HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, November 19, 1963.

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

QUESTIONS.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In this morning's *Advertiser* under the heading "Could Not Serve" is an article concerning Professor Neal. Beneath the sub-heading "Free Will", Professor Neal is reported as saying:

> Because a great many people have asked me whether pressure from improper quarters had been exerted on me to resign, I am glad of this opportunity to make it absolutely clear that the decision to resign was taken of my own free will. And it was taken for one reason only. I resigned because it was unmistakably clear to me that some members of the board, namely those nominated by the Minister of Education, and including in particular the Director of Education, disapproved of my actions as chairman and proposed to censure them severely. That being so, I considered I could no longer usefully serve the board.

Was the Minister of Education responsible in any way for the impression that the Director of Education or the other Government nominees would criticize Professor Neal with a view to seeking his resignation from the board?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, certainly not; I have had no dealings with the board. As I pointed out before, there are 26 members of the board, and under the Statute eight of them are nominated by the Minister of Education. When any vacancy occurs through death, retirement or resignation, I nominate, on the recommendation of the Director of Education, someone to fill that vacancy. However, I have no dealings with those eight nominees, any more than I do with the other members. I have not made any representations to members of the board, and I have not received any representations or reports from them.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The press article referred to a meeting at which Professor Neal was severely criticized. Will the Minister ascertain whether the Director of Education was responsible for convening such a meeting?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to obtain that information, but I can say of my own knowledge that the meeting was convened by the Secretary of the Public Examinations Board, Mr. Dalziel.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say whether further negotiations have been completed with the Adelaide City Council regarding the rebuilding of the Morphett Street bridge and its extension into the North Adelaide section of my district? Can he also say whether the announcement by the Minister of Roads last week regarding an extension of West Terrace by means of a bridge across the River Torrens was a surmise concerning future planning, or whether the Government is actively interested in this project?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government told the City Council that it would provide financial assistance towards the alteration of the Morphett Street bridge and the work associated with it, extending as far as the top of Montefiore Hill at North Adelaide, and that the Government would share the cost of the scheme and provide the loan money necessary for the repayment of the other half. The council has accepted that offer. The city engineers who, under the original proposals, were responsible for drawing up a plan, have drawn up most comprehensive plans, and I believe that they are satisfactory in every way. I think the engineers are now engaged in detailed planning. I had an idea that the original proposition would be a little delayed, but more recent information is that the engineers are pushing the job through as quickly as possible.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the West Terrace extension?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government is not actively engaged in any planning for that scheme, which would be a very long-range project.

COLOURED TISSUES.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Health, say whether the manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers who are manufacturing and disposing of coloured tissues and coloured toilet paper have been asked to discontinue the manufacture and sale of this paper because it has been found that the dye used therein has caused infection?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Although it is possible that what the honourable member has said is correct, I know of no information along those lines. I will obtain a report for the honourable member, I hope by tomorrow or Thursday.

BOOL LAGOON.

Mr. HARDING: On Sunday of last week I visited Bool Lagoon, an area that has received much publicity in the press recently. So much publicity has been given that I think the circumstances should be explained. The Bool Lagoon area comprises about 7,000 acres, and about 50 square miles of excellent land adjoins it. This land is wonderful grazing country, with strawberry clover predominating, and with several clovers, phalaris and other valuable pasture plants, as well as temporary swamp land. Privately owned, the land provides much shelter such as rush and native flora. The press report stated that 1,000,000 birds could be affected. Probably there are 1,000,000 ibises in the area, and, as each bird consumes about 100 grubs a day, about 100,000,000 grubs a day, or 700,000,000 a week, would be eaten by them. These grubs include crickets, grasshoppers, cut worms, caterpillars, and other insects. The statement also mentioned mosquitoes, but I do not think ibises eat them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member had leave to explain his question: he cannot debate it.

Mr. HARDING: It is not recommended by the Drainage Board that Bool Lagoon be completely drained. The board has said that it intends to erect an adaptable regulator on the outlet of the lagoon to regulate the level of the water. The Land Settlement Committee some years ago recommended that the committee should make an inspection after the first phase of development was completed and before further drainage was undertaken in the Eastern Division. Will the Minister of Lands or the Minister of Agriculture make an early inspection of the area while the ibises are feeding their young and before the water level gets lower, as in the deepest part there is only two feet of water? If an inspection is made, could members of the Land Settlement Committee accompany the Minister?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The danger to the ibises inhabiting Bool Lagoon is much like the report of Mark Twain's death—it has been grossly exaggerated, I think! I have taken the trouble to obtain from the Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board (Mr. Anderson) a report on this matter to explain just what is contemplated in the proposed drain into and out of Bool Lagoon. Mosquito Creek comes from Victoria and drains into Bool Lagoon. When in flood, or at any time, Bool Lagoon would not hold this water, and for a long time there has been a drain out of Bool Lagoon towards Baker Range. Before the Baker Range drain was constructed, the water gravitated naturally towards Beachport and flooded vast areas. In many areas stop-banks were constructed in the opening in the Baker Range drain to prevent the water from seeping along that track. Water was forced north-west along the Baker Range drain to Alf Flat, which is way to the north, above Kingston. I have seen so much water in Alf Flat that the *Queen Mary* could have been floated in it.

This is the background of the matter. It is now intended to relieve the Baker Range drain of some of that water so as to make some land available for development, but it is not intended to make the country bone dry, as the report I have obtained clearly indicates. A petition has been lodged by landholders from the hundreds of Spence, Robertson and Naracoorte about the construction of the proposed drain from Mosquito Creek to Bool Lagoon stating that they have been informed and verily believe that the South-Eastern Drainage Board contemplates the construction of a new main drain from Bool Lagoon to Mosquito Creek and that this drain will drain the surrounding lands much more quickly than hitherto. The proposed drain would intercept the water of Mosquito Creek near the Naracoorte to Mount Gambier railway. At present, some water from Mosquito Creek passes round the northern fringe of the lagoon and causes considerable damage to the land situated northward. It is intended to discharge the whole of the Mosquito Creek water into Bool Lagoon and to use the lagoon as an equalizing basin. Members will see that what is contemplated is that the water that touches Bool Lagoon will be put into the lagoon, which will be used as an equalizing basin for the whole drainage system. The water would then be taken *via* the existing Bool Lagoon outlet drain and the enlarged drain M direct to the sea at Beachport. It is planned to intercept Mosquito Creek about half a mile west of the railway line. At this point Mosquito Creek is about 50ft. wide and about 6ft. deep. From this point the proposed drain would then taper to a wide drain, probably 225ft. wide, and it would be as shallow as possible—a matter of inches. Stop-banks are to be constructed on the northern side, and these could assist to keep the drain at a shallow depth. The purpose of the drain is not to drain this surrounding country north of the lagoon, but it should prevent the overflow of Mosquito Creek reaching the area. I think that is sufficient to explain what is being done. Regarding the birds,

I have been assured by the Minister of Agriculture that the area has already been inspected by the Fisheries and Game Department, which is, I understand, satisfied with the existing conditions. As it is not intended to completely drain the lagoon, the sanctuary for the birds is likely to remain there indefinitely—for as long as it rains and water flows down Mosquito Creek. I think that should ease the minds of people who are justifiably concerned about any danger to such a vast colony of our bird life. A submission has been made to Cabinet to place the further drainage of Bool Lagoon before the Land Settlement Committee for report.

TILLEY SWAMP SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN: My question, regarding the Tilley Swamp School, concerns the member for Albert also, as he has made representations to the department. In a letter from the Minister last month, I was informed that consideration was being given to the possibility of including a 24ft. by 24ft. wooden building on the list of such buildings to be erected in time for the beginning of the 1965 school year, and that the District Inspector of Schools would be asked to inquire into the most suitable site for such a school and to make recommendations about the purchase of land. Will the Minister of Education say whether further consideration is being given to the allocation of this building and whether any recommendation has been received from the District Inspector?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Further consideration has been given to the matter but, if a recommendation from the District Inspector of Schools has been received, it has not yet reached me, and no doubt it is being dealt with at some other level. I shall be pleased to go into the matter and, if I have not been advised on this matter before Thursday, I shall be pleased to write to the honourable member later.

FLINDERS RANGES.

Mr. HEASLIP: Some time ago, in reply to my question about the road that had been constructed to a television site at The Bluff in the Flinders Ranges the Premier said:

It is not known where a suitable area for a car park would be located. Access to the summit from this point could only be obtained through the land to be acquired by the Commonwealth. It is pointed out that the scenic road is a right of way proposed to be acquired by the Commonwealth for its own exclusive use and there is no suggestion that it will become a public road.

Will the Premier take all possible steps to prevent this road, which is a Government road, from being used as a private road by the Commonwealth Government or any Government department, and to try to keep it open for the public of South Australia and for tourists from other States?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the land belongs to the South Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government desires to acquire it for Commonwealth purposes, it has, under the Commonwealth Constitution, complete power to acquire it. I will take up this question with the Commonwealth department to see whether some joint use of the land can be arranged. If that can be arranged, and provided that the land is Government land, this Government would be willing to give the Commonwealth Government a right of way over the land without compelling the Government to acquire it. It would thus be available for other road users. I will inform the honourable member when I have something more concrete to report.

POINT GREY CUTTING.

Mr. TAPPING: On a number of occasions the member for Port Adelaide and I have made overtures to the Minister for the dredging of a cutting at Point Grey to assist 60 professional fishermen who have been deprived of the use of Angas Inlet and North Arm because of temporary bridges constructed from the mainland to take equipment, etc., for the construction of the powerhouse on Torrens Island. The Minister of Marine promised to take up with the trust the possibility of providing access for fishermen at Angas Inlet or North Arm to avoid the need to come through Outer Harbour, which is dangerous and slow during bad weather. Recently the General Manager of the Electricity Trust (Mr. Colyer) stated that tenders were being called for the building of a permanent bridge half a mile in length, with a 24ft. carriageway and a pedestrian walk on either side. It was hoped to start construction in February next and complete it in mid-1965. Can the Minister of Marine say whether it would be possible in planning the new bridge to provide a section for professional fishermen and others to have access through the North Arm and so avoid the risk of using the Outer Harbour channel?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As I have reported to the honourable member and the House from time to time, the Harbors Board has examined the possibility of cutting a channel and has subsequently reviewed the costs

of dredging the channel. In each case it has confirmed that the dredging cost would be about £70,000 and that, in addition, the channel would have a doubtful life, because, in the opinion of the board's engineers, whatever is done the littoral drift would tend to silt up the channel rapidly once it was dredged. Heavy maintenance would therefore be involved in addition to the heavy initial capital cost. I have more recently discussed the question of a passageway under the bridge that the Electricity Trust intends to build, and I find that it is an essential part of the trust's plan that Angas Inlet should be permanently closed in order to separate the hot water from the trust's generating plant from the cold water on the Port River side. That restricts the possible passageway to the North Arm, where a bridge is being planned with a clearance that would, if the masts were not high or could be hinged, provide a passageway for fishing vessels under the bridge. That would depend to some extent on tidal conditions, as the Port Adelaide tides vary about five feet normally and more than that on peak occasions. The higher the tide the smaller the clearance would be under the bridge. I do not know whether the proposed clearances would provide a passageway for all types of fishing craft (they would certainly not under all tidal conditions), but they would allow some entrance to be made for smaller boats, which, I understand, are in the habit of fishing on the coastal grounds north of the harbour. I will obtain the proposed specifications of the bridge for the honourable member to see and to check on the clearances. They will provide some relief for fishermen using smaller boats.

THEVENARD BOAT HAVEN.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I understand that the Minister of Marine has a reply to my recent question about a boat haven at Thevenard.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As reported previously to the honourable member, arrangements were made for Mr. H. W. Jones, Harbors Board Planning Engineer, to visit Thevenard, confer with the fishermen, and revise the scheme under investigation some years ago by the Public Works Standing Committee for the establishment of a fishing haven there. Following this visit, the Planning Engineer has revised the original scheme and up-to-date estimates are now being taken out. It is expected that these will be completed in three or four weeks' time, when a full report will be submitted to the Harbors Board, and subsequently to me. The matter will then receive further consideration. Last week, when the honourable member asked me about this report, I said I understood that the report had been received in my office, but that statement was incorrect: I have not yet seen the report, but as soon as I do I shall consider it further.

DECENTRALIZATION.

Mr. BYWATERS: I understand that at a dinner at Elizabeth last Saturday evening the Premier forecast that three industries, suitable for decentralization, would be coming to South Australia. I have a letter addressed to His Worship the Mayor of Murray Bridge, which states:

> In passing through Murray Bridge executive members of our company have remarked on the bountiful supply of water, transport facilities to capital cities and the general industrial potential of the district. Some effort was made to obtain general information from the files of the city press, but little knowledge was gained. Past knowledge has taught us that when direct inquiries are made the results are somewhat distorted. We have now obtained copies of your local newspaper and these are being read with interest. May I respectfully suggest, copies of your local newspaper could be supplied to travellers passing through on the *Overland*. This is carried out with good results extensively overseas, and in several Australian districts, including Narrandera, N.S.W. I will ask to be excused from disclosing details of my company and self, and will conclude by wishing your town progress and prosperity.

This letter supports my contention that Murray Bridge is an ideal place for decentralized industry. Will the Premier amplify the remarks he made at the dinner, and will Murray Bridge be considered as a suitable site for any of these new industries?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot add to my remarks. Negotiations are proceeding with several industries and, as I said on Saturday evening, I believe that some of these industries may be established outside the city. I hope that that will be the case. I am conversant with the attractiveness of Murray Bridge as an industrial centre, and on two or three occasions I have assisted industries in that town. I assure the honourable member that that assistance will be extended wherever possible. In fact, one industry that the Government has already assisted has submitted to me a proposition that has been referred to the bank to determine whether additional assistance can be supplied this year. The honourable member is familiar with that industry. I assure members that wherever possible the Government will do its utmost to assist industries to establish in areas outside the metropolitan area.

EGG MARKETING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In the current issue of the *Red Comb Poultry Journal* under the heading "Egg Marketing Changes N.S.W." the following appears:

> Legislation to compel interstate traders to conform to N.S.W. grading, packing and quality regulations is expected to come before State Parliament within a few weeks . . . The amendments will mean that interstate traders will not be able to continue using loopholes in the Act to market undersized or poor quality eggs.

At present there is no control over the grading, packing and quality of eggs coming into South Australia from other States. Will the Premier consider, for the protection of the South Australian public, similar legislation to that proposed in N.S.W.?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have had referred to my attention the article quoted by the honourable member. It stated that the purpose of the legislation was to hinder trade in eggs between States. That was an injudicious statement because, as the honourable member knows, under the Commonwealth Constitution trade and commerce between the States must not be hindered. The Privy Council's interpretation is that any law designed to impede trade between States is bad.

Mr. Freebairn: Surely we can have some control by regulation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government will support any marketing plan that contains three essentials: first, it must be controlled by the primary producers; secondly, the primary producers must have indicated by a vote that they favour the legislation; and, thirdly, it must be constitutional. It would be only wasting the time of Parliament and of the marketing board to pass legislation that could be upset on the first challenge to the High Court or Privy Council. Any Bill that could be challenged would be challenged by traders. A Bill must be constitutional if it is to receive any active support from the industry, from the Government and from Parliament.

I point out that the article the honourable member quoted said that it was intended to introduce the legislation within a few weeks. I suggest that Parliament will have adjourned before the legislation can be introduced. In my opinion the legislation will not be introduced because it could not possibly withstand a challenge in the court. True, we have been able to impose restrictions on trade between the States, but those are for quarantine purposes and not merely to restrict trade. The proposed legislation is intended to stop trade between the States. I do not think it is possible to ban eggs merely because they are small. Small eggs are priced and sold in every State, and it would not be feasible to ban pullet eggs. One intention of the proposed legislation is to ban the transport of eggs below a certain size. While it is lawful to sell any egg in South Australia it is obviously lawful to import any egg from another State.

MOONTA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HUGHES: On February 13 last I wrote to the Minister of Works on behalf of the Moonta Council seeking a better water pressure for the town. There was little or no pressure along Milne Terrace and near the fire station and members of the council were afraid, as they still are, that in the event of a fire there would not be sufficient water to combat it. Investigations carried out by departmental officers revealed that despite several improvements to the trunk mains supplying the area further improvements would be necessary to provide an adequate pressure. Proposals for improving the supply were examined and reported upon by the Engineer-in-Chief. A few days ago I received a further letter from the Town Clerk, and the Mayor of Moonta made personal representations to me that during the recent hot weather that part of Moonta had little or no water pressure. Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineer-in-Chief has reported further on the proposals to improve the position, as this could represent a serious threat in the event of a fire?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have not seen a report on this matter for some time or discussed it recently with the Engineer-in-Chief, but in view of the honourable member's question I will ask the Engineer-in-Chief if he has anything further to report and, if he has, I shall inform the honourable member.

BLANCHETOWN BRIDGE.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: My question concerns the Blanchetown bridge which connects your district, Mr. Speaker, with my district of Angas. A rumour is current that the Highways Department has condemned the rubber joints where the concrete pylons and bridge join and, further, that the contractor will have to send to the United Kingdom for new bearers to hold the bridge. Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, say whether this is a fact and, if it is, whether this would delay to any extent the completion

and the opening of the bridge? When will the bridge be completed and opened for traffic?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not aware of the problems mentioned by the honourable member, except that I understood some time ago that there was some difficulty with some of the bearers or the rubber bearings referred to but that it was not a matter for great concern. The Premier now reminds me that he understands that provision was made for replacements to be fitted. In any event, there is no great difficulty about fitting replacements if they are necessary because, from what I understand and from my own observations, that is possible without any great disturbance. The last time I saw the bridge, a few weeks ago, it was complete except for the centre span, which was then being installed. I will get a report for the honourable member from my colleague, the Minister of Roads. I am informed that the bridge will be opened on time, at the date previously considered possible.

MENINGIE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works an answer to the question I asked on October 29 regarding the turbidity of the Meningie water supply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The honourable member previously said that now that the pump had been converted to automatic operation the times of pumping were no longer selective in respect of the turbidity of the water in the lake. In other words, when manually operated, the pump would be operated at a time when the water was clearest, but now that it is automatic the pump cuts in whenever called upon and that increases the quantity of solids in suspension that are taken through the Meningie water system. The Engineer for Water Supply in that district (Mr. Harvey) reports that although automatic operation might tend to increase the amount of silt pumped into the system, trouble of this nature has always been experienced with the Meningie water supply as the water in Lake Albert is always very turbid. Complaints of dirty water were received in the early operation of the scheme. The question of treatment by chemical precipitation and filtration to try to clear the lake water was investigated several years ago, but the process is very costly and the question of policy arises as there are many places other than Meningie where turbidity of water is encountered. The township water supply is maintained in good order by the country turncock, and the tanks and mains are flushed frequently to remove silt, but despite these constant precautions the water still retains a high turbidity. Summarized, the automatic operation that the honourable member considered to be the cause of the problem is not the real cause of the problem: the real cause appears to be the basic quality of the water itself.

HILRA CROSSING.

Mr. CLARK: Recently I asked the Minister of Works to inquire of his colleague, the Minister of Railways, about the possibility of installing warning signals at Hilra railway crossing following the recent fatal accident there. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the Hilra crossing was provided at the request of the Long Range Weapons Establishment in 1953, and construction costs were met by the Commonwealth Government. This factor should be clearly understood: this was not an ordinary "public" crossing. Initially, the crossing was protected by standard warning boards. In 1956 "stop" signs were added following representations by local residents. The crossing traverses four tracks, one being the main line between Salisbury and Port Pirie. The remainder comprise part of the Penfield railway system. Visibility of approaching trains by drivers of road vehicles is good.

The District Council of Salisbury and the Weapons Research Establishment have made representations seeking the provision of automatic warning equipment. In 1960, the Commissioner notified both authorities that the priority of this crossing for provision of such equipment by the department was low. He stated, however, that if either body considered such installation necessary, he would have the work carried out provided the cost were defrayed by either or both the authorities. In other cases where similar offers have been accepted by other bodies, the Commissioner has subsequently accepted liability for maintenance of the installation. In a letter dated October 1, 1963, the District Council of Salisbury has requested consideration of a proposal aimed at improving the flow of road traffic over the crossing. This proposal is now being examined by the Commissioner's officers.

EGG LEVY.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of last Tuesday regarding the substantial increases in the egg levy?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Chairman of the South Australian Egg Board reports:

With regard to the increase in the amount of pool levy which the South Australian Egg Board has been working on, namely 3d. per dozen for all eggs consigned to registered grading agents of the board, and 4½d. per dozen to those producers who are selling under permit to the board: the levy for those producers consigning to grading floors was increased by 2d. per dozen, to 5d. per dozen, as from November 11, 1963, and those producers selling under permit were increased 2d. per dozen, to 6½d. per dozen, as from November 4, 1963. It is pointed out that with these increases the amount of pool levy deducted by the South Australian Egg Board is still the lowest of any State in the Commonwealth. It is also pointed out that since July 1, 1963, *i.e.*, the commencement of the pool year, the producers of all grades of eggs have received considerably higher prices than was the case last year. For instance, week commencing November 11, 1963, the prices were:

	Per dozen. s.	d.
First quality hen	4	5
First quality medium	3	5
Second quality	3	2
Ungraded	3	8

For the corresponding period of last year the prices were:

	Per dozen. s.	d.
First quality hen	3	7
First quality medium	2	11
Second quality	2	2
Ungraded	2	6

This has been the pattern right through since early July. In order to hold these prices at a reasonable level to the producers, and to meet the financial commitments of the board, it was necessary to increase the levy by 2d. per dozen. The levy is under constant review by the board, and it is varied according to the finanial position of the board.

BORING PLANT VEHICLES.

Mr. BURDON: On October 23 I asked the Premier whether vehicles owned by boring plant operators who render a service to primary producers could be considered for registration purposes on the same basis as primary producers' vehicles. Has the Premier obtained a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following report from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles:

As far as I am aware, it has never been intended to provide registration concessions for vehicles owned by contractors for primary producers on the same basis as the commercial vehicles owned by the primary producers themselves. If this concession were extended to boring plant operators for vehicles towing boring plant, it could be argued that the same concession should be applied to all of the many and varied classes of contractors engaged on work for primary producers. The concession, if extended to boring plant operators, would be a fraction of the standing charges for such vehicles, and would certainly be a very minute part of their operating costs. If this very small saving were passed on to the primary producers for whom a particular contractor contracted, the value to the primary producers would be so small as to be negligible. In view of the above, I do not think there is justification for extending concessions to boring plant operators who are engaged solely in providing a service for primary producers.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Works, who represents the Minister of Railways in this Chamber, obtained a reply to a question I asked a couple of weeks ago about the progress of the survey and the work generally on railway standardization?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: No, I have not yet obtained the information.

Mr. McKEE: Will the Minister try to obtain a report this week and, if he is unable to do so, will he ascertain what is causing the delay?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member is aware, the matter is not in my hands as I am not in charge of the department concerned. I imagine that my colleague is endeavouring to provide the honourable member with the information, as is the custom in this House, without undue delay, and that as soon as he can furnish the information he will. I cannot make promises on behalf of my colleague, but it is the custom in this Parliament to supply information, and I am sure that that is the intention of the Minister concerned.

WHYALLA BOAT ANCHORAGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Marine any further information in reply to a request by the Whyalla Boatowners' Association for assistance in providing a safe anchorage for members' boats?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a note in my bag to the effect that the Chief Civil Engineer of the Harbors Board has compiled an estimate of the cost of constructing the boat haven and breakwater, and that this should be available within a few days. That note is a day or two old: I will check to see if the report has been forwarded to my office.

TIMBER IMPORTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: I have recently been approached by a constituent connected with the timber industry who is concerned about information received from the Timber Development Association of Australia (South Australian branch) about the use of a timber known

as jelutong. I believe the Housing Trust used this timber for a while, but ceased doing so because it found it was unsatisfactory. However, I understand that it is still being used by private builders because of its cheapness. Will the Premier have this matter investigated to see whether this timber is, as alleged, unsatisfactory for South Australian use? Further, will he ascertain whether its importation affects the use of Australian timbers in general, and South Australian timbers in particular, and whether action should be taken in this matter, because this timber is used in houses in such positions that its use could involve heavy maintenance costs?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Most timber used in Housing Trust houses is not purchased by the trust, and the trust has no say concerning its purchase. The trust specifies a standard of timber, and the contractor is free to purchase it from any source he desires. It is rather significant that labour costs affect this matter appreciably. In many instances coming to my notice the contractor has preferred to use a much more expensive imported timber rather than Australian timber because, although the imported timber is dearer, it is much easier to use. However, I will get a report for the honourable member.

ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATION.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In this morning's *Advertiser,* under the heading of "Education Proposal Criticized", it was reported that the Minister of Education had told a meeting yesterday:

> We are hearing a lot of loose talk about what the Calwell Labor Government would do for education.

Does the Minister of Education believe that the Commonwealth Government, irrespective of the Party in office, should offer greater assistance to the Education Department, particularly concerning bursaries?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: What I said was that we were at present hearing much loose talk about what a future Calwell Labor Government would do for education, but that I was much more interested in past performances than in future promises. I said that the Menzies Liberal Government had done more for education than the two previous Governments—the Curtin and Chifley Governments—combined.

Mr. Clark: They were in during war-time: doesn't that make any difference?

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not intend to let this develop into an argument.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: That is what I thought, Mr. Speaker. To answer the question, I said that I was opposed to Mr. Calwell's proposal for the appointment of a Minister for Education and Science, because as a believer in federation as opposed to unification I thought this was the thin edge of the wedge for the unification of education throughout Australia.

Mr. Shannon: That is the Labor Party's policy.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Yes. I much prefer the proposals of the Prime Minister, who has done a marvellous job for the universities. He appointed a committee dealing with tertiary and post-secondary education and that committee's report will be submitted towards the end of the year. I believe that, particularly in relation to technical and scientific education, the report will produce a new era in education throughout Australia, and I strongly applaud the proposal. I do not think that everything that could have been done for education has been done, but I think that we are in for a better and brighter future—

Mr. Jennings: Under the Calwell Labor Government.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: —when the Menzies Government is safely returned within the next fortnight.

AIR COOLING IN SCHOOLS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On several occasions I have asked the Minister of Education to make subsidies available for air coolers in certain schools in my district, and the Minister has told me that the matter is under constant review. Last night I received a telephone call from the chairman of one of the school committees concerned and he said his committee desired to provide this amenity for the school before the height of the summer season. Has the Minister of Education anything further to report on this matter?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I can make a statement but it is not a final decision on the matter. Perhaps I could briefly state that, prior to 1954, air-cooling equipment was not subsidized, but an exception was permitted at Copley school about that time, and subsequently Cleve. Additional exceptions were made for Leigh Creek and Oodnadatta. In January, 1955, as a result of a deputation that waited on me from Morgan, I submitted the matter to Cabinet and was authorized to make the following decision:

(1) Each application for subsidy on air-cooling units should be considered on its merits, having regard to climatic conditions, availability of electric power and other matters.
(2) The department shall pay for electric power to operate units.
(3) The cost of maintenance and ultimate replacement shall be on a subsidy basis.

From the approvals granted it became apparent that two areas generally were regarded as having a sufficiently arduous climate to warrant expenditure on coolers. They were the Far and Upper North, and the Upper Murray Valley. I have received applications from metropolitan schools and some country schools that are not within those two areas. Up to the present they have been refused or held over, but as soon as Parliament adjourns I shall have them collated and submit a report and recommendation to Cabinet. It will not be in time for this year but a final decision will be made and promulgated later this year in ample time for school committees to know their position for next year.

GAWLER AREA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CLARK: Recently I brought to the notice of the Minister of Works complaints by two people from Brahma Lodge and Salisbury North about the quality of the water in that area. I understand the Minister has a report.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a report from the Engineer-in-Chief and information collected by the chief chemist whose duty it is to analyse and to check water quality. Much technical information has been included, which conveys comparatively little to the layman, but I could summarize the report. It sets out that the two addresses mentioned in the letters given to me by the honourable member were visited and water samples taken from them. The results of the analyses indicate:

That the water is bacteriologically satisfactory and represents normal reservoir water. Though the colour is somewhat higher than usual this can have no effect on health.

Mrs. Morrison referred to samples being obtained in situations that would not reveal the true character of the water. The chemist said that this was not a correct assumption and that sampling locations were always selected to be fully representative of the supply. I am informed that a number of observation points are used, one of which is near General Motors-Holden's, which has a treatment unit located after this point. The suggestion that the treatment unit gave a false representation of the quality was not correct. The sample was taken from the main before it reached the treatment unit. However, bacteriological samples are not normally collected here but are collected from a school at Salisbury, and from the former police station at Ridley Street, Elizabeth, which is now a police officer's private residence. That summarizes the information in the report. The honourable member may see the document if he desires further information to enable him to reply to his constituent.

WOMEN IN HIGH POSITIONS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In this morning's press appears the report of a speech by the Minister of Education at a meeting yesterday. It states:

"A woman councillor in the Adelaide City Council is more than a match for most of the male members," Sir Baden Pattinson said. "Perhaps the day is not far distant when this State will enjoy the benefit of a woman judge and a woman Cabinet Minister."

Did the Minister of Education have in mind advocating, if the opportunity presented itself, that our only female Q.C., Miss Roma Mitchell, should be appointed to the Supreme Court bench? Further, as he is charitably inclined, will he consider offering his post as Minister of Education to the member for Burnside?

The SPEAKER: Does the Minister desire to reply?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not deal in personalities.

STUDENT ALLOWANCES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Has the Minister of Education anything further to report concerning my question of October 8 about the living and boarding allowances paid to teachers' college students?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I pointed out to the Leader at the time that if it were decided to act upon his suggestion to change the tribunal and substitute the Teachers Salaries Board it would be necessary to amend the Education Act. I asked the Director of Education to report upon the matter and he has reported:

As you pointed out to Mr. Frank Walsh in your reply in the House, any transfer of authority to fix the scale of students' allowances to the Teachers Salaries Board would certainly involve an amendment to the Education Act. Apart from this, however, I would not be prepared to recommend that such a change should be made. So far as I know, the only State in which the scale of students' allowances is fixed by the authority fixing teachers' salaries is Victoria, and it is generally agreed that in that State the teachers' tribunal made a runaway award which is out of touch with

reality. I also feel that it would, in the long run, be contrary to the interest of the students themselves for their allowances to be fixed by the Teachers Salaries Board.

The Director also stated, as an addendum, that if I so desired he would submit to me a recommendation concerning whether or not the present allowances should be increased. I have verbally asked him to do so. I will submit the whole matter to Cabinet later this year so that, if a decision is made to increase the allowances, there will be ample time for an announcement to be made before the commencement of the next school year.

OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. BYWATERS: Can the Minister of Education indicate what progress has been made with the purchase of a house in Cypress Terrace, Murray Bridge, for an occupation centre?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Unfortunately I cannot tell the honourable member precisely because on Monday afternoon, instead of being at a Cabinet meeting, I was attending the meeting that the Leader of the Opposition seems jealous about and at which I spoke in support of a woman Parliamentary candidate. The Premier has informed me that the recommendation went through Cabinet yesterday, in which case settlement will be soon effected and we will be able to take over the property for the occupation centre.

BEDFORD PARK UNIVERSITY.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Several of my constituents communicated with me during the weekend and yesterday concerning earthworks being undertaken at the Bedford Park site for the university. Playing fields are apparently being prepared and the earth-moving equipment is being operated from 4.45 a.m. to 7.30 p.m. I have been asked to bring this matter to the notice of the Minister of Works and to ask him whether these machines could be operated from 7 a.m. until 5 p.m., which would be reasonable working hours. Will the Minister obtain a report?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not aware of any contracts involving departments under my jurisdiction. I think that all the contracts that have been let have been let by the university authorities, not by the Public Buildings Department. However, I will inquire and, if the contracts are under the control of my department, I shall see whether the Director of Public Buildings will interview the principals of the contracting firms with a view to ameliorating the conditions as the Leader has suggested. If the contracts are under the control of the university authorities I shall notify the Leader so that his remarks can be noted by them.

GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. CURREN: I have received the following letter, dated November 13, from the Upper Murray Grapegrowers Association:

The committee asks me to write to you and thank you on behalf of the committee and the grapegrowers generally for the assistance you have rendered to the industry by your questions to the Premier and your replies to us. However, as you know, the work is never finished, and the committee would appreciate it if at some opportune time you would formally thank the Premier for making the services of the Prices Commissioner available for the 1964 vintage.

In conveying the thanks of the committee, I ask the Premier whether the services of the Prices Commissioner will be made available in the future if requested.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As I have already indicated to the honourable member, the Government would favour a survey and negotiations by the Prices Commissioner again this year. However, as I previously stated, it would be premature for the Prices Commissioner to start his work until all of the factors upon which he could base his recommendation were known. I assure the honourable member that, provided the Commissioner has the co-operation of the industry, he is willing to make his officers and his services available the same as he has done, I believe with great satisfaction to the industry, for several years.

LEAVING HONOURS CLASSES.

Mr. BYWATERS: On August 21 I inquired of the Minister of Education regarding the possibility of establishing a Leaving Honours class at Murray Bridge in 1964. The Minister then said he could not see that this would be possible until 1965, and he referred to other places that also needed these classes. He concluded by saying:

I am advised that it would be risky to announce the establishment of any further classes at this time of the year. If it is possible later in the year to decide on more, I shall be pleased to do so.

Can the Minister say whether Leaving Honours classes other than those originally proposed for 1964 will be established, and whether such a class will be established at Murray Bridge?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I cannot give the honourable member any further information at present, and I doubt whether it will be possible to announce any further ones

for next year. The limiting factor is the limited number of highly trained specialist teachers for this purpose, and, as I have explained before, Leaving Honours classes are extravagant in the use of these teachers because a class splits up into two or three for one subject and it is uneconomic for one highly qualified—and, if I might say so, highly paid —teacher to be teaching two or three students one subject. Until the Director of Education is able to say he has sufficient of these teachers, he will not recommend to me that any more schools should have Leaving Honours classes for next year. I shall try to make a final decision within the next week or so, and if I do not do so by Thursday I shall write to the honourable member later. However, I think the answer will be "No".

PENNINGTON SCHOOL.

Mr. RYAN: Some time ago I introduced a deputation to the Minister of Education regarding the urgency of building a new school to replace the present Pennington Primary School. Since then, representations have been made on this matter, stressing its urgency. Provision has been made for this school in this year's Loan Estimates. Will the Minister say whether the necessary plans and specifications have been prepared for this school, and when tenders are likely to be called for the project?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I know that plans and specifications are being prepared, but I do not know whether they have been completed; if they have been, they have not yet reached me. I personally regard this school as being very urgently required, and I shall take the honourable member's question as a further reminder to see whether I can obtain finality soon about when tenders can be called.

STUDENTS' INSURANCE.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to arrange for insurance of scholars obliged to use railway crossings when proceeding to and from schools?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: No such action is contemplated at present.

AGRICULTURAL ADVISERS.

Mr. BYWATERS (on notice): What are the reasons for agricultural advisers of the Agriculture Department being asked to reduce travelling in country areas when this is so necessary to provide a service to primary producers?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The overall amount allocated in the Estimates for travelling expenses throughout the department in 1963-64 exceeds that which was voted for 1962-63.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH.

Mr. BYWATERS (on notice):

1. How many graduate technical officers have resigned from the Agriculture Department since 1957?

2. Does this number indicate a higher rate of resignations in comparison with non-graduate technical or clerical officers employed in that department?

3. If so, what are the reasons, and what steps are being taken to improve the situation?

4. Is the Minister satisfied that sufficient emphasis and assistance are given to applied research and extension in the Agriculture Department in comparison with the Waite Institute's approach to student teaching and academic research?

5. Is the Minister satisfied with the gulf that exists between the Waite Institute and the Applied Research and Extension Branch of the Agriculture Department?

6. If not, what plans are in hand to improve the situation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The replies are:

1. Thirty-five.

2. This is a higher rate than that of non-graduate technical officers, and a lower rate than that of clerical officers.

3. The reasons for resignations are varied, but the shortage of trained officers throughout Australia has resulted in opportunities for such officers to obtain alternative employment in other organizations. Recognizing this, the Government has, for many years, provided cadetships for degree courses in Agricultural Science, Rural Science, Rural Economics and Veterinary Science. Since 1957, 35 cadets have graduated under this scheme, the majority of whom are still in the employ of this department. The Public Service Arbitrator has recently determined increased salary rates for graduates on the "graduate range", and salaries of the more senior positions are at present under review by the Public Service Commissioner. Facilities are constantly under review. Construction has commenced on new modern laboratories at Northfield, and Cabinet has approved of new office blocks and laboratories to be erected at Loxton, Nuriootpa and Struan.

4. Yes.

5 and 6. I am satisfied that there is close co-operation and harmony between the Waite Institute and the Agriculture Department both at the formal level and between individual officers of the two organizations. The research activities at the Waite Institute are of a basic nature compared with the more applied research of the department, but these differences are not always clear-cut and some overlap occurs. There has been for many years a liaison committee comprising senior officers of both organizations. This committee exchanges information, and discusses technical problems and the sphere and scope of investigations necessary on the part of each organization in attempting a solution to these problems. In addition, there is a free interchange of technical information between officers at all levels. The operation of the liaison committee and individual contacts between staff of the two organizations result in effective liaison.

RAIL AND ROAD COLLISIONS.

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. How many collisions have occurred in South Australia between rail and road traffic since January 1, 1962?

2. How many of these collisions occurred in darkness or at times of significantly reduced visibility?

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

1. Calendar year 1963, 88. Of that total, 28 per cent of the collisions occurred at protected crossings.

2. Twenty-five of these collisions occurred during hours of darkness or poor visibility.

SEMAPHORE PARK SEWERAGE.

Mr. TAPPING (on notice): When is it proposed that a sewerage project for the Semaphore Park and Semaphore South areas will be referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Designs and estimates of cost for the sewerage scheme for Semaphore Park and Semaphore South have been prepared and financial statements are in course of preparation. It is expected that details will be available for Cabinet's consideration early in the new year.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

Clause 14:

Page 4, line 44: Leave out "payable".

Page 6, line 37: After "last" insert "preceding thirtieth".

Page 6, line 38: Leave out "preceding the date of the application".

Page 6, line 41: Leave out "last" and insert "thirtieth".

Page 7, line 6: After "licence" insert "by a person other than a person specified in subsection (5) of this section."

Page 7, line 23: After "III" insert "and".

Page 7, line 23: After "IV" leave out "and VIII".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): All the amendments are drafting ones, and none alters the purpose of the Bill. The explanation of the amendments was submitted to the Government before the Chief Secretary moved them in the Legislative Council, and it is as follows:

(1) Clause 14, page 4, line 44: This is a drafting amendment designed to ensure that all duties will be included in the definition of "gross amount"—the word "payable" which will be left out under the amendment is unnecessary and could have the effect of excluding duties already paid, which is not the intention.

(2) Clause 14, page 6, lines 37, 38 and 41: These are connected drafting amendments overlooked when reference was made to the relevant dates in proceedings for applications for licences. Under the Bill, intending applicants for renewals of licences have to furnish information by October 1, relating to liquor purchased up to the preceding June 30. The actual application is not made until early in the new year—so that as at the date when the information is required there is no "application". The amendments remove the references to "application" and refer simply to the preceding June 30, which is what is intended.

(3) Clause 14, page 7, line 6: The purpose of this amendment is to make it clear that only in those few cases where the applicant for the transfer of a licence is the outgoing licensee will he be required to give details of purchases made to date. As the subsection now reads, a transferee could be technically required to give such details—he would not be in a position to know anything about transactions by the transferor. The amendment makes it clear that in such a case a transferee will not be so required.

(4) Clause 14, page 7, line 23: This is a drafting amendment, designed to remove a figure which should not be in the subsection.

Honourable members will see that all these amendments were found by the Parliamentary Draftsman to be necessary to clarify clauses that were inserted in the Bill originally. They were moved by the Government in another place, and they do not introduce any new matter. I ask that the amendments be taken *en bloc*, and that they be accepted.

Amendments agreed to.

AUSTRALIAN MINERAL DEVELOPMENT LABORATORIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

OPTICIANS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act, 1948-1962.

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.

As members are aware, the joint committee (consisting of the Public Service Arbitrator and the Auditor-General) appointed to inquire into and report upon the salaries and allowances of members of Parliament was authorized by the Government to extend its inquiries also into the subject of superannuation for members. In the course of its inquiries, the joint committee considered the Parliamentary superannuation schemes in the other States and a number of submissions from Ministers and members, both individually and collectively, as well as from various other persons, and, in its report dated November 8, 1963 (which I have tabled for members' information), made several recommendations, most of which have the Government's approval. If members take the opportunity to study the report, they will see that it contains three recommendations, and that, apart from making recommendations in respect of members, it also makes recommendations in relation to certain officers of Parliament—the Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, and the President of the Legislative Council. It also made recommendations regarding Ministers. Cabinet did not approve the alterations that were suggested for the officers, nor has it approved the recommendations made with respect to the Ministers. The Bill gives effect to all of the recommendations made for members and to the extent that Ministers and officers of Parliament are members, they receive the benefit. However, the Bill does not include any recommendation concerning the Ministers or the officers of Parliament. Since its inception, this scheme has been considered as a Parliamentary superannuation scheme with members of Parliament as its whole basis. A member of Parliament qualified for benefits as a member of Parliament. To alter the nature of the scheme would, in the Government's opinion, create many problems. Cabinet members, who naturally have ideas on various matters, have considerable doubt about the wisdom of including the extensions.

I realize that honourable members have not had the opportunity to study the report. The special privileges that would be attached to the types of officers I have mentioned would become available only when the office had been held for six years. They would not be available to an officer who was not an officer at present. Many anomalies might arise from the recommendation, but that was not why Cabinet turned it down: Cabinet turned it down because this scheme must be regarded as a Parliamentary superannuation scheme. Therefore, the Bill does not introduce any special privileges for Ministers, the Leader of the Opposition, the President or the Speaker. This Bill gives effect to all the recommendations of the joint committee that affect members generally. I intend to deal with these recommendations in detail as I explain the clauses of the Bill.

Section 9 of the principal Act deals with the present rates of annual contribution by members, while section 13 sets out the annual amounts of pension payable to ex-members. At present three rates of contribution are in operation. They are:

£72 per annum—which attracts a pension of £260 per annum at 10 years' service increasing by £20 per annum for each additional year up to 18 years and for each additional three years thereafter up to a maximum pension of £500.

£100 per annum—which attracts a pension of £390 per annum at 10 years' service increasing by £30 per annum for each additional year up to 18 years and for each additional three years thereafter up to a maximum pension of £750.

£150 per annum—which attracts a pension of £585 per annum at 10 years' service increasing by £45 per annum for each additional year up to 18 years and for each additional three years thereafter up to a maximum pension of £1,125.

At present two members contribute at the rate of £72 per annum, one at £100 per annum and the rest at £150 per annum. Although the Act provides that members who commenced to contribute to the fund prior to 1960 at the rate of £58 10s. per annum could continue to do so, no contributors pay at that rate. The joint committee has recommended:

(*a*) that the rate of contribution of £58 10s. per annum and corresponding benefits be eliminated, provided the rights of persons at present receiving benefits derived from contributions at that rate are preserved;

(*b*) that the rate of contribution of £72 per annum and corresponding benefits be eliminated for all but existing contributors at that rate who may choose to continue to contribute at that rate, provided also that the rights of persons at present receiving benefits derived from such contributions are also preserved;

(*c*) that the rates of contribution be revised to enable members to contribute at rates and to receive benefits, as follows:

£100 per annum—which will attract a pension of £360 per annum after nine years' service increasing by £30 per annum for each year up to 18 years and for each additional three years thereafter up to a maximum pension of £750.

£150 per annum—which will attract a pension of £540 per annum after nine years' service increasing by £45 per annum for each additional year up to 18 years and for each additional three years thereafter up to a maximum pension of £1,125.

£200 per annum—which will attract a pension of £720 per annum after nine years' service increasing by £60 per annum for each additional year up to 18 years and for each additional three years thereafter up to a maximum pension of £1,500.

I have not worked it out but a member will see that, by taking the maximum superannuation to which he is entitled to contribute, he could, at the end of 24 years, receive a pension of £1,500 a year. If a member at present contributing at the rate of £72 per annum elects to continue to contribute at that rate, the joint committee has recommended that his pension payable after nine years' service should be £240 per annum increasing by £20 per annum for each additional year up to 18 years and for each additional three years thereafter up to a maximum pension of £500. It also recommended, however, that existing members should be permitted to contribute at the next higher rate above that at which they are at present contributing, if they elect to do so before a specified date, but, if they do not make an election within the prescribed time, they should continue to contribute at the rate at which they are now contributing. With respect to female members, the committee recommended that they should contribute only two-thirds of the rates payable by male members but that no pensions should be payable to their dependents or widowers although the same pension rates should be payable both to male and female ex-members. The committee has recommended that members should be permitted to contribute at the next higher rate to that at which they are now contributing. If a member is paying £100 now, he can pay £150 and obtain the benefits applicable to such contribution. Similarly, if now paying £150 he can pay £200 and obtain the benefits applicable to the £200 contribution.

Mr. Riches: For how long does a member have to pay the higher contribution to qualify for the increased pension?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: He has to nominate within the prescribed time to be eligible.

Mr. Riches: To be immediately eligible?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: One payment would make him eligible. He has to nominate within the prescribed time to become eligible for the additional benefits applying to the higher rate. Clauses 3 and 6 give effect to these recommendations. Sections 11 and 14 of the principal Act prescribe the conditions which qualify a contributor to a pension on defeat, retirement or resignation. Under section 11 the normal qualifying period of service is 10 years. That section further provides that a person of or over the age of 50 years who has served as a member for 18 years or more need not comply with section 14. The committee has recommended that the normal qualifying period of 10 years' service should be reduced to nine years and that the age bar of 50 years of age for a member who has served for 18 years or more should be removed subject to further conditions which I shall deal with presently. Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts subsection (1) so as to reduce the normal qualifying period of service from 10 years to nine years but preserving the existing rights of persons who are presently receiving pensions. The further conditions of entitlement to pensions, however, are stated in section 14, subsections (1), (2) and (2*a*) of which provide, in effect, that in addition to satisfying the requirements of section 11:

(*a*) a person of or over the age of 50 years who has served for less than 18 years and ceased to be a member upon resignation or when his term expires, must satisfy a judge that there were good reasons for his resignation or for not seeking re-election or stand for re-election and be defeated; and

(*b*) a person under the age of 50 years who ceases to be a member upon resignation or when his term expires must satisfy a judge that there were good reasons for his resignation or for not seeking re-election unless his total service is 20 years or more and he has stood for re-election and been defeated.

The joint committee has recommended, however, that these conditions should be modified as follows:

(*a*) Any member of or over the age 65 years who has the normal qualifying service of nine years and any member under that age who has 18 years' service or more should be entitled to resign or retire at any time with pension rights without being obliged to stand for re-election or to satisfy a judge that there were good reasons for his resignation or for not seeking re-election.

Members will see that a member who has qualified may retire at 65 years of age without having to satisfy a judge that there is good reason for his not seeking re-election.

(*b*) any person under the age of 65 years who has the normal qualifying service of nine years but less than 18 years and ceases to be a member upon resignation or when his term expires should not be entitled to a pension unless he either satisfies a judge that there were good reasons for his resignation or for not seeking re-election or stands for re-election and is defeated;

(*c*) if a person under the age of 50 years becomes entitled to a pension on any grounds (other than that he has satisfied a judge that there were good reasons for his not continuing as a member) he should not be entitled to receive such pension before he attains the age of 50 years and his pension will commence only on his attaining that age unless he has elected to receive a refund of his contributions.

Under the old provisions a person could be a member for 15 years, and if he were defeated at the age of 45 or 48 he would not be eligible for a pension. However, under the new provisions, if I understand the committee's recommendations correctly (I have not had time to study them closely) if a member who qualified for a pension was defeated before he was 50 years of age he would not receive his pension until he reached 50. He would not be repaid—unless he asked for it—the amount he had paid in, but the matter would stand in abeyance and he would receive his pension when he reached 50 years of age. He would not have to contribute anything in the intervening period while he was not a member, but his right to a pension at 50 would not be disallowed, as it would have been under the old provisions. Clause 7 gives effect to these recommendations.

Section 12 of the principal Act in effect provides that a pension accrues as from the day following the day when a member completes compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (*a*) to (*e*) of section 11 (1). These requirements are that he must have ceased to be a member and to be entitled to

any parliamentary salary after having served for the minimum qualifying period, and that his contributions to the fund should not be less than £351. Under the joint committee's recommendations, where a person qualified for a pension when he was under 50 years of age but did not become entitled to receive it until he attained that age, his pension would not accrue until he in fact attained that age. Clause 5 accordingly re-enacts section 12 so as to make an exception in such cases. Paragraphs (*a*) and (*c*) of clause 8 are consequential amendments.

Paragraph (*b*) of clause 8 adds a new subsection to section 16 of the principal Act which provides that where, before the death of a person who had qualified for a pension which had not commenced because he had not attained the age of 50 years, he had not elected to receive a refund of his contributions as is provided in the amendment to section 18 of the principal Act as proposed by clause 10, his widow shall be entitled to a pension except where he marries after he ceases to be a member. Members will see that a widow would be entitled to a pension provided that the member's marriage took place while he was a qualified person.

Section 17 (2) of the principal Act provides that if a person in receipt of a pension holds an office under the Crown for which he is remunerated at a rate exceeding £500 a year, his annual pension shall be decreased by the amount by which such remuneration exceeds £500. That is the present limit. If a person entitled to a pension holds an office of profit under the Crown to the value £500 a year or more, his pension shall be decreased by the sum by which it exceeds £500. Incidentally, an office under the Crown does not mean only an office under the Crown in South Australia. It has been held by the Crown Solicitor that it would exclude or partially exclude, as the case might be, a member in respect of an office of profit under the Commonwealth Government. Honourable members will recall that some years ago the then Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Richards) resigned and took up an appointment under the Commonwealth Government as Administrator of Nauru. While Administrator, he did not qualify for Parliamentary pension because of this provision. I believe that this affected another former member of this House (the late Sir Shirley Jeffries who was a member of the Board of Governors of the South Australian Savings Bank). While he occupied that position his pension benefits were decreased by the appropriate amount. The committee has now increased this amount from £500 to £750. As this amount of £500 has not been altered since 1953, the joint committee has recommended that it be increased to £750, and clause 9 gives effect to this recommendation. The joint committee has also recommended that a person who qualifies for a pension which does not commence until he attains the age of 50 years should be permitted to elect to receive a refund of his contributions in lieu of the future pension. This recommendation is given effect in clause 10.

Section 19 of the principal Act provides that where a person dies during his term of office the trustees shall pay the amount of his contributions to his widow (if she is not entitled to a pension under the Act) or to his personal representatives or some other person to whom the trustees deem it just to pay it. Clause 11 re-enacts section 19 so as to extend its application to the case where a person dies after becoming entitled to a pension which had not commenced because he had not attained the age of 50 years, but without electing to receive a refund of his contributions. I emphasize that the Government has not in any way tampered with the recommendations of the committee as they affect members. However, it has not deemed it appropriate to endorse the recommendations that officers of Parliament might contribute up to £250 with corresponding benefits, and that Ministers might elect to contribute up to £300 with corresponding benefits. The Government has included in the Bill only those provisions applicable to all members of both Houses.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BENEFITS).

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932-1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is introduced as a result of discussions by the committee which meets to consider various aspects of workmen's compensation and which makes recommendations to Parliament each year. As far as I know, the recommendations all favour increasing benefits. They were sifted by the committee, and the Bill was delayed so that it could be sent back to members of the committee for perusal. The Bill provides for

several improvements to the present Act. Every member, of course, has his individual idea; some members opposite, and some on this side, would no doubt say that the Bill does not go as far as they desire. However, at the request of the Opposition, Parliament will adjourn this week and will re-assemble on February 18. I suggest that members give this matter prompt consideration, as I should like the Bill to be dealt with by another place before Parliament adjourns this week. If this measure is delayed, many people who have accidents between now and February will be deprived of the increased benefits provided in this measure. In the circumstances, although I do not want to preclude members from stating their views on workmen's compensation in the fullest possible way, I should like the Bill to go to another place in time to be dealt with before we adjourn next Thursday. Members will see from the second reading explanation that the measure is entirely beneficial as far as it goes, although perhaps it will not go as far as some would desire.

Its provisions are based on a report by the Workmen's Compensation Advisory Committee, which has met during the year and has considered various matters in connection with the revision of the Act. The first set of provisions made by the Bill will raise the amounts payable for compensation. The maximum rate of compensation for death is raised from the present £3,000, plus £100 for each dependent child, to £3,250 and £110 respectively (clause 5 (*b*)). The minimum rate is raised from £1,000 and £100 for each child to £1,100 and £110 respectively (clause 5 (*a*)). The maximum rates of compensation for disability are raised from £3,250 to £3,500 (clauses 7 (*d*) and 9), payments in respect of wives and children being raised from £4 and £1 10s. a week to £4 10s. and £1 15s. respectively (clause 7 (*a*)). Maximum weekly payments are raised from £15 and £10 5s. to £16 5s. and £11 respectively (clause 7 (*b*) and (*c*)).

These are the principal amendments regarding amounts of compensation, but I refer also to the raising of the maximum amounts for burial expenses from £80 to £100 (clauses 5 (*c*) and 6) and for damage to clothing from £25 to £30 (clause 8 (*c*)), and the raising of the exclusion based on earnings from £45 to £55 a week (clause 4). Members will realize that this is an important amendment, as at present persons receiving over £45 a week are excluded from the Act. The raising of that figure to £55 is, for many people, an important amendment. At the same time the minimum compensation for a workman under 21 with no dependants is raised from the present £5 10s. to £6 a week (clause 7 (*e*)).

The Bill also makes some incidental amendments considered desirable, which I shall now list. In the first place, section 18a of the principal Act is amended to make it clear that ambulance services will include not only transport to hospital but also where necessary on return journeys; likewise, it is made clear that medical services include renewals or replacements of surgical apparatus (clause 8 (*a*) and (*b*)).

Another unrelated matter concerns section 27 of the Act (which relates to review of weekly payments of compensation) by making provision for regard to be had to fluctuations in wage rates as was done in connection with section 25 in 1961 when a similar provision was made as to the fixing of the amount of weekly payments (clause 10). In addition to the foregoing, the Bill makes three important amendments of principle to the principal Act. First, it makes definite provision for cover while travelling for or in connection with medical treatment resulting from compensable injuries, as exists in Victoria (new paragraph (*c*) inserted in section 4 (2) by clause 3 (*c*)). Secondly, the Bill provides for cover during temporary absence during authorized meal breaks (new paragraph (*d*) inserted in section 4 (2) by clause 3 (*c*)). The additional cover is limited to cases where the employer consents to the absence and is designed to exclude completely unrelated activities or anything undertaken contrary to an employer's instructions.

The third amendment of substance removes what have hitherto been gaps in the law. First, the present Act omits provision for an accident arising while a workman is at a trade school. Similarly, no provision is made for the case (perhaps not frequent) where a workman actually stops work at the end of the day and immediately proceeds to the trade school because his class is held at that time. Technically, he is not, in such case, travelling during ordinary working hours, although if he had left a short period before the conclusion of the day he would have been covered. (Clause 3 (*a*) and (*b*) and new paragraph (*c*) inserted in section 4 (2) by clause 3 (*c*)). Clause 11 provides that the amendments (other than that designed to remove doubts as to replacements) are to apply prospectively only. The committee has also given consideration to certain questions relating to what is known as Q fever. In view of difficulties of a technical character

relating to this disease, it has not been possible to cover the matter in the Bill in the available time: the Chairman of the committee is pursuing the question with interested parties with a view to making a report to the Government as soon as practicable. The Bill, which is designed to give increased benefits and to cover omissions from the Act, has one or two extensions of principle of the present Act. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that, if it is convenient for him, he secure the adjournment of the debate to a later stage today when he may have had the Bill investigated and be able to say to what extent the Opposition supports it. I hope the Leader can do that as I should like to have the Bill in another place before the conclusion of today's sitting, so that it might be considered before the adjournment at the end of this week.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. I expect Parliament to resume some time in February and that in the meantime the committee and the Parliamentary Draftsman will be able to frame a provision concerning compensation for Q fever. Should that happen, I expect that another Bill would be introduced next year to enact such provisions. I have discussed this legislation and know that it does not cover everything my Party desires but, so that it will not be delayed and so that those persons who come within its ambit may receive immediate benefits, I shall not delay it. This is more or less machinery-type legislation. I understand that apprentices attending trade schools are excluded from the benefits provided by the present legislation even though they may be injured at the trade school or while travelling after certain hours. The committee has done a reasonably good job in its approach to this matter. I do not apologize for having introduced earlier this session a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. At least it provided an opportunity to discuss the matter.

Mr. Jennings: It passed the second reading.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Yes, but not the third reading. This Bill reflects the need to improve compensation benefits for those unfortunate people who are entitled to them. The maximum earnings are to be increased from £45 to £55 a week, and this indicates the trend of normal wages. Today £20 is recognized as almost the basic wage for some trades or occupations. Some would receive more. However, the Bill seeks to increase the benefits.

Another important amendment relates to burials. Funeral costs are obviously increasing, and I think that the committee has adopted a reasonable approach. Provision is also made for temporary absence during authorized meal breaks, but the additional cover is limited to cases where the employer consents to the absence, and is designed to exclude completely unrelated activities or anything undertaken contrary to an employer's instructions. I presume that this means that if an employee plays football during the lunch break and meets with an accident he would not be covered. I support the second reading, but will seek further information in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Amendment of principal Act, section 27."

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I referred to temporary absence during authorized meal breaks. Can the Premier amplify the limitations applying on the additional cover?

The CHAIRMAN: Is the Leader linking his remarks to clause 10?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I take it that during the lunch hour an employee would be covered for anything that he would normally do during that period. However, if he played football, which is an entirely unrelated activity, and broke his collarbone, I do not think he would be covered. An employee has his lunch hour with the consent of his employer. If in going to the canteen an employee had to cross a street and met with an accident whilst so doing, he would be covered because that activity would be related to his employment. However, football would be out, because it is unrelated. A man would be covered if in his lunch hour he slipped and sprained his ankle while walking downstairs. I do not think he would have to get specific approval to be absent.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The Premier has referred—

The CHAIRMAN: The question asked by the Leader was not pertinent to clause 10. The honourable member must confine his remarks to clause 10.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I wish to refer to the clause on which the Premier replied.

The CHAIRMAN: I think those remarks were pertinent to clause 3. We are discussing clause 10.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I thought that as you permitted the Leader—

The CHAIRMAN: I called on clause 10 and the Leader of the Opposition began speaking.

Mr. FRED WALSH: How can I get back to clause 3? This is an important matter.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall put the question that the honourable member have leave to speak now.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The Premier outlined the new cover, and he interpreted the clause. I interpret it a little differently. Many employees who live adjacent to or within walking distance of their employment go home for lunch, and those employees could well meet with an accident while going to or from their place of employment. I cannot see that those people would be covered, and I think it is most important that the position be clarified.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Going home to lunch is entirely different from going somewhere to play football, for instance, and I believe that it would be covered. Going to a meal at the normal lunch time with the approval of the employer is, I think, completely all right: I do not think any other interpretation would be put upon the words. The thing that is unrelated is something of the type to which the Leader referred. A person might meet with an accident while going to play football or for a swim during the lunch hour; I do not think that has anything to do with employment, and I do not think that would be covered.

Clause passed.

Remaining clause (11) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has been prepared to give effect to recommendations of the Physiotherapists Board of South Australia relating to registration under the principal Act and to the practice of physiotherapy. Clause 3 inserts a proviso in section 6 (2) of the principal Act to place on persons who are exempted from registration by reason only of the fact that they practise face or scalp massage or apply physiotherapy to members of sporting teams a limit on the duration of such treatment. As the Act stands, these exempted persons are entitled to continue any such treatment indefinitely. It is considered undesirable that such exempted persons should be permitted to practise, in effect, as physiotherapists for a longer time than is necessary for the purpose of the exemption. Under the proviso inserted by this clause the massage or physiotherapy must be confined to a period of three months after the training or the time when the injury was received.

Clause 4 effects two amendments of section 39 of the principal Act. The first of these amendments removes the requirement that a person must be a resident of the State before qualifying for registration. Under the existing Act, if a person holding the required diploma goes to another State before being registered he is required to return to this State and take up residence here if he wishes to obtain registration. The second amendment made by this clause relates to qualification for registration by virtue of a diploma granted by the South Australian Branch of the Australian Physiotherapists Association. The amendment merely affords statutory recognition of the fact that the association ceased to issue diplomas in the year 1945, after which the University of Adelaide has issued diplomas in physiotherapy.

The Physiotherapy Board has received many applications for registration from migrants who have qualified or undergone training as physiotherapists in foreign countries. In some cases the board, after due inquiry, makes a reciprocal agreement with the country concerned under which a migrant may obtain registration as a physiotherapist. (These countries are specified in regulations made under the principal Act.) In other cases, however, there is no central authority through which negotiations can be conducted, and it is sometimes impossible to obtain any evidence on the course of training that a particular migrant has had. Thus it may well happen that a migrant has had ample training and practice in physiotherapy overseas but cannot become registered here because the board is not able to make sufficient inquiries. Clause 5 inserts new sections 39a and 39b in the principal Act. The purpose of new section 39a is to empower the board to investigate an application from such a migrant and determine whether the applicant is a fit and proper person to be registered here as a physiotherapist. If the board is satisfied that the migrant fulfils the following requirements, namely that:

(*a*) he has qualified as a physiotherapist in a foreign country;

(*b*) he is competent to practise physiotherapy in this State;

(*c*) he is of good character and has an adequate understanding of English,

he may be registered here as a physiotherapist. The new section is not mandatory but discretionary; it will enable the board to make

inquiries and, if satisfied that an applicant is in fact qualified, to register him. It is designed to remove a difficulty which has been a source of dissatisfaction among several migrants who, although possessing excellent qualifications, are barred even from having their cases considered.

Clause 5 also inserts new section 35b in the principal Act. The purpose of this new section is to enable students who qualify for their diploma in December to obtain temporary registration as a physiotherapist until they receive their diplomas some months later. Under subsection (2) of the new section the temporary registration will remain in force, unless permanent registration is sooner obtained, until one month after the council and senate meetings convened for the purpose of conferring diplomas. Under subsection (3) the board may, for sufficient cause, extend a temporary registration. Subsection (4) is a consequential machinery provision. Clause 6 inserts new section 47a into the principal Act. The purpose of this section is to preclude physiotherapists from treating their patients with drugs.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PRODUCER REPRESENTATION).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 12. Page 1589.)

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the Bill, the main provisions of which, as the Minister said, were requested by the producers. Some time ago producers approached me in relation to this matter and suggested amendments to the Act. The section with which they were mostly concerned was that which provides that producer members are to be elected by the industry. I am pleased that the Minister has agreed to this, that he intends by this measure to set up zones, and that those people producing 3,000 dozen eggs a year will be able to elect the members they desire. In the past, these members have been selected every three years from a panel of names submitted to the Minister by interested organizations of poultry farmers. The other members will remain on the board until their term expires. The clause relating to the three producer members is the main part of the Bill.

Another provision requested by producers was that section 23 (5) be deleted from the Act. This subsection has applied to eggs used for hatching, and the industry generally has considered that too many producers have been using it to escape the levy. Because of that, they asked for its deletion, and that has been agreed to. Some other provisions sought by the industry, however, have not been included in the Bill, although some of them can be tidied up once the elected members of the board take office. The organizations associated with the egg industry will need to watch the position and to promote some of the provisions they have requested.

One provision in which they are interested is the provision of more egg floors to handle eggs. As members know, most egg floors are in the metropolitan area. There is one in the country at Gawler, but there are other important parts of the State from which eggs have to be transported to the city for grading. Because of this, it is considered that there is a breakdown in quality, and the returns of producers are affected. I know that members of the poultry section of the Australian Primary Producers Union have suggested that there should be an egg floor at Murray Bridge, as there are several big poultry farmers in the locality. They think there is a need for an egg floor in the locality so that eggs can be graded and producers can be satisfied with the grading. It has been a source of contention among poultry farmers when they get their returns that often the returns are not as good as they have expected, as they have contained many seconds, cracked eggs, blood-spot eggs, and so on. They would have been more satisfied had they seen their eggs graded, but that has not been possible when they are miles away from the grading floor. If there were a floor around Murray Bridge, they could see their eggs graded and would be much happier.

All members are concerned about the number of people escaping the levy. It is estimated that only 50 per cent of poultry farmers are paying it. This is happening because of the border-hopping mentioned this afternoon in a question of the Premier by the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn).

Mr. Freebairn: It is difficult to get a real estimate, isn't it?

Mr. BYWATERS: I agree, but it is possible to get somewhere near the correct figure, which has been approached by taking into account the number of poultry farmers and the number of fowls they have. It has been suggested that only 50 per cent of producers in Australia have been paying the levy; this applies not only to South Australia but to other States. Frequently, semi-trailers go from South Australia to Victoria and New South Wales loaded

with eggs, and others come back from those States to South Australia. This afternoon the member for Light referred to legislation proposed by the New South Wales Government. This was mentioned in the October 24 edition of *Poultry*, which suggested that legislation would be introduced in two or three weeks. I have written to the New South Wales Minister of Agriculture asking him to send me a copy of the legislation when it is drafted. I know the New South Wales Government is as much concerned about border-hopping as are other States. I suppose the district I represent and its neighbouring districts are the main offenders in this matter. I have known of semi-trailers coming into the district and, because there are established depots, they have received ready cash for their eggs. They now receive below the price paid by the board, yet people still send eggs to other States, although they would probably be better off if they sold to the Egg Board. This matter concerns the industry.

We are all well aware that not long ago the Commonwealth Egg Marketing Authority was set up to try to bring down suggestions to overcome border-hopping, and its recommendations had a stormy passage in the first instance.

Mr. Freebairn: Not to overcome it: to make it less attractive.

Mr. BYWATERS: Yes, but I suppose that making it less attractive would be overcoming it. The C.E.M.A. plan that was eventually brought down would have made it unattractive to transport eggs to other States. Someone must pay for this transporting of eggs; either the poultry farmer or consumer pays it, as extra cartage is involved. Someone has to pay because these people are avoiding the payment of the levy. The only people gaining are those who are trading interstate, as they are avoiding the levy. Members who are associated with the poultry industry in any way are aware of the fiasco that took place two or three years ago, when some interstate buyers ceased operations overnight and the South Australian market was flooded with eggs that could not be handled in the time; consequently, there was a big breakdown in quality and smaller returns to producers. This made poultry farming so uneconomic that many producers went out of existence.

This is a bad thing for the industry. Orders to hatcheries decreased by about 33 per cent on that occasion, which meant so many fowls less today, with a consequent egg shortage during the winter. This shows the need for organized marketing. The system operating between the States today is, as the Premier suggested, hard to overcome because of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, and while it continues we will have this disorganized marketing of eggs. Two authorities control the export of shell and pulp. When the Second World War ended and restrictions were removed, the New South Wales Government, because the New South Wales Egg Board had most poultry farmers (I believe they have 50 per cent of poultry farmers in New South Wales) took almost half the money held by the Australian Egg Board. This Government started on its own and left the other States to form the export marketing authority. This scheme has been unsatisfactory but, although the N.S.W. Government was asked to co-operate and was offered many concessions, it would not enter the agreement to market under one exporting authority. Eventually both bodies competed with each other for eggs and pulp exported from Australia. This weakened the authority and naturally reduced prices.

We are aware of these problems, but a genuine attempt by the industry appears to have been made to overcome them. The industry has considered the matter thoroughly. Prior to the egg glut on the Adelaide market about three years ago, little organization existed in the poultry industry. No-one cared about what happened to the industry until the slump came, but since that time a strong organization has been set up inside the Australian Primary Producers Union to protect the poultry farmer. Much of this re-organization was suggested by people in my district. I recall presiding over a large meeting attended by about 200 producers. They formed a committee and have taken the active interest in the industry that has resulted in this legislation.

This is not the first time that producer-elected members have been suggested. In an earlier debate the Speaker, the member for Ridley, moved an amendment to provide for producer-elected members. It was not accepted on that occasion. The present Minister of Agriculture (then a private member), added his support but said he would move to amend the amendment of the member for Ridley. The amendment was not carried so the Minister did not introduce the amendments he had foreshadowed. Nevertheless, he favoured the legislation, and now as Minister he has introduced a Bill to give effect to what he supported at that time. The industry will be pleased with this legislation because it incorporates the main provisions it has asked for. The Commonwealth Egg Marketing Authority

plan has caused concern to people active on a committee representing the poultry farmers and working on their behalf. They have been concerned at the delay and with statements appearing in the journal *Poultry* criticizing the South Australian Government for not accepting this plan. The Minister of Agriculture has said that, although he is not opposed to the stabilization of the industry, but is in favour of it, he has not received information that would satisfy him that the scheme should be introduced in this State or that this State should agree with other States on its introduction. Apparently all other States have accepted the situation with the knowledge they had, but our Minister was not willing to do this. He could be right, but many people are concerned because he has not accepted it.

I know that this matter is being talked about in the industry, not only in this State but in other States and in Canberra and I hope that something will be done soon so that the industry may be stabilized. Explanations have been given by members of the board and members of Red Comb to those interested in the industry at meetings at Murray Bridge, Barossa Valley and in Adelaide, and each of those meetings endorsed this scheme almost unanimously. They accepted that this State should co-operate with the other States in the introduction of the Commonwealth Egg Marketing Authority scheme. People who are greatly concerned consider that much time has been lost in introducing this plan. I sincerely hope that, whatever the outcome of the Commonwealth election on November 30, the Government of the day will continue with this legislation and inform the Minister of Agriculture in this State, so that he can be satisfied that the plan is warranted. No-one would deny that it is badly needed, and all would agree that the trade between States has been detrimental to poultry farmers generally, and consequently, because of the increased prices, to the consumer who eventually has to pay.

This plan would assist in overcoming the problems inherent in the interstate trade in eggs. It is not good to transport eggs by semi-trailer to another State on hot days like today when it takes two days to reach their destination. The quality of the eggs is not improved. Eggs do not improve with age: they deteriorate. I consider that this legislation is a step forward. Now that the industry can elect its members by ballot, the setting-up of the zones and provision for elections will give the Minister the opportunity of testing how people feel about the Commonwealth Egg Marketing Authority scheme.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I support this Bill, the main purpose of which is to provide that the producers may elect their three representatives to the South Australian Egg Board. This is a step in the right direction. It is democratic and will remove some of the criticisms being levelled at the present board which is appointed by the Minister, not elected by producers. The three producer members who will be elected under the provisions of this legislation will take on an extremely responsible job. Their decisions will reflect the desires of producers who have within their power the ability to continue having these members in office after the expiry of their term or to reject them if they have not carried out the desires of the producers who elected them. So, we are placing fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the industry itself matters of immediate concern to the industry. I believe that this legislation could well open up for consideration a new basis for stabilization schemes. Any scheme to be successful must have the backing of the producers at large. Without that backing any scheme would be doomed to failure. Give the authority to the producers themselves, as this Bill does, and we will have firm and correct foundations on which to work to ensure the welfare of this industry.

I regard the voting qualifications as most reasonable. Any poultry farmer who has sold 3,000 dozen eggs to the board in the past year, or who, under a permit, has disposed of 3,000 dozen eggs will qualify for a vote in the elections. It means that any producer who has about 250 layers will qualify for a vote. The onus of actually voting will rest on the producer. The Egg Board will compile the electoral rolls but the person entitled to vote will have to see that he gets a vote. I regard this as good legislation that will enable a better expression of the interests of the industry.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support this Bill, which will have the effect of altering the system by which the egg producers' representatives are elected to the Egg Board. As the House knows, in the past the three producer members have been selected by the Minister of Agriculture from a panel submitted to him by the South Australian egg producers' organizations. Under this legislation, however, the producer members will be elected directly by the poultry farmers. I have canvassed this legislation in my district and I find general support and even enthusiasm for it. It will enable the egg producers to have a direct and personal say as to who represents them on the Egg Board. I do not say this as a reflection on

the present growers' representatives on the board. We know that they are doing a fine job under the difficult conditions obtaining in the poultry industry at present. I do not intend to speak at length now, but will move certain amendments in Committee, amendments which will not greatly affect the machinery of the Bill but which will widen voting qualifications and slightly alter the electoral districts.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): It is with much pleasure that I support the second reading of this Bill. I am a Past President and an executive member of the Australian Primary Producers Union, and the principle of direct grower representation has been one of the things we have battled for strongly for years. The Government, in assenting to permitting growers to elect their own representatives, will enable the appointment of exceptionally well qualified men who are highly regarded by the actual egg producers.

Mr. Freebairn: They will also have a local responsibility.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, to those who elect them. They will have some direct say in directing the board's activities. Although I should like to see this legislation go further, if the growers' representatives prove themselves worthy I believe that future amendments may be made to give the growers an even greater say in the board's activities. Although the problem of trafficking of eggs between States seems hard to solve, we hope that the board may come up with some scheme to satisfy and stabilize the industry.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Election of producer members."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I move:

In subsections (5), (6) and (7) after "Act" to insert "or sold for hatching".

Under the Act the producers of eggs for sale for hatching will be required to pay a levy to the Egg Board the same as will the suppliers of eggs for the table, and it is rather unreasonable that producers of fertile eggs will not have the right to vote at the first election.

Mr. Millhouse: I understand that you have some information on how many female fowls there are in South Australia.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The member for Mitcham is going rather ahead of the clause I am discussing: the clause to which he is referring is clause 9. My amendment will allow producers of fertile eggs to vote for their representatives on the Egg Board.

Mr. SHANNON: I favour the amendment. I consider that the honourable member has a valid reason for including the people who will be paying their levy to the Egg Board, even though they do not sell their eggs for human consumption. Obviously, a person who contributes by way of a levy should have some voice in the election of members. The member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) and the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), in addition to the member for Light, have stressed that this is the most important aspect of the Bill, and that it is the thing producers have been seeking. The fact that these people have not had a chance to elect their own representatives has caused more criticism of the board than has any other factor. I think the honourable member's suggestion will meet with the approval of every person who provides fertile eggs for hatching, for such a person has just as big a claim to a voice in the industry as the person who produces eggs for sale for the table.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Enactment of schedule to principal Act."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I move:

After "Albert" to insert "Eyre".

The purpose of my amendment is to make the electoral districts rather more equal in terms of numbers of poultry than they are under the present arrangement. With the assistance of my good friend and colleague, the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), I carried out some research yesterday and assessed the approximate numbers of hens and pullets kept in each county in the State. Those figures were obtained from the Bureau of Census and Statistics. For the purpose of the exercise we excluded all counties that recorded less than 1,000 head of hens and pullets. If this amendment is carried and county Eyre is included in electoral district No. 2, the county of Adelaide, which will be electoral district No. 1, will have about 358,000 head of poultry; electoral district No. 2 will have about 528,000; and electoral district No. 3 will have about 660,000. Considering the contiguity of the land and the geography of our State, we could not see that we could improve on this division.

Mr. Shannon. Did you obtain information about the number of growers in each of these three districts?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Those records are not available. The only records we could find that had any bearing on this schedule were the ones

we obtained. The figures do not indicate the number of poultry farmers, but I am sure the Committee will appreciate that we must have some basis upon which to work, and this was the only one available to us. In this amendment we seek to ensure that justice will at least appear to be done.

Mr. Shannon: Would it be a fair assumption that many growers of poultry in these areas are not known because they do not carry sufficient poultry?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, but how can we possibly assess the number of poultry keepers in each county?

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Onkaparinga said that most producers in outside counties would not be big producers. I understand that the Red Comb Egg Association claims that the county of Adelaide will represent 50 per cent of growers entitled to vote and, if any amendment is to be made, that county should have extra representation.

Mr. Freebairn: You are speaking only on supposition.

Mr. McANANEY: The honourable member is speaking on figures that may not be applicable; I think on Monday 60 per cent was mentioned, and on Tuesday it was 50 per cent.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I am happy to accept the amendment. Tremendous guesswork is involved in such a matter. Not only the number of fowls but the number of producers has caused interest. Also, the number of producers that qualify will be relevant, because in some districts where there are many fowls the producers may not support the board, so they will not qualify for a vote. It is impossible to make an accurate prediction of what the electoral roll will look like. The honourable member has made a reasonable effort to get some equity and I think his amendment should be supported.

Mr. RICHES: I do not oppose the amendment, but I think it calls for comment. From this we can see the source of some proposals submitted for electoral adjustments in other spheres. Here the election depends on the number of fowls rather than on the number of people keeping them. Perhaps the system of counting sheep and electing members of Parliament of the number of sheep herded in the various districts could be adapted!

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

In Committee.

(Continued from November 12. Page 1619.)

Clause 13—"Power to apply parking meter revenue for car parks."

Mr. RICHES: Clause after clause in this Bill has a marginal note "Amendment of principal Act". We are accustomed to having each clause treated in the same way as clause 13, where the marginal note indicates the subject matter being amended.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to clause 13.

Mr. RICHES: I hope that in future Bills we will get this information in relation to all clauses.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

After "council" in subsection (2) to strike out "may" and insert "shall"; in subsection (3) to strike out "may" and insert "shall", and to strike out "whole or any part of moneys" and insert "money"; and to strike out subsection (4).

Clause 13 inserts new section 290d in the principal Act. This new section gives a council power to apply parking meter revenue for car parks. My amendment seeks to make it mandatory on the Council to vote any revenue obtained through parking meters for the provision of off-street parking facilities. Motorists pay parking meter fees and fines for parking in prohibited areas, and such moneys should go into this fund.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): I should comment upon two aspects of the Leader's amendment. He has clearly set out the reasons for his proposals, and generally the Committee would commend them. The first point is that this is a new clause and breaks new ground for the Local Government Act. If the Leader's amendment is accepted, it will mean that the councils are obliged at any time to spend moneys collected from parking meters and other revenue on off-street parking. I consider (and it is the Government's view) that it is reasonable to expect that if councils are given the opportunity they will do the right thing. The complaints that have been made about revenue from parking meters in the past have been largely that no power existed under the Local Government Act for councils or corporations to accumulate funds and apply them for a specific purpose, as provided in this clause.

We are removing the problem that confronted councils in accumulating funds to spend on off-street parking. I believe that a fair comment is that it will remove the obstacle and councils

will then do the right thing. That is the Government's view. Before we consider compulsion we should give councils the opportunity to do the right thing, and I believe they will do it. Local government authorities are entrusted with important duties in the community, and I doubt whether Parliament has the right to assume that given the machinery to achieve a certain object councils will refuse to use that machinery. I am aware that, if in time councils do not comply with the intention of Parliament in this matter, amending legislation may be introduced to provide more stringent control on councils. At this point we do not need to push councils around.

Secondly, the amendment states that they shall "expend the whole or any part". It takes time to accumulate a worthwhile fund to embark on a programme of providing off-street facilities. I do not know how councils would be able to interpret terms of the clause if we accepted the amendment. At what point of time would they have to be obliged to spend the money? After they have received the first £1,000? Technically, they would be breaking the law if they failed to maintain expenditure at the same figure as income, and that is not feasible in practice. I draw the Committee's attention to an amendment to be moved by the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) to remove subsection (4), which in its present form provides an escape for councils wishing to avoid their obligations under new section 290d.

The amendment of the member for Gouger deletes subsection (4), and the Government intends to support it. The obligation will be fairly and squarely on the councils concerned, but we should avoid the position where we assume that councils are not going to do the right thing and we should not introduce compulsion before it has been proved necessary. I hope the Leader will accept this view. Taken as a whole, this amendment provides fairly fully what he seeks to do without imposing compulsion and possibly some technical difficulties on corporations to implement the provisions of the clause as he intends to amend it. I hope that the Committee will not accept the Leader's amendment but will accept that of the member for Gouger.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: What do the words "or any part" mean in subsection (2)? When is action to be taken under this new section? Had members been able to forecast how far the Adelaide City Council would go with parking meters I doubt whether the council would have been given an open go. It will take the council a long time to pay for the parking meters it has installed. Why should meters be installed in King William Road between North Terrace and the River Torrens, for instance? What business is conducted in that locality? Why should a motorist have to pay a parking fee there when he has to walk some distance to shops in Rundle Street? If meters were limited in number I would not be so concerned. When we gave the council permission to install meters we believed that fair play would apply. Incidentally, I have not read of the lady councillor complaining about parking meters, although yesterday she was highly commended at an election meeting. I believe that the council should use parking revenue for specific purposes, so I intend to press my amendment.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Minister said that he thought members agreed that it was desirable that the fees obtained from parking meters should be devoted to providing extra facilities. I think this question revolves around whether we think it is right to apply money so obtained in the manner prescribed in the Act. I believe it is a correct principle that the money obtained from parking meters should be applied to the purposes mentioned in the Act, so the Act should state that the money should be expended in that manner rather than giving councils the right to interpret this provision differently from what Parliament intended it to be interpreted. The Minister said that we should not dictate to local government by substituting the word "shall" for "may". I have been associated with local government for many years, and the word "shall" appears frequently in the Act, but I have not regarded that as dictating to the council, but as an indication of what Parliament intended should be done. I am concerned that because of the difficulties councils are faced with in obtaining finance if the word "may" remains it will be a temptation for some councils to use this as a means of applying the revenue for other purposes. Motorists have been mulcted sufficiently in other directions and they are particularly annoyed at what they are paying through parking meters. That annoyance would be somewhat alleviated if they believed that the money going into the meters were to be applied to the purposes mentioned in the Act.

Mr. HALL: I think we are getting away from what many of us are trying to do. I intend that it should be made permissible for councils to accumulate funds. However, if we substitute "shall" for "may" it will be obligatory for a council to expend the funds.

Mr. Loveday: Where does it say that the money must be spent as soon as it is obtained? There is provision for a reserve fund.

Mr. HALL: If the word "shall" is used it will be obligatory for a council to expend the money from parking meters on those facilities mentioned.

Mr. Riches: How do you think the money should be spent?

Mr. HALL: It is the Government's intention to enable councils to accumulate the money, if they so desire.

Mr. Riches: And if they do not desire?

Mr. HALL: Then they need not do so.

Mr. Loveday: They can do what they like, and that is what we object to.

Mr. HALL: I do not think that came out clearly in debate.

Mr. Loveday: I thought I made it clear.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member has made it clearer than it was made before. We are dealing with the basis of this clause. We either compel a council to do something or we give it permission to do something.

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

Mr. HALL: The Leader's amendment seeks to make it obligatory on local government bodies to spend the revenue they collect from parking meters and other parking charges on the facilities that have been mentioned. If the Leader's amendment is defeated, local government will be able to accumulate the funds accruing from parking meters if it so desires. It is my thought, and the thought of at least some of my colleagues, that we should make it permissible for councils to spend that money on the facilities mentioned and not obligate them to do so.

Mr. COUMBE: I ask the Committee not to accept the Leader's amendment. Many members either are local government representatives or have been local government representatives in the past. I have heard members plead for greater authority and jurisdiction for local government in certain matters. However, the Leader's amendment would be to make the obligation in this respect mandatory. The Adelaide City Council, which, of course, has more parking meters than has any other council, is the body that most of the criticism has been levelled against. I do not say that that council has been entirely blameless in its administration of parking meters. Parking meters are now installed in many of the smaller metropolitan municipalities. For instance, Port Adelaide has parking meters, and I admit that they may be necessary in some streets there.

We should give local government the opportunity to try out this legislation on a voluntary basis. If the Leader's amendment is carried, councils will have to spend the money that is accumulated from parking meters. I suggest that we give this clause a trial and let local government carry the responsibility in this matter. If the provision is not successful, then in another year or so we can make it mandatory. I think we shall find that the Adelaide City Council is now seriously considering moves to provide off-street parking. I ask the Committee to reject the amendment.

Mr. RYAN: I support the Leader's amendment, which makes it mandatory for councils to spend money collected from parking meters on off-street parking. In the past the Port Adelaide Council has spent its revenue from parking meters on off-street parking, which is good, but the moment that revenue is so spent the council then puts meters in those streets. We have seen the same thing in the city of Adelaide.

Mr. Coumbe: You don't have meters for off-street parking; you place the meters in streets.

Mr. RYAN: When the City Council has brought any Adelaide street to a condition where it is able to take parking meters, it immediately places meters there.

Mr. Heaslip: That is not off-street parking.

Mr. RYAN: The Bill in its present form will give the green light to all municipal bodies to install parking meters in their areas for the purpose of collecting revenue from motorists. It is not compulsory under the present law for a council to create a parking meter fund, so without the amendment the clause is useless. How can a fund be wound up if it is not there?

Mr. Nankivell: There is no ability to create a fund now.

Mr. RYAN: The honourable member has not the ability to read the legislation. The Premier has often criticized the City Council over some of the things back-benchers opposite are now trying to support. The City Council has often said that it is not financially able to create parking facilities, but these exist in every major city of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Hall: What proportion of the revenue from parking meters has not gone back?

Mr. RYAN: There has been some doubt about whether they have the right to spend it for other purposes, but this Bill expresses no doubt about what councils can do with the revenue.

Mr. Coumbe: This Bill permits them to spend the money on off-street parking.

Mr. RYAN: There are too many parking meters, so let Parliament decide what control should be placed on them; they have become

a burden on the motorist. The motorist who pays these fees is not usually living within the boundaries of the particular municipality. The Royal Automobile Association, which is the body that can speak collectively for motorists and which is the biggest motoring organization in this State, has often said what it has considered necessary regarding parking meter revenue, and not one member opposite has disagreed with it.

Mr. Hall: What does it say about the activities of the Adelaide City Council?

Mr. RYAN: It is not happy about its activities, and the Premier is not happy about them, either. He has said in this House and outside that money provided by the motorist should be spent on amenities for the motorist. The Leader has moved this amendment so that people who provide the revenue will have the facilities provided by it.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think parking meters are a bad thing.

Mr. Ryan: Apparently you don't pay 6d. or 1s.

Mr. SHANNON: I have had first-hand experience of parking meters in Bentham Street. When it was first suggested that meters would be put in that street, some thought they would be a great deterrent to business, but experience has shown them to be a great help to the company with which I am concerned. One can usually be sure of finding a parking space, which costs a paltry 6d. In the past some people hogged space on the roadside. They did not mind paying an occasional fine of 10s. or £1; that was cheap parking, and they were able to occupy a space for 24 hours. That was the practice in many districts of Adelaide, and it was to the detriment of business. Some people would park their cars in front of a competitor's place of business, thereby depriving him of parking space for one customer and probably depriving him of that customer's business. They would leave their cars in front of other businesses for the whole day and risk the fine. I think a parking meter is the best method of dealing with the fellow who will not play the game. I hope to clarify my support for parking meters. The Adelaide City Council at present are busy on South Terrace and Hutt Street. In South Terrace the footpath has been taken back on the south side to provide ample room for vehicles to be parked. This does not interfere with the area required for road traffic. The council has done the same thing in Hutt Street and by reducing the footpath area has allowed cars to be parked on either side of the street. I favour this method of finding accommodation for people who have to work in Adelaide, and the council is to be commended.

Mr. McKee: We want to know where you are spending the revenue, and don't beat about the bush.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope the honourable member for Port Pirie will cease interjecting.

Mr. SHANNON: The Government provides a charter for local government bodies to run their own affairs. Councils work under the Act so that they may do in an orderly way the things that, in their opinion, are wise and proper in the sphere of local government.

Mr. McKee: I don't know why we are dealing with this at all.

Mr. SHANNON: I do. It is being dealt with here because it is the Labor Party's policy to tell everyone what they shall do, whether they like it or not.

Mr. McKee: What is the Bill doing here?

Mr. SHANNON: It provides for local government to do certain things if it wishes to do them. Parliament should deal with it because it provides for councils to deposit parking meter revenue into a fund. Perhaps this legislation is too restrictive having regard to what is going on in Adelaide and what could go on elsewhere. The using of parts of footpaths and providing areas in which to park vehicles is a desirable object. Nothing like that is provided in this legislation, which does not provide for street widening for the purpose of providing room for car parking. I am one that thinks that local government should be given at least enough authority in its own sphere to enable it to carry out its policy without too much interference from central government, which should not tell local government what it should do.

Mr. Fred Walsh: The Liberal and Country League selects the members of the City Council.

Mr. SHANNON: Local government and central government do not mix well. In fact, the less they mix the better it is for local government. This parking meter fund could grow in the future so that people concerned would be embarrassed if they had only one channel on which to spend it. It may be appropriate for the council to spend the money for the benefit of road users in some other way rather than in off-street parking. Why keep the fund snowballing to the point where it has no valid use for the purpose for which it is designed? If that were done no-one would be able to make plans for the future because they would

not know what Parliament would do the next year. If we give local government the opportunity of exercising the power that this Bill confers and councils do not play the game then that is another question. However, I do not believe that will happen. From what I have seen of local government, I believe it has a sense of responsibility and will carry out its duties fairly to ratepayers and road users.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I have seldom listened to a more specious argument than that put forward by the member for Onkaparinga. He poses as the defender of the independence of local government. He has been a member of a Government which has been in power since about 1938, yet the Local Government Act on almost every page contains the word "shall". If he has been a champion of the independence of local government then he has been sadly remiss over the years in not drawing attention to the fact that the State Government has introduced legislation that contains the word "shall" on almost every page.

Mr. Shannon: You must have regard to the context in which the word "shall" appears.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Act says that councils shall do certain things where Parliament has thought it sufficiently important that councils should be directed and where a matter of principle is at stake. The member said that councils should do what they want to do, yet Parliament recently agreed that councils should be empowered to spend up to £200 on anything that was not otherwise specified in the Act. That is the tremendous latitude that this Government has given councils over the years.

Mr. Bywaters: Even that is subject to the Auditor-General's approval.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Exactly. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said that municipal bodies should have greater powers. What does he mean by that? The Minister inferred that it was right that the money collected from parking meters should be devoted to the various purposes specified in the Act—the provision of other parking facilities. Even the member for Onkaparinga spoke about local government not playing the game. Does not that mean that he also thinks that most of these funds, if not all of them, should be devoted to parking facilities?

Mr. Shannon: I said that local government played the game.

Mr. LOVEDAY: If we give municipal bodies the option of doing what they like with these funds, the only power we are giving them is the power to do the right thing or the wrong thing. Is that giving councils greater power? If we think that this money should be devoted to better parking facilities we should say so. It is obvious that members opposite are not sure that councils will always do the right thing, so why give them the opportunity to do the wrong thing?

Mr. Millhouse: Because they should be independent in their own sphere.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I have already demonstrated that they have never been permitted to be free in their own sphere where Parliament has believed otherwise. If the honourable member is familiar with the operations of local government he must know that councils are tied hand and foot regarding loan raising and the way they raise their rates and so on. I have been associated with local government long enough to know how tied up councils are under the Local Government Act.

Mr. Millhouse: So you would like to tie them up more!

Mr. LOVEDAY: No. I said that members of councils did not feel that they were being dictated to on matters of principle. If a thing is right it should be in terms of "shall" and not "may". In other legislation if Parliament regards something as wrong it uses the word "shall". The need for parking meters is irrelevant to this argument. The question is whether it should be obligatory on councils to devote their money to specific purposes. It has been suggested that the revenue must be spent as it is collected, but that is not stated. In fact, it says that a municipal council may expend the whole or any part of moneys standing to the credit of a reserve fund. The very mention of a reserve fund shows that the money can be collected and accumulated until it is needed for a specific purpose. Parking meters are a sectional imposition, yet the revenue therefrom is of benefit to practically all people in an area. The revenue comes from one section of the community, so surely it is right that the burden of that imposition should be lifted from that section as soon as possible by providing other facilities.

Mr. Shannon: Do you imagine that councils will build parking facilities and supply motorists with free parking space?

Mr. LOVEDAY: Off-street parking areas are being built in other cities and are regarded as absolutely essential when traffic reaches a certain density.

Mr. Shannon: Is such parking free?

Mr. LOVEDAY: No.

Mr. Shannon: Of course it isn't!

Mr. LOVEDAY: But everybody benefits from it, even the motorist. Motorists would be happy if parking revenue were spent on providing extra facilities. The main points at issue have been thoroughly canvassed. This is a question of the principle at stake regarding how the money should be spent. If the principle is right that it should be spent in the provision of other facilities, this Committee should say so. The fight that is being put up to make this optional clearly indicates that someone wants to use that money in large quantities for other purposes, otherwise there would be no fight. The Minister admitted by inference that it was right that the money should be spent in providing other parking facilities. Why should we not agree to the right thing being done and make it obligatory?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have listened with great attention to this debate, and especially to what was said by the member for Whyalla. I do not support the amendment but I have much sympathy for the principle behind it. It seems to me that much of this debate, and the heat of it, has arisen from the actions of the Adelaide City Council.

Mr. Ryan: Two councils are concerned.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: But the Adelaide City Council is the main one.

Mr. Shannon: Perhaps the member for Port Adelaide does not know about Mount Gambier.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not have to worry much about parking meters. I do not bring my car to town often, and when I do I park here. I think there are too many parking meters in the streets of Adelaide, and I hope the Adelaide City Council will review its policy of installing meters and start to reduce the number. I do not support the amendment, but I hope that the City Council and other municipal bodies that install meters will in fact use this revenue for the purposes for which we give them power in this new section. As against that, I believe that as a principle we should interfere with local government as little as possible and leave it as much discretion as possible. I cannot see that it is any argument at all—and this is the argument put forward by the member for Whyalla (Mr. Loveday)—to say that, because we direct local government in other matters, we should direct it in this one. I do not think that argument holds any water.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson (teller), Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Stott.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. HALL: I move:

To strike out subsection (4).

I realize that it is not now obligatory for councils to create a fund for the purpose of spending money on the facilities mentioned. I believe that once a local government body established this fund it should not be able to use the fund for any other purpose than that for which it was established. I believe that subsection (4), if it stands, would enable a local council, simply by resolution, to dissolve the fund and use it for any purposes for which the council might spend money, and that this would be a let-out provision that would in fact establish the principle that councils could accumulate funds for any purpose at all. In the light of what has transpired in this debate, I believe this matter is fully understood by all members.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I should like the member for Gouger to explain what is to be done with any surplus that is held in a reserve fund. I think the implication of this amendment is that the fund so collected may be spent in the manner specified in the Act. The purpose of subsection (4) is to deal with any surplus in a reserve fund which may be there after money has been spent on the facilities described. How is such a balance to be spent?

Mr. HALL: The honourable member said this was a permission given to a council; that it had no obligation to accumulate these funds. Surely any council would know its requirements in advance, so it would not need to accumulate more money than necessary. If it had accumulated enough for its needs, it would stop accumulating.

Mr. Clark: What would it do then?

Mr. HALL: It would spend the money, as it does today. Any surplus in this fund would be minor, and would be the result of incorrect budgeting.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The honourable member obviously has not been in local government for long, if at all. If a council can budget to within a few pounds so that it will have no surplus, why has this subsection been inserted? There must be a reason for its insertion. I do not think the honourable member has answered my question. As he is now proposing that the council must spend all its money, I am amazed that he voted against the previous amendment moved by the Leader.

Mr. RICHES: When Parliament first gave councils authority to establish parking meters, it also gave them authority to apply the revenue raised for off-street parking facilities. This provision has been in operation since 1956. I understood that the Government intended that any money raised from parking meters would be preserved for off-street parking, and the Bill as submitted provided that a council would pay all revenue into a reserve fund, out of which it would pay all moneys for the purposes for which the fund was established. That clause has been amended, and the council may or may not establish a reserve fund. If a reserve fund is established, the money should be spent for off-street parking. The Committee was not prepared to direct the council that money received from parking meters must be paid into reserve funds, so councils can spend it on a parking station or a fountain. I cannot see much point in subsection (4) as it stands. Its effectiveness has been reduced, and councils will be discouraged from setting up reserve funds. They will be getting revenue from meters, so why put it into a fund?

Mr. Hall: Do you suggest they cannot accumulate now?

Mr. RICHES: The Premier has said in this House that the revenue accumulation has not been spent for the purposes intended by Parliament when councils were given authority to install meters. Since 1956, councils have had authority to establish off-street parking and to charge parking meter fees. I do not think it matters whether the subsection is deleted or not, so I am on both sides.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 14 to 38 passed.

Clause 39—"Amendment of principal Act, section 667."

Mr. HUTCHENS: On behalf of the Hindmarsh Council I thank the Minister for amending this Act to give it authority and power to overcome a difficulty.

Clause passed.

Clauses 40 to 44 passed.

Clause 45—"Amendment of principal Act, section 883."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Behind this clause lies a little piece of South Australian history. This clause relates to section 883, and was included at the request of Mr. E. Fuller, a former Mayor of Kapunda. Mr. Fuller was the Mayor of the Corporation of Kapunda until July, 1962, when the Corporation and the District Council of Kapunda were united. This amending section enables the fund to be expended by the District Council of Kapunda on the provision of public conveniences in Kapunda. The fund goes back to 1867, when the Hon. James Pearce, a member of the Legislative Council and Mayor of the Town of Kapunda set apart certain moneys to form a trust fund, commonly known as the Mayor's Bounty Fund, and declared that the fund should be used for the relief of the distress arising from any extraordinary general calamity within the corporate bounds of Kapunda; further, that the custody and disbursement of the fund should be by the Mayor of the town.

No general calamity occurred within the boundaries of the Corporation of Kapunda, and by donations from Mr. Pearce and others, the fund grew until in 1930 it exceeded £500. In 1930 a special Bill was passed by the South Australian Parliament to vary the terms of the original trust to enable the Mayor of Kapunda to offer financial relief to Kapunda residents in necessitous circumstances owing to unemployment. At the date of the amalgamation last year, the fund stood at £219, made up of £100 invested in a war loan and £119 in a savings bank. This clause permits the District Council of Kapunda to disburse the Mayor's Bounty Fund by investing it in an amenity for the benefit of the township of Kapunda.

Clause passed.

Clauses 46 and 47 passed.

New clause 10a.—"Remission of Rates."

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move to insert the following new clause:

10a. The following section is inserted in the principal Act after section 267a thereof:

> 267b. The council may, upon the application of any person who is liable to the payment of any rates or other amounts payable in respect of ratable property and who in the opinion of the council is in necessitous circumstances, by resolution remit the payment of such rates or amounts or any part thereof or the interest or any part of the interest thereon. The

council may require the applicant for any remission under this section to support his claim by evidence on oath or by statutory declaration, in such manner and with such particulars as may be prescribed or the council may require. Any rates or amounts or part therof or interest or any part of the interest thereon payment of which is remitted by the council pursuant to this section shall cease to be a charge upon the ratable property concerned.

Section 267a of the principal Act goes part-way to meeting some of the hardship cases that concern councils. It provides that where rates were not collected and were suspended the council had first claim when the property changed hands. I commend the new clause to the Committee for its serious consideration and hope that it will be passed.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am conscious that this amendment has considerable appeal to many people and that it has been desired by certain sections of the community for some time. I am not sure that local government as a whole considers it desirable, but in this case the Leader has not made it obligatory on councils to remit rates. I can relate his attitude in this case to that expressed by the Opposition in the previous clause that if it is a right and proper principle then it should be imposed on councils, but I do not intend to develop that argument. Because it is within the jurisdiction of the council whether or not it takes advantage of this provision or otherwise, I will not oppose it. It can be tried to see whether it works. Some objections have been raised by the Local Government Association in some cases, but in other cases the association has supported it. The Government does not oppose the amendment.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL (PUBLIC SERVANTS).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL (MEMBERS).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

c5

TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 13. Page 1666.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): In supporting the second reading of this Bill, I do so with some mixed feelings. I appreciate the need for regulations when an Act is passed by this House, and regulations are necessary to aid the implementation of the legislation, but in this case Parliament has already said, "Introduce legislation to provide that the report of the Town Planning Committee shall be an interim development plan." That meant that Parliament would have given effect to those portions of the plan that were acceptable to Parliament and it would have given sufficient time for objections to be lodged if need be.

I believe in this instance the Premier has made known his dislike of the plan and I think, on broad principles, we can all find some fault with it, but that in itself should not discount the authority of Parliament. The record shows that there was no division against the adoption of the motion I moved on behalf of the Opposition relating to the report of the Town Planning Committee. It stated:

That in the opinion of this House the report of the Town Planning Committee should be an interim development plan and that provision should be made for the lodging and consideration of objections and the co-ordination of the work of the local governing bodies to give effect to the plan as revised from time to time.

I admit that if a Bill had been introduced to provide for interim development, it may have needed the inclusion of a provision for regulations. When I introduced that motion, I mentioned the booklet, prepared by the Adelaide Division of the Australian Planning Institute, that strongly emphasized the need for interim control.

In Perth, the system of interim control was used with its town planning development in respect of major parts of its plan. In Melbourne interim control has been used for approximately eight years. The same applies in Sydney where the Cumberland County Council plan was developed under interim control. As regards Sydney, however, I believe there was some delay in introducing interim control, and development that took place contrary to the original recommendations led to considerable additional expense to members of the community.

The report of the Town Planning Committee mentions metropolitan Adelaide. Let me make this point: the metropolitan Adelaide referred

to in that report comprises a much greater area than the accepted metropolitan area as defined for most purposes. The report of the Town Planning Committee is supported by maps, and the part I am concerned about at the moment is its terms of reference about highways which stated:

Whether after taking into consideration the probable development of the metropolitan area and the provision made or likely to be made for public transport in the metropolitan area, the existing principal highways are adequate to provide for the needs of the metropolitan area and what provision should be made for principal highways in that area.

The plan firmly indicates where proposed freeways should be constructed, and under the terms of reference it has made known on its plan how some improvements could be made to the existing highways in the metropolitan area. It has also planned freeways outside that area to link with what it refers to in its report as metropolitan Adelaide. The Highways Act provides for the appointment of a Commissioner of Highways, and to make further and better provision for the construction and maintenance of roads and works and for other purposes. It also provides for the compulsory acquisition of land for road-making purposes. It is also known that the Highways Department has firmly indicated where it wants freeways constructed. In addition, the Town Planning Committee has printed maps and stated where freeways and highways should be used to greater advantage, and I can only assume that as soon as this Bill is assented to the Town Planning Committee will submit certain matters to the Minister under the terms of clause 3 of the Bill. When such report is received and considered by Parliament, it may then relieve much of the anxiety that already exists in the minds of many people, particularly those who have studied the plan already printed. People ask themselves, "How long will it be before any offers are made to purchase our properties to enable the alteration of highways or the construction of freeways?" Earlier this year I obtained the approval of this House to exhibit a plan, prepared by the Town Planning Committee, indicating proposed freeways and highways. Persons who examined that plan have been caused much anxiety. I do not know whether other members have been approached by persons who are worried about the routes of proposed highways. I have already referred to the intentions of the Highways Department. I do not think I need mention the controversy raging in the hills at present. It would appear that this freeway will be built, and probably the Commonwealth Minister for Immigration will not be happy about it. Whether some or all of this development plan will be adopted I do not know, but I assure the House that many people would like to know about these things. I do not doubt that if this Bill is passed the Town Planning Committee will report further to the Minister on some suggestions in its report.

Whilst I have already indicated that I would support the second reading of this Bill, I still believe that the steps recommended by the Adelaide Division of the Australian Planning Institute in its publication in 1962 on the implementation of the recommendations of the Town Planning Committee would have proved invaluable. An extract from that publication states:

The interim development order should be made as soon as possible for the area covered by the advisory development plan for Metropolitan Adelaide and should require permission to be obtained from the Town Planning Committee for certain classes of development.

I support the second reading.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I will not detain the House long on this matter, but I remind members of the motion the House passed earlier this year regarding town planning. It was clear at that time that the Opposition could not introduce the kind of town planning measure it thought necessary. The objections that were voiced by many members to the report of the Town Planning Committee could not adequately be coped with by a mere reference of the plan back to the committee. It was necessary that we instead institute new legislative machinery that would allow the report of the committee to be an interim development plan, subject to hearing objections and subject to amendment, and then to be given teeth in due course so that effective town planning could be done in this State.

Objections were raised to the plan at the time. The present Bill does not provide for the hearing of most of those objections. Objections were widely raised by numbers of town planners in South Australia to the fact that the plan assumed that the development of Adelaide would be along the lines of suburban sprawl with no high-density redevelopment of the kind most planners talk about as a necessity for a city like Adelaide. There was no such provision in the existing Act (and there is no provision in this Bill) for the consideration of the kind of objection necessary to give effect to the very matters the Premier himself raised in discussing the motion that was before the House. The Premier referred to the kind of

difficulty with which the Town Planning Committee or anybody else would be faced in the Premier's own district. Nor is there adequate provision for the objections that could be raised by many people whose individual properties are adversely affected by the present plan, which in some cases was drawn without realization, apparently, that the plan divides existing industrial properties in half.

We need to provide here for the hearing of objections and the amendment of the plan. The Bill as it stands has a curious feature. New section 28a commences:

> The committee may from time to time make recommendations to the Minister as to any regulations concerning any matters referred to in the report of the committee submitted to the Minister pursuant to section 28 as the same may be amended or varied from time to time by the committee.

Well, Sir, there is no power in the legislation for the committee to amend the plan. The plan is a part of the committee's report which has been laid on the table of this House but, as the Act stands (and as it would stand if this provision were enacted in its present form) there is no provision for amendment of the plan. The report has been laid on the table of the House and has not been disallowed. It is provided that the committee may make recommendations in relation to a plan which in some undefined manner has been amended. If these regulations were made on the basis of the plan, not as it has been laid on the table of the House but as amended, we might face the fact that some person who was adversely affected eventually by the regulations might suggest that in fact the regulations were *ultra vires* because they related to the provisions of an amended plan for which there was no legislative provision for amendment.

We could get into some unpleasant difficulties here. I do not think that the proposal is satisfactory without some provision in it concerning amendment of the plan and the way the committee is to amend the plan. I think the House was of a mind that the Opposition motion was agreed to in this House. The view was very forcibly expressed by the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) and, I think, other members in this House that if the plan was to be amended the House ought to have a right to look at the amendments so that it could agree or disagree with them before they became part of the final plan to be implemented. Therefore, we ought to provide for the amendments to be laid on the table of the House. We also, before we proceed to have the committee amending its plan, ought to provide for the objections I mentioned earlier. If that is done, I think that we have got the committee provided with the means to proceed to do something effective about town planning and at the same time to listen to those many worthwhile objections that have already been raised to the plan.

It has not been suggested by the Town Planner himself that the plan as prepared and the committee's report laid on the table of this House are the complete answer to town planning in South Australia. He has suggested, in discussing the plan with councils in the inner suburban area, that in fact some provision for high-density redevelopment ought to be able to be made within the general terms of the plan as proposed by the committee, and, of course, that cannot be done without amending the plan. So, Mr. Speaker, if the second reading is agreed to—as I hope it will be—I believe that in Committee amendments will be moved to cope with the difficulties I have outlined.

Mr. Millhouse: Where are they?

Mr. DUNSTAN: As many copies as could be typed have been circulated; if the honourable member has not seen one I shall try to get him one quickly so that we may discuss the matter in Committee. I hope the Committee will urge agreement on these matters—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot discuss any amendment.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. The House was unanimous on the Opposition's motion that was before the House originally, and it said specifically that the plan ought to be an interim development plan and that provision should be made for hearing objections and giving teeth to the committee to amend the plan from time to time and to co-ordinate the work of councils in carrying out the plan. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Enactment of section 28a of principal Act."

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move to insert the following new subsections:

(1) The Committee shall within twelve months from the passing of the Town Planning Act Amendment Act, 1963, call for, receive and consider objections and representations from any person relating to the report of the committee submitted to the Minister pursuant to section 28, or any matters referred to therein.

(2) The committee may from time to time recommend to the Minister the amendment or variation of the report of the committee submitted to the Minister pursuant to section 28. The

> recommended amendment shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament, and shall not take effect until it has lain before both Houses for fourteen sitting days, and either no notice disagreeing with it has been given in either House during that period, or if any such notice has been so given, the same or all such motions if more than one is or are negatived.

I do not desire to derogate from the Bill, as I am concerned to see that whatever submissions are made are acted on by the appropriate authority by means of regulations, as the Bill provides. I am greatly concerned about this matter. In my second reading speech I said that the interim plan would have provided more than this Bill provides. I think Parliament would like to see an appropriate authority for the planning not only of the metropolitan area but of the whole State. The Town Planning Committee has done a good job in the interests of the State. Although members may not agree with all of its recommendations, at least by the acceptance of my amendments I believe those who are vitally interested in the implementation of the plan, or any portion of it, will be assisted.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I have considered the amendment, and I do not see any problem in relation to new subsection (1) or the first part of new subsection (2), but I see some problem about the second sentence of new subsection (2), which I think will be meaningless unless it is amended slightly. When the legislation establishing the Town Planning Committee was submitted to Parliament it provided that the plan, after it had been prepared and tabled, would be subject to disallowance, and, if not disallowed, would become a definite law in relation to the planning of the city. Parliament would not approve that—and on consideration I believe it was right—because it was said that it was a tremendous power to give to an outside authority, so it decided that the plan should be tabled so that it would have the opportunity to decide how effect would be given to the plan. I ask members to consider the following words in new subsection (2):

The recommended amendment shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament and shall not take effect—

The words "take effect" could mean "become law", and I do not think the Leader means it to become law. I do not know the legal meaning of the words "take effect". I suggest that the words be deleted and "shall not be considered to be the official plan" be inserted in lieu. If the Leader agrees to that trivial alteration I shall accept the amendment. I believe that it has merit as it gives outside people as well as councils the opportunity to consider it, and the people would be able to state an objection to a plan already existing.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I consider this amendment desirable because, as the Leader and the member for Norwood stated, strong objections were made to the plan which have not been put before the committee. I believe the Town Planner and his staff would be anxious to consider any objections. It is well-known throughout Australia that this State has an efficient Town Planner, who is prepared to listen to all people interested in town planning, and this amendment would enable him to appreciate the views of local government and all persons concerned. Previously I spoke about a case in Hindmarsh in which the Town Planner's proposals would have divided an industry, by a proposed roadway, into two parts. No-one wishes to embarrass an industry that has spent a considerable sum in a district. High-density living it also required for our rapidly growing population as this system may lessen the cost to Government departments and councils of providing services.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I thank the Premier for the suggestion and, after consideration, I ask leave to amend my amendment by striking out the words "take effect" in new subsection (2) and inserting "be made to the report".

Leave granted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: New subsection (2) will now read:

(2) The committee may from time to time recommend to the Minister the amendment or variation of the report of the committee submitted to the Minister pursuant to section 28. The recommended amendment shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament, and shall not be made to the report until it has lain before both Houses for fourteen sitting days, and either no notice disagreeing with it has been given in either House during that period, or if any such notice has been so given, the same or all such motions if more than one is or are negatived.

Amendment as amended carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I may be wrong but the provision in subsection (3)—as the subsections are now numbered—seems to be as wide as the world. It appears that the committee can make recommendations on anything arising in the report. If these recommendations are made and a procedure is followed then regulations can be made at the discretion of the Minister and the Government. I cannot really see any good at all in this amendment even with all the camouflage. If I am right in

believing that this is an enormously wide regulation-making power (in fact, an undefined regulation-making power) can the Premier say whether the interpretation he places on it is the same?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government intended that the committee consult with local councils and certify that it had done so, so that the Minister would be aware of the council's views before he made the regulation. The Government did not intend to impose any restrictions on matters properly associated with town planning. All of the matters mentioned are associated with town planning. I agree with the honourable member that the provisions are set out in detail. However, this is not a broadening but a limiting factor. If I were doing this myself and did not want to use a lot of words I would say, "such things as the Minister thinks necessary", which would cover the whole position. This matter was referred to the town planning authorities for comment and their only suggestion was that it would be more satisfactory if the regulations were to remain on the table for seven days rather than for 14 days.

Mr. Millhouse: Ridiculous!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government did not accept the suggestion because it believed that, with the big volume of work that comes before Parliament when it first assembles, 14 days was necessary. That period gives outsiders an opportunity to state their views to members, and it affords members the opportunity to satisfy themselves that the regulations are all right. It is important that councils should be formally consulted, and that is why specific reference has been made to the need for a certificate and for the views of a council to be set out so that the Minister is aware of the council's view before he makes a regulation. I went through these provisions with the Parliamentary Draftsman. They all have a meaning. They are wide, but they refer to matters in the language that town planning authorities use.

Mr. HALL: The matter of acquisition of land arises under this clause. We know that under the zoning provisions areas can be zoned. Great financial loss could result to owners. No reference was made in the second reading explanation to any compensation. I realize that this can be a difficult subject and I know that areas that are acquired will be paid for. A farming area may be zoned as a green belt. I am not suggesting that the States should compensate the owner because his land has been so zoned, but is it right that adjoining landholders should, by subdividing their land, obtain large sums of money whilst their neighbour receives nothing. These zoning problems will be accentuated by this Bill. What has the Premier in mind for compensating people who are permanently injured financially?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At present councils have power to zone by way of regulation. A zoning by-law has to be certified by the Crown Solicitor as being properly made. It has to come before Parliament and has to lie on the table for 14 days before it can become effective. It becomes effective if there is no move to disallow it. What we propose in this Bill is, as the honourable member can see, already provided for elsewhere. Zoning can be extremely difficult when the area to be zoned extends into two district council areas. The Government has already taken the view that if we are to acquire private land for recreation purposes then the land must be purchased. The Government has never dispossessed people. The Town Planning Act stipulates that the person subdividing an area must provide roads and allow space for recreational purposes. This ensures that the subdivision is proper. If the Government wants a new national park, the Government will be prepared to pay for the land, as it has done in the past.

Clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DIAMOND TURNS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 13. Page 1673.)

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I secured the adjournment of this Bill only because at the time the second reading explanation was given I had not had time to study it. I see no objection to the Bill. However, new section 70(6) states:

> Where, on turning to the right, the vehicle is entering a one-way carriageway, the vehicle shall enter the carriageway as near as practicable to the right boundary of that carriageway.

I know that is done in practice, but it is here defined in law. I do not doubt that motorists still have to give way to the right, but in this instance it seems that the provision is designed to allow through traffic to pass on the left. Of course, we know that the diamond turn facilitates the passage of that through traffic.

Can the Premier say whether this has any significance regarding the "give way to the right" rule?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): No, Mr. Speaker.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Course to be followed by vehicles turning right."

Mr. FRANK WALSH: A diamond turn is permissible at the King William Street and North Terrace intersection. Some drivers proceeding north along King William Street and wishing to turn west into North Terrace extend courtesy to pedestrians who are crossing from Parliament House corner to the Gresham Hotel corner or *vice versa*, and although they have the green light to enable them to turn left they wait at the intersection until the roadway is clear of pedestrians. However, it often happens that the drivers of vehicles proceeding in a southerly direction in King William Road make the diamond turn west into North Terrace and the motorist who has extended courtesy to pedestrians is chopped off and consequently has to wait until the lights change again. Must the motorist travelling north and wishing to turn west into North Terrace give way to the motorist who makes a diamond turn west into North Terrace when he considers that he has a clear passage?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I do not follow the Leader. If I were proceeding down King William Street in a northerly direction and I wanted to turn left into North Terrace I should not be involved in a diamond turn at all. A motorist making that turn must keep as near as practicable to the left-hand side of the road and while doing so he must not interfere with pedestrians crossing the road. However, if a motorist travelling in that direction wished to make a right turn east into North Terrace he would have to make a diamond turn.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I was speaking of a vehicle travelling south and making a right turn west into North Terrace. Could the Premier ascertain for me whether a driver making a left turn around the Gresham corner must give way to a vehicle that is on his right when it is making a diamond turn?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Whenever an important amendment is made to the Road Traffic Act it is always the Government's practice at the time the Act is proclaimed to see that the press is given clear details, together with diagrams, of the new law. I will see that in this instance the press is supplied with this information. When amendments were made to road traffic laws not long ago, they were held up for some time while the public was being instructed in what was involved. I shall be happy to do what the Leader suggests.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MENTAL HEALTH AND PRISONS) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 13. Page 1674.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is aimed at solving two problems. The first is providing adequate treatment for mental defectives who because of some crime against society are a special class in that they require to be securely housed whilst undergoing psychiatric treatment. The second problem is that the prisoner as defined in the Bill must remain in the custody and under the control of the Comptroller or one of his responsible officers. Naturally, the ideal place to treat such a patient is in a mental hospital, but recent treatment of mental defectives in general is based on removing as many of the restrictive barriers, such as the bars on the windows and the surrounding high walls, as is possible commensurate with the mental health of the patient. However, with the criminal mental defective, it is necessary to have absolute security. This, of course, requires a security block, which is contrary to modern thought regarding the treatment of other mental defectives.

The Bill seeks to make amendments to both the Mental Health Act and the Prisons Act so that officers from the Hospitals Department and the Gaols and Prisons Department may work in liaison in the treatment of mental defective prisoners, but at the same time these prisoners will not be permitted to escape from custody. Therefore, it is an improvement on our existing legislation, because it seeks to establish a mental hospital within the security ground of a prison. The main alterations are made by clauses 4, 6, and 7; the other clauses cater for machinery amendments. By clause 4, the Mental Health Act is amended so that the Comptroller of Prisons retains the overall direction of the prisoners

as regards administration, discipline, and security, but the members of the medical profession will have absolute control over the medical care, treatment and welfare of the patients within the hospital. With such efficient doctors as Dr. Salter (Deputy Superintendent), who has proved himself so successful in the treatment of the mentally sick at Northfield Mental Hospital, we should not have any difficulty in having skilled medical practitioners available to treat the mentally sick prisoners in a hospital within the prison grounds.

Clause 6 is a comparable amendment of the Prisons Act. The definitions of "prison" and "prisoner" are altered to conform to the establishment of a hospital in the prison grounds and the treating of mental patients in that hospital. Clause 7 relates to the regulation-making powers of the Governor under the provisions of the Prisons Act and, in this instance, empowers His Excellency to make regulations with respect to hospitals for criminal mental defectives, including the custody, management and discipline of the patients.

I am completely in accord with this Bill because previously I have drawn the attention of the Government to the problems associated with prisoners being sentenced for some crime and pleading insanity, as a result of which they have been transferred to the Parkside Mental Hospital and placed in the security block, from which they have subsequently escaped. In such instances, it is not unusual for the Police Commissioner to be advised, and for him to be obliged to apprehend the escapees and to return them to the security block at Parkside. However, once the person has been returned to this security block, the responsibility of the Police Department has ceased. It is no reflection on the mental hospital that the prisoners have escaped, because I am sure that the Medical Superintendent is more concerned with the treatment of the mentally sick than with the confinement of the criminally insane, and rightly so. On previous occasions I have advocated the treatment of mentally afflicted prisoners within the confines of the Yatala Labour Prison, and this Bill seeks to provide the legislative framework for this type of treatment to be undertaken; therefore, it receives my support.

However, another class of prisoner—namely the alcoholic—is causing considerable concern to the Comptroller of Prisons as well as to many other public-minded citizens who concern themselves with the rehabilitation of these people. I understand that evidence has already been submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee regarding the establishment of a medical centre for the treatment of alcoholics. This complaint has been accepted by members of the medical profession as another facet of mental sickness and, of course, in many circumstances, it is a crime against society for which the alcoholic is committed to prison. I believe that this is an opportune time for the Government to consider whether the hospital envisaged under the Bill should not also make provision for alcoholic patients who have been committed to prison. I am not advocating alcoholics' homes in prisons but, while accommodation and care are being considered, at least these people should be treated medically.

I support the second reading of this Bill, which I believe is a move in the right direction. I am positive from information I have received that the Sheriff and Police Commissioner both desire that, if a person is proved to be mentally deficient, appropriate provision will be made in a prison for his treatment. If people are properly committed to these places, I think there should be provision for their treatment so that they can be restored to their normal health.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I wish to speak briefly in support of the Bill. In the five years that I have been a member for Burnside I have come to know well the Parkside Mental Hospital. On three or four occasions I have visited Z block, the section housing the criminally insane. This legislation is a move in the right direction. Changes have taken place in the last few years in the attitude of the medical profession through the Superintendent of the Hospital, and enlightened changes have come about in that section of the Parkside Mental Hospital. I first visited it when Dr. Birch was in charge, and on that occasion he was reluctant to allow me to go through this section. It was not until Dr. Cramond took over the supervision of this hospital that I was able to see for myself conditions in Z block. In the last two years many changes have taken place in this section. I well remember my first visit, when the men had nothing to do. Although it was known that they were mentally sick and that they had committed a crime, which had led to their being incarcerated in that section, they were fairly able-bodied men and all they could do was to walk up and down in the enclosure and inside the section. Nothing helped them to fill in the day. Now television means that at least the men are

occupied mentally in looking at it, although it does not help much in their physical well-being. It does perhaps contribute something. A book waggon has been introduced, which enables the men to have access to some kind of reading matter. I have addressed a meeting organized by the Workers Educational Association and a discussion group with some of the more intellectual inmates. My point is that when these prisoners are transferred to the control of Yatala something may be done to give these men a simple type of occupation. I consider that if that is done their mental outlook will improve and it will be for their own physical and mental good. I mean not that they should be engaged in any kind of labour, but simply that they might be given some simple form of occupation that would contribute to their well-being. This might be better undertaken in the new circumstances that this Bill envisages than under the present system.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I welcome this legislation. As one who has had something to do with the various projects relating to the mental hospital at Parkside, I believe this legislation is long overdue. I am pleased the Government has accepted the recommendations made by the Sheriff's Department for it to take charge of these people, who have been committed to the custody of the institution at Parkside because of a crime and because they are declared insane. Obviously the institution considers them a burden and of no help. They are not the only section proving a problem for the administration of the Parkside Mental Hospital.

The seniles and the aments are cluttering up valuable space at Parkside, and from the point of view of remedial treatment are past any help that medical science can give at the moment. Aments are mentally deficient and provide an obstacle that cannot be overcome. The senile, by the passing of the years, have also deteriorated to the point where medical science can no longer assist. Why those types should be housed in an institution designed to treat people suffering from mental disorder that can be treated is a matter of some importance to the psychiatric department. I am convinced that the criminally insane who have been committed by a court order are appropriately handled by the Sheriff. These people have committed a crime against society, albeit they have had some mental derangement that brought about their misbehaviour. At the same time they have earned the sentence imposed by the court because of the crime committed against society, and the Sheriff's Department should handle them. Another section of the population, which I am not going to deal with because they are being considered by the Public Works Committee at present, is the alcoholics. The time will come when these people, who have been committed by a court order to an institution, should also have psychiatric assistance. It will be important that some fully qualified psychiatric assistance is available to the Sheriff so that he can deal with this problem at Yatala.

I agree with the remarks of the member for Burnside. Some activity is needed, not necessarily a form of labour where the sufferer is asked to do something constructive that may be beyond his capacity, but anything that can be done to fill in his or her time is a part of the psychiatric treatment. If some of them finally regain their mental stability, possibly after a period, they could be released. However, I have some reservations in this matter. I am convinced from what I have heard that certain criminals when faced with the extreme penalty of the law because they committed a crime that merited the extreme penalty, have pleaded insanity and, by virtue of that plea and the difficulty of disproving it, have satisfied the court that they were in fact insane and have been confined to this section of the Parkside institution. Under this amendment they will be confined to a section at Yatala. Some people in this category, who have feigned insanity in order to avoid the proper penalty under the law may finally be released because the psychiatric department dealing with them decides that they are no longer insane. In some cases insanity seems to pass quickly when the accused person finds himself confined and, knowing that he is going to be confined until such time as he is released, seems to recover his mental stability remarkably quickly. These cases should be dealt with on their merits, and I suggest that a person who so recovers within a short time after being sentenced by the court should be referred back to the court before he is released into society where a similar offence to that which he originally committed might be repeated. The court should decide whether it had been misled or encouraged by evidence that a man was suffering for some hallucination or mental aberration when he committed the offence. Only a proper judiciary can decide whether a man is likely to be a recidivist. It would be wise to refer such cases back for further investigation before offenders are released

into society. I am convinced that the Sheriff's Department is the proper authority to handle this.

I have discussed this with Dr. Cramond, but as a public servant it was difficult for him to express a definite view. I gained the impression that he did not object to being relieved of the responsibility of these people in his mental institutions. I am convinced that we should relieve Parkside and our other mental institutions of incurable cases. These institutions are designed essentially to provide curative treatment. I know that segregation is practised at Parkside, but it is extremely difficult to prevent information circulating within an institution, and it is impossible to detect where the leakage is occurring. Consequently the administrator has difficulty in keeping the segregation as tight as he would like it to be. I hope that the House will approve of this legislation which I regard as the first step in relieving Parkside and similar mental institutions of a problem.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.8 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, November 20, at 2 p.m.