.

Mr. Millhouse: It may be better to take the money from the Commonwealth.

Mr. LAUCKE: As I have said, I believe in the sovereign rights of the State being maintained. I want to make a comparison of

the expenditure on education in 1957-58 and 1962-63. In 1957-58, £7,500,000 was spent (including £4,600,000 on teachers' salaries) and £2,600,000 on school buildings, making a total of £10,100,000. Last year the expenditure was £20,665,000, made up of £14,600,000 for education (including teachers' salaries of £8,300,000) and the remainder on school buildings. In the five years there has been an increase from £10,100,000 to £20,600,000, without considering miscellaneous grants to the university, kindergartens, youth clubs, etc. Five years ago these miscellaneous grants totalled £1,200,000. The last figure was £3,700,000. All this gives a total of £11,300,000 spent on education in 1957-58, and £24,300,000 last year. Over the five years there has been an increase in the expenditure of 115 per cent. In 1957-58 total Budget and Loan expenditure was £96,520,000. Last year it was £127,500,000, an increase of about 32 per cent on the previous figure. Therefore, while the general Budget expenditure has been increased by about 32 per cent the education allowance has increased by 115 per cent.

Mr. Loveday: We are still spending much less on education than are comparable countries.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. Although I acknowledge that the State is doing all it can in the attempt to meet this major challenge of education, we should bear in mind that there will be an increase in the number of students requiring education. This increase will continue for a number of years, with the result that the Government will be unable adequately to cater for the requirements. So far an excellent allocation for education has been made, but more is required when we remember the increasing number of students.

Mr. Clark: It is nice to see another convert.

Mr. LAUCKE: I do not know whether I have been converted, but in the allocation for education requirements there must come a time when there is a maximum amount available for that activity. That is why I can see a need for money to come to the State for education. With our limited taxing powers the money cannot be obtained from revenue. To avoid a situation where we shall not be able to meet the day to day need in accommodating and properly tutoring the children of future generations, we must look ahead and advocate getting more money from the Commonwealth Treasurer, while at the same time retaining the right of the State to direct its own education.

Mr. McKee: Has a case been presented to the Prime Minister in this matter?

Mr. LAUCKE: I understand there have been approaches from political Parties.

Mr. McKee: From your Party?

Mr. LAUCKE: I have no knowledge of any such approach.

Mr. Clark: Some of us have been preaching this for years.

Mr. LAUCKE: I realize that.

Mr. Loveday: Do you think that the views of the member for Mitcham on this subject would be the views of a little States-righter?

Mr. Millhouse: He does not know my views.

Mr. LAUCKE: When we remember that the number of student and junior teachers has increased from 354 to 2,200, trainee teachers from 448 to 2,644, and full-time teachers from 4,900 to 7,700, we can see what is necessary to meet the challenge.

Mr. McKee: The people are aware of that.

Mr. LAUCKE: Every thinking person is aware of it. It is basic to our way of life and we must be on a level comparable with the most educated countries in the world if we are to maintain our living standards and compete in industry. I believe in the highest educational standards possible. They are basic for the welfare of the individual.

Roseworthy College is to receive £27,000 for alterations and additions. I believe they are for more accommodation for students at the college. The present head, Mr. Herriot, is doing a magnificent job in endeavouring to instil into the minds of the students a sense of ownership, pride of college, etc. In his brief tenure of office as the head he has transformed the college in the matter of accommodation, facilities for students in their relaxing hours, etc., and he has given the students a new appreciation of the need to have a sense of ownership whilst at the college. The spirit there is excellent at present and in no small measure it is due to the work done by Mr. Herriot in seeing that the students live in comfortable surroundings, and that the appointments are such as would tend to lead them to have a respect for their surroundings. Roseworthy College, as far as residential accommodation is concerned, has been vastly improved in recent years. I commend Mr. Herriot for the part he has played as I commend the Government for making this allocation which should further improve conditions at that college. The benefits we have received as a State from Roseworthy are very wide: it has done more for a State's wheat production than has any other institution that I know of in

Australia. We have, in South Australia, wheat varieties that have been bred at Roseworthy and are of a type and quality without peer among wheats anywhere in Australia. For many years South Australia had wheats that were high in protein figure (that is, in quantity) but there was no correlation between the amount and quality of protein.

All the Roseworthy College wheat varieties are known by the name of a weapon: sabre, scimitar, javelin, dirk, and so on. These "weapon" varieties have the ability to produce heavy yields equally productive per acre in bushels with the lower quality wheats of the past. We have not missed out on the return per acre with these new varieties containing that inherent quality of protein. If a chemist tests Roseworthy wheat with a result of, say, 12 per cent dry protein one can be sure that that 12 per cent is of good quality and will ensure a first-class bread flour.

There can be a 12 per cent protein in, say, Gluyas, another variety of wheat, which is not a quality protein at all and is quite useless for quality bread baking. These breedings of wheat at Roseworthy constitute one of the college's most valuable achievements and this fact is leading to this State's being sought after for certain types of wheat from certain ports.

I have in mind that each year New Zealand specifies to the Wheat Board that it requires cargoes of wheat loading *ex* Ardrossan, which is a port that has a hinterland of wheat-growing areas producing predominantly Roseworthy varieties of wheat. The New Zealand millers realize that there is a uniformity of quality and a correlation of a protein content and the quality test, and they specify that South Australia shall supply wheat to them in preference to wheat from other States. All this is due to Roseworthy's research.

Mr. McKee: Climatic conditions enter into it?

Mr. LAUCKE: To a degree, but I am trying to indicate that a grower can produce Gluyas obtaining a 12 per cent protein content but not of a good quality, whereas the same varieties can be grown at Roseworthy producing a first-class wheat acceptable to the baker.

Mr. Hughes: They grow much of that around Paskeville.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. We are earning a reputation in South Australia for our wheats which has led sales from this State to equal our production and those sales have come more rapidly to us than have sales by other States. That is of extreme importance, I think, when

we have, this year, a crop anticipation of about 60,000,000 bushels. It is possible under present conditions for this State to reap—if we consider the entire crop and not just the deliveries to the Board—60,000,000 bushels and that means some big selling programmes to clear that quantity.

Mr. Nankivell: It could well exceed that figure this year.

Mr. LAUCKE: It will be an all-time high if it does. We have a reputation for quality wheats in this State, and also an excellent system of zoning in South Australia with the recommendation by the Minister of Agriculture to grow certain varieties in certain areas with a segregation of semi-hards and softs and an opportunity for a purchaser to specify what he wants so that he may have precisely that type of wheat supplied to him. It is desirable to get the best values of the different varieties to grow soft wheats in areas with a high rainfall and ease of growth, and the harder varieties in the lower rainfall areas; then there is this perfect segregation of softs which are essentially used in biscuit manufacturing, cake flours, etc., and, on the other side, completely satisfactory semi-hards to provide for the milling trade and the baking of bread.

Mr. Hughes: The money spent on research has been repaid twofold.

Mr. LAUCKE: It has been a very good investment. I admire the growers of wheat who have been prepared to contribute to most of this research because it has led both to an increasing in productivity of different varieties of wheat and to better qualities than we have had in the past.

I refer now to a matter I mentioned a few days ago namely the localized schemes of deep drainage. A large sum is provided for sewerage purposes but there are some areas in this State near the metropolitan area which are, by reason of distance alone, unable to have major sewerage systems installed at present. It is most unsatisfactory if we must wait for some years to have major trunk lines taken to service these areas. I think that the drainage schemes that have been operative in other parts of the world (that is, schemes set up to serve a given area as a self-contained unit) can ultimately be introduced, but in the interim we must have these schemes to provide for the disposal of effluent as the density of population increases. I am referring to Tea Tree Gully. I am concerned that, even with the best intentions of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, that district will not have a major

sewerage system for some years. In the meantime, provision must be made for the disposal of septic tank effluent. If the Government were to make special moneys available to a local government authority to enable it to implement temporarily its own small scheme, that would be a good investment, because the small scheme serving a particular area would ultimately be linked with the major system. *Pro tem*, such a system would provide a service that would ensure a healthy district and also prevent the embarrassment of effluent flowing down footpaths. Several builders in major housing schemes install drainage pipes to run in a certain direction, and then the local council provides the biological filtration plant.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The council in the honourable member's district must take credit for initiating this idea and introducing it.

Mr. LAUCKE: It was very proud of its activities in this direction, because obviously something had to be done immediately to meet the position. It was proved that these small localized systems would work, but the difficulty in a rapidly growing area like Tea Tree Gully was the lack of finance and borrowing ability of the council, which prevented its doing the things it should do. That is why I appeal for consideration to be given for moneys to be allocated to councils to provide systems that will, after a process of filtration, allow the effluent to run down natural waterways, alleviating any nuisance, and giving satisfaction to residents in the area.

Mr. Shannon: You are justified in making that suggestion. The lack of finance for floodwaters schemes in the metropolitan area is also another problem.

Mr. LAUCKE: Both problems are beyond the financial ability of some councils to solve, and some assistance should be given to meet the councils' requirements. My appeal is not being made without justification. The Premier recently announced proposals for long-term financial assistance to enable skilled young farmers to become landholders in their own right. I would not agree with the creation of peasant farming, but the proposals do not suggest that units will be uneconomic, and applicants will be subject to close investigations. There is an urgent need for the provision of long-term finance to enable aspiring farmers to become landholders. A system similar to that provided under the Industries Development Act would enable assistance to be given to rural industry, as it has been given to secondary industry. I am

sure the successes enjoyed in secondary industry would be repeated in rural industry, and would enable competent young farmers to become landholders in their own right.

Mr. Harding: It could be done where a farmer's property is sufficiently large to enable a son to be settled thereon with financial assistance.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. It is a long-term view, but there would be an increase in the number of landholders in South Australia. Productivity will increase with the passing of time, particularly if farmers take advantage of the advances in scientific methods now available. I have no doubt that this scheme would enable the State to have more farmers than it has had in the past. I look forward to any scheme that gives an opportunity to aspiring farmers.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What about perspiring farmers?

Mr. LAUCKE: But it is healthy perspiration, and farmers do not mind that. The whole scheme is a matter of economics: the units should be selected to ensure a real expectation of success. Every application should be considered on its merits, and a decision made accordingly.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You must remember the marginal lands.

Mr. LAUCKE: There were real problems prior to the marginal lands arrangement, and there is a strong lesson to be learned from that.

Mr. Nankivell: Some of those areas could be restored to an economic unit, and that could be done with scientific research.

Mr. LAUCKE: We have to consider and allow for those experiences. I support the first line.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): After listening to the member for Barossa and other members on his side of the Committee, I should walk outside to see if I am still in South Australia. I have never found the State so prosperous! Even the Treasurer said that the Loan Estimates were a balanced programme. He said that if any honourable members had any pessimists in their districts, he would personally forward them a copy of the Loan Estimates so that they could give it to the pessimists who, after considering it, would realize that the State was not only progressing, but had the strength and the resources to do a job it had never dreamed of doing. I assure the Treasurer that were copies of the Loan Estimates sent to the 6,500 unemployed in this State, they would still take convincing that everything was bright and rosy.

Many wage-earners would take convincing, too, particularly those who have had to leave their homes and families to seek employment. A young married man called on me recently to inquire about employment possibilities in Port Pirie. He and his family have a Housing Trust house there. However, as no employment was available he had to go to Whyalla to work for the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited. His weekly wage is £17, from which he pays the company £5 a week for board. After meeting all his commitments he is lucky if he can send £11 back to his wife. The rental of his house at Port Pirie is £3 10s. a week, so his wife has the handsome sum of £7 10s. a week from which to feed and clothe herself and her four young children. The children are all suffering from severe colds and the wife is concerned for their welfare because she cannot afford to buy wood or warm clothing for them. That family could not be convinced that everything is all right. All wage-earners are battling to make ends meet. Living costs are fantastically high. People nowadays eat less meat and butter than they did before the war, simply because they cannot afford to buy more.

I do not expect Government members to fully appreciate the plight of these little people. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) interrupted his backslapping contribution to this debate to say, with tongue in cheek, that these Loan Estimates would provide employment for all those who were prepared to work. For the last four years I have heard similar statements from Government members. One year the Treasurer said that the State was bursting its seams with prosperity, but what happened? A credit squeeze overtook us. I warn members: opposite not to get over-confident. They must remember that the majority of the people voted against them at the last election for making promises that they were not able to carry out.

Mr. Jennings: They had no intention of carrying them out.

Mr. McKEE: True. The Commonwealth Budget is supposed to benefit the "little people", but the only persons to benefit will be the big people. Mr. Holt should not think that he has hoodwinked the little people into falling for the Liberal Party's propaganda. He described the Budget as "something for the little people." Have members ever heard of such nonsense? Many pensioners pay more than half of their pensions in rent, and the same applies to most wage-earners. The Government has not lifted a finger to protect them but has given the lead to private landlords by charging exorbitant rentals on departmental houses. The subsidy on superphosphate,

which was designed to induce electors in the Grey District to vote for the Liberal Party, backfired. No doubt it will help the big primary producer and the monopolistic pastoralists, but the Liberal Party forgot about the market gardeners and small farmers in the Flinders Range foothills. It costs those market gardeners as much as £300 to £400 a year for the various trace elements they must use to gain satisfactory production from their properties. They are big revenue earners for the State, and they supply surrounding communities, but they were overlooked. The Commonwealth Government should think twice before it goes to the people on the strength of its Budget. If it went to the electors now, it would get done to a frazzle.

I agree with the Treasurer's scheme for assisting small farmers, but letters that have appeared in the press indicate that he has thrown a scare into some of the big land-grabbers. Recently I travelled through the Rocky River District. As in many other parts of the State, I saw beautiful old houses filled with hay or left to decay. Properties have been taken over by monopolistic farmers. I do not know how the Treasurer proposes to acquire such properties, but if we want to develop and populate this State the only solution is for a closer settlement scheme. One can travel through most districts and see beautiful institutes and community halls, which must have given service at one time, that are now derelict. I support the scheme for closer settlement, but I think that the Treasurer will encounter problems in bringing it to fruition.

First line—State Bank, £885,000—passed.

Highways and Local Government, £670,000; Lands, £34,000—passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

AMUSEMENTS DUTY (FURTHER SUSPENSION) BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill will further suspend the levy of amusements duty under the Stamp Duties Act until July 1, 1967. Under the existing legislation amusements duty will automatically come into force again on July 1 of next year. As honourable members know, the collection of this duty has been suspended since entertainment tax was imposed by the Commonwealth as a wartime measure in 1943. Although this tax was abolished in 1953 the State did

not re-enter the field and therefore since it is not the policy of this Government at present to re-impose amusements duty this Bill is introduced for the further suspension until the end of June in 1967.

Mr. TAPPING secured the adjournment of the debate.

METROPOLITAN TAXI-CAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main objects are two in number. The first is to make provisions in relation to taxi-cabs similar to those which apply to motor vehicles since day-to-day registration was introduced. As members know, the Motor Vehicles Act now provides for six-monthly or twelve-monthly registrations dating from the day of registration and not the first day of the month of registration. Calculations for refunds of unexpired portions of registration are now therefore based on the actual number of unexpired days. Clause 5 accordingly takes out the existing provisions of section 37a of the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act relating to this matter and substitutes provisions which will enable the Registrar to pay refunds in respect of taxi-cabs on substantially the same basis as in the case of other motor vehicles.

The second amendment is made by clause 6, which will bring Noarlunga into the list of constituent councils in the schedule to the Act. Under the regulations an applicant for a taxi-cab licence must have a usual place of residence within the area of a constituent council. At least one operator has recently erected a house within the area of Noarlunga and, in view of the subdivision of land along the South Road, it is possible that other operators may do likewise. The amendments made by clauses 3, 4 and 5 (a) and (c) are in the nature of Statute law revision amendments; they substitute in the principal Act references to the appropriate sections of the new Motor Vehicles and Road Traffic Acts for the present references which are to the old Road Traffic Act.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

THEVENARD TO KEVIN RAILWAY BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is introduced following a recent report of the Public Works Committee. Clause 3 authorizes the construction of a railway from a point near Ceduna to Kevin on the West Coast. Clause 4 contains the usual financial provision in connection with the new railway. Clause 5 authorizes the Commissioner to discontinue the existing railway between Wandana and Kowulka.

I should explain to members that at present there is a line running from Port Lincoln to Penong passing through Wandana and Kowulka. A further line exists between Wandana and Thevenard passing through Ceduna. A branch or spur line runs off the main Port Lincoln to Penong railway from Kowulka to Kevin. To go by rail from Thevenard or Ceduna to Kevin, which is only 38 miles away, it is necessary to proceed to Wandana, join the main line, and proceed thence on that line to Kowulka and by the branch line from Kowulka to Kevin, a total distance of 64 miles. The proposals envisaged in the Bill will mean that the shorter route can be taken by way of a direct line, while access from Port Lincoln to Kowulka and Penong will be by way of Wandana, Ceduna, Kevin, Kowulka and Penong. The map that will be exhibited in the House will make the position clear to members. Perusal of this map will show the result of the works authorized by the Bill.

The Wandana to Penong railway was opened to traffic early in 1924 and during the following six or seven years the principal freight consisted of farm requirements inwards and grain and salt outwards. After 1930 the inwards movement dropped and the salt traffic ceased between 1930 and 1943; although there was a slight recovery, that traffic ceased altogether after 1953. In recent years grain freight has fallen off, largely as the result of bulk handling. However, mining of gypsum at Lake MacDonnell commenced in 1947 and the five-mile Kowulka to Kevin branch line was built under agreement with the gypsum company and opened to traffic in April 1950. The quantity of gypsum traffic has increased and recent events have improved the prospects of obtaining overseas markets for gypsum. Arrangements have now been made to carry about 6,000 tons a week during 1963.

As I have said, the present route from Thevenard to Kevin is circuitous. The line is in poor condition and to cope with the increasing gypsum traffic an intensive relaying programme would be required. This would involve a cost of over £800,000 over a period

of 10 years. On the other hand, construction of the new direct line from Thevenard to Kevin would cost only an additional £43,000. The direct line would provide a quicker and better service with substantial savings to the Railways Department in view of the shorter distance and better grade, offering the possibility of reduced charges if the export trade in gypsum is developed. I do not think it is necessary for me to do more than refer to the desirability of encouraging the export trade in gypsum as in many other commodities. The Public Works Committee, having investigated the matter fully, reported in favour of the proposal, and the present Bill is designed to give effect to its recommendation. I commend the Bill to members.

Mr. FRED WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

FRUIT FLY (COMPENSATION) BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is similar in form to the Act passed in 1959, its purpose being to enable the Government to pay compensation for losses arising from the campaign for the eradication of fruit fly. Six proclamations relating to areas near Clovelly Park, Frewville, Beulah Park, Highgate, Marion and North Unley were issued this year prohibiting persons from carrying away fruit from the infected areas without the authority of an inspector.

As members know, it has been the practice in other years for compensation to be given for loss arising from these measures, and this Bill accordingly provides by clause 3 for compensation for loss arising by reason of any act of the officers of the Agriculture Department within the areas defined by the proclamations. It also provides for compensation for loss arising from the prohibition of the removal of fruit from any such land. Clause 4 fixes the time limit for the lodging of claims as February 1, 1964.

Whilst the number of outbreaks of fruit fly in the metropolitan area this year is disappointing, there is no reason for excessive alarm. I have had a discussion with a world authority on fruit fly, Dr. Steiner, who visited South Australia early this year. He said that the precautions South Australians were taking were particularly effective and, when I asked in what way he thought we could improve our methods, he said only that he had been able to give us some assistance in the construction of the actual lures for fruit fly and that in

every other respect he considered our methods were exceedingly good. I asked him to comment on the outbreaks we had from time to time despite the precautions and he said that we had to expect a certain number of outbreaks as long as fruit fly was a menace anywhere else in Australia. Bearing that in mind, I think it may assist members to know that, although we have had a few outbreaks, that does not necessarily indicate a preliminary to a breakdown in our system. Everything we have seen in the last few years and all the information we have gathered has given us encouragement for holding it at bay in future. Certainly, if we were able we would have more road blocks and do other things to tighten preventive measures even more. It is impossible to stop every vehicle that enters this State on the different roads, and undoubtedly some fruit must get past. However, it appears that the measures we are taking are generally effective.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

BRANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

For some time it has been the practice of cattle owners to attach permanent ear tags to their cattle instead of branding them. Under the Brands Act, however, it is illegal to punch a hole in the ear of cattle for the insertion of a tag; ear tags are permitted only in the case of sheep. The purpose of the Bill is to legalize the practice of attaching ear tags to cattle. It is considered desirable to encourage this practice because it saves unnecessary damage to hides from branding and permits easy identification of offspring of artificial insemination in the bull-proving programmes conducted by the Artificial Breeding Board.

Clause 4 accordingly inserts in the principal Act a new section 21a, which expressly permits an owner of a registered brand or stud-stock brand to attach an ear tag to his cattle. Subsection (2) of the new section limits the matters which may be specified on ear tags to recognized brands and numerals to identify particular stock. The other subsections provide that, in making a hole for the insertion of an ear tag, the owner shall not interfere with any existing earmark or tattoo, and that the owner will not be making an earmark that is unlawful by virtue of other provisions of the Act unless the hole is unnecessarily large.

Clauses 5, 6 and 8 are consequential amendments in order that the penal provisions of the Act relating to earmarks will not apply to an owner when inserting an ear tag. Clause 7 permits the use of a special brand to identify cattle which have been artificially inseminated (by the Artificial Breeding Board or independently by the owners) or which are the progeny of cattle that have been artificially inseminated.

Mr. CASEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to enable provision to be made for the control of air pollution and air impurities. For some time the Government has been considering this matter and from time to time has had representations from various quarters for some form of legislative control. The Department of Public Health has carried out investigations into it and has been conducting tests over the past two years. While most of the representations to the Government have related to what may be described as smoke nuisance, members will appreciate that air can become polluted not only by smoke but from other products issuing from combustion, fumes and exhaust from vehicles. Moreover, pollution of the air derives not only from manufacturing or industrial processes but from other sources. Legislation has been enacted in at least two other States but, of course, conditions in this State differ greatly from those elsewhere.

Although the problem of air pollution has not in this State assumed very great proportions, the Government believes that there is a need for some form of clean air legislation to enable preventive measures to be taken before it is too late. The problem is, as members will be aware, a highly technical one. It is one which cannot, in the Government's view and in the view of its advisers, be effectively controlled by static legislation. With the continuing growth and development of the State, and particularly of the metropolitan area, the matters to be controlled or regulated will inevitably be subject to constant change and variation.

The Government has therefore decided to make provision by way of amendment to the Health Act, because this matter is essentially a problem of health. Moreover, this method would be administratively more convenient than

separate legislation, since many of the machinery provisions of the Health Act would automatically apply in relation to this subject. Accordingly, clause 4 inserts three new sections at the end of Division I of Part VIII of the Health Act. Part VIII itself deals with sanitation generally, and Division I with air. The first of the new sections (94a) is a definition section. New section 94b establishes a Clean Air Committee charged with the function of carrying out investigations into problems of air pollution and air impurities and of advising and making recommendations to the Minister as to the making of regulations.

The composition of the committee is designed to give representation to the persons who might be expected to know something of the highly technical problems involved and at the same time to be representative of the interests concerned, including industry and labour. At the same time it is considered desirable that the committee should not be too large. Accordingly, the Bill provides for a committee of 10, four of whom are the Director-General of Public Health, the Principal Medical Officer (Public Health), the Chief Inspector of Steam Boilers and Factories, and the Consulting Engineer, Department of Labour and Industry. The other six members are to be appointed respectively on the nomination of the Trades and Labor Council, the Railways Commissioner, the Electricity Trust, the University of Adelaide, the Gas Company and the Chamber of Manufactures.

New section 94c empowers the Governor to make regulations on the recommendation of the committee. The powers are defined in fairly wide terms, this being considered necessary in view of the technical nature of the subject. Without recapitulating in detail the matters upon which regulations may be made, I would refer to the powers to define to what impurities or equipment the regulations are to apply, to control the emission of air impurities, to prescribe authorized fuels, to regulate the installation of fuel-burning equipment and the establishment of incinerators and tips and the burning of rubbish.

Ways and means of preventing or controlling air pollution are clearly matters for experts. To attempt to set out in a Statute some requirements would be to limit the scope of the legislation and would require amendments or additions from time to time in the light of further research and be largely ineffective. I believe that all honourable members are seized of the importance of this problem. I believe, too, that they will agree that a skilled, expert and representative committee will be in

the best position to recommend appropriate regulations from time to time to enable this matter to be brought under control before it is too late.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Government is concerned about the increasing practice, in connection with the registration of mortgages at the Lands Titles Office, of avoiding the disclosure of interest rates and penal terms simply by reference to collateral agreements that are not registered. Usually a request by the Registrar-General of Deeds for production of a copy of the other document is complied with, but it is desirable that, in these circumstances, a mortgagee should be required to produce the copy in order that the records of the Lands Titles Office disclose to persons making searches a complete record of the terms of the transaction. Accordingly, this Bill provides (in section 129 (2), added by clause 4) that, where any term of this nature is not specified in the mortgage and is determined by reference to some other document, that other document shall be attached to the mortgage. This requirement also extends to the relatively infrequent case of a "building covenant"—a covenant to build in accordance with plans and specifications. A copy of the plans and specifications will be required to be attached to the mortgage. But the requirement will not apply where the collateral or other document is already available for inspection by the public in a public registry—for example, in the Lands Titles Office itself or in the Companies Office.

Clause 5 of the Bill inserts two new paragraphs in section 220 of the Act dealing with the powers of the Registrar-General. The new paragraphs give the Registrar-General, first, express power to make requisitions when an instrument lodged for registration does not comply with the requirements of the principal Act and, secondly, power to formally reject the instrument if any of the requisitions are not complied with. If an instrument lodged for registration is defective in form, the Registrar-General is not obliged, as the Act stands, to make requisitions: he may simply refuse to register. However, it is the usual practice to make requisitions so that the person lodging an instrument

shall have an opportunity of altering it so as to include all the particulars required by the principal Act.

As the Act stands, once an instrument has been lodged for registration, no other subsequent instrument can be registered until the first instrument is registered or withdrawn. Sometimes it happens that an instrument is "taken out for correction" (that is, requisition is made) and either not returned at all or returned only after an inordinately long time. During that period the Registrar-General is powerless to effect the registration of any instrument affecting the title. It is considered desirable that the Registrar-General should have power to formally reject an instrument in such circumstances. The purpose of clause 3 of the Bill is to effect certain formal amendments to section 2 of the principal Act consequential upon the insertion of new Parts therein some years ago.

Mr. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUSINESS AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purposes are, first, to increase the amount of a fidelity bond required to be filed by a business agent from £500 to £2,000 and, secondly, to abolish the concessions granted to a business agent who is also a land agent.

The amount of £500 was fixed when the principal Act came into force in 1938. In 1959 the amount of a fidelity bond required of a land agent was increased from £500 to £2,000. However, no such amendment was made in the case of business agents and it is now considered desirable to increase the business agent's fidelity bond to £2,000. The amount of £500 presently available under the principal Act for a person who suffers loss by reason of any default of a business agent could rarely be just compensation: no paying business could be bought for that amount today. The amendment is effected by clause 4(a) of the Bill. Clause 5(a) contains a consequential amendment. Instead of filing a fidelity bond a business agent may deposit securities, and the amount of these securities is increased from £600 to £2,250 to conform to the corresponding provision in the Land Agents Act.

The second amendment removes the concession granted to a business agent who is also a land agent. A business agent is not required to

file a fidelity bond under the principal Act if he has filed a fidelity bond under the Land Agents Act and that bond has been endorsed to cover his activities as a business agent. If a person carrying on business in this dual capacity should default, he would in most cases default in each capacity. In other words, there would be claimants against him from his land transactions and claimants from his business transactions. But there is no machinery in the legislation for distributing the £2,000 between them. It is questionable whether claimants in respect of business transactions would have recourse to the full amount of the business agent's bond or only a proportionate part of it. But, apart from this question, it is clear that there would not be sufficient funds to enable a payment to be made in full under each Act, and that a member of the public who deals with such a person does not enjoy the full protection that each Act, at first sight, purports to extend to him.

It is desirable that a person carrying on business as a land agent and as a business agent should be required to meet in full the obligations imposed by each Act; in other words, to file bonds in a total sum of £4,000. The purpose of the bond is to provide compensation for those who, by reason of any default of the agent, may have lost a house or a business or perhaps both. It is apparent from experience that the fidelity bonds in the present amount of £2,000 have proved inadequate. The effect of the amendment will be to secure a more adequate measure of compensation. Accordingly paragraph (b) of clause 4 and paragraph (b) of clause 5 provide for the repeal of the appropriate provisions of the principal Act.

Section 18 of the principal Act prescribes a reduced licence fee for a business agent who is also a land agent, the fee being £1 instead of £3. Consequential on the foregoing amendments, the distinction between a business agent who is also a land agent and one who is not is removed, making a single licence fee of £3 in all cases. Clause 3 re-enacts section 18 (1) accordingly. Clause 6 provides that present business agents will not be affected by these amendments until April 1, 1964, which is the date on which their current licences expire.

Mr. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 20, at 2 p.m.