HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, February 9, 1966.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

HOUSING.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Premier a reply to my question of January 25 regarding activity in the house-building industry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Although there was, in the private building section, some slackening off in house building during the latter part of 1965 the Housing Trust has not perceived any indication of substantial unemployment among building tradesmen. The figures quoted by the honourable member relate to approvals given by councils to building plans. These figures do not necessarily tell the full picture. The statistics for house constructions break up approvals into private building and Government building, the latter of which all relates to the trust's programme. As it is the practice of the trust, on allotting contracts for large numbers of houses, to lodge plans for very many houses which may take from 18 to 24 months to complete in total, this can inflate the approvals figure for a particular year. The statistics for completed houses during 1965 have now come to hand and these are significant. In 1964, 12,148 dwellings (that is, houses and flats) were built in South Australia. In 1965, the total was 12,717, the highest total ever recorded in the State for any calendar year. As far as the trust is concerned, the completion figures are as follows: in 1964, 3,082 and in 1965, 3,333 houses and flats, the 1965 figures being the highest for several years. It must be appreciated that the record figures for 1965 were achieved as a result of the building commencements in 1964, when the building rate was possibly getting beyond the capacity of the building industry.

It is a matter of interest to see the growth of flat building (which includes home units) in South Australia. In 1964, 1,279 flats were completed, compared with 2,131 in 1965. To see the full picture of the housing position in South Australia, the figures showing the houses under construction should also be noted. At the end of 1964, 6,658 dwellings (of which 1,109 were flats) were under construction. At the end of 1965, 5,847 dwellings (including 749 flats) were under construction. The Housing Trust had 2,896 houses under construction at the end of 1964, and 2,822 at the end of 1965. The conclusion to be drawn is that, during 1966, the completion rates of both houses and flats will be less than in 1965. This particularly applies to private building. Probably the principal reason for this diminution is lack of sufficient mortgage money to finance the building of a larger programme of houses. This is aggravated by the increases in development costs which the purchaser must now face. It is now true to say that many house buyers are attempting to finance public works for water and sewers by means of money raised on second mortgage, frequently at very high rates of interest.

I would point out that the house building industry is one where, because of the time taken to complete a house, any change in productivity has effect for a considerable time. It is the experience of the trust that, if an increase in production is desired, it takes up to a year after placing contracts before there is any increase in the production rate. Similarly, if there is a deceleration process, the effect continues long after the slackening in the placing of contracts. This makes it desirable that corrective action should be taken before any building slump of any magnitude occurs.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Commonwealth Minister for Housing was reported to have stated this week that there had been a serious falling off in house construction throughout Australia and that additional money would be made available to the banks which the Minister hoped would be used for the construction of new houses. I agree with what the Premier said earlier about house building. One of the great problems is that many people desiring to purchase houses are not able to obtain finance for them. Can the Premier say whether any of this additional finance has come to South Australia and, if it has, can he say what banks have it and whether it is available on application?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am unable to give the information sought by the Leader because I have not been told what is taking place.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Did you see the statement?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, and I read it with great interest. I will investigate the matter. A Housing Ministers' conference will be held in Adelaide soon and I hope then to be able to place before the Commonwealth Minister certain information affecting finance for house building. Overall concern exists on this matter and some aggravation is being

caused overseas. Certain organizations are working under a type of licence, and my information discloses that people overseas are paying as much as £1,000 as a deposit on a house in South Australia. I have reason to believe that, when these people arrive in South Australia, they are mostly accommodated for a short while in privately-owned flats for which they pay as much as £5 a week rent. They are then given the opportunity of having furniture supplied, in some cases under hire-purchase agreement. Some of them then find themselves unable to obtain employment. These people again resort to hire-purchase in order to buy a motor car so that they can travel to employment elsewhere. Apparently some money is available to these people at about 9 per cent interest, but the arrangement peters out at the end of about 12 months. Therefore, these people put £1,000 into a property, get into further debt, and finally have to arrange temporary finance. I believe that the temporary finance is provided at 1 per cent per month interest, which becomes a burdensome cost to these people.

Mr. Lawn: How long have those conditions existed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: They are operating under licence. I believe the matter is to be reviewed this year. I assure the Leader and others that, whilst all this is going on, the speculative builders are disposing of their houses to these people who are not acquainted with the conditions here, and they in turn are making the wait for loan money longer and longer, even for our own people who desire houses. Therefore, we are in somewhat of a dilemma from the point of view of having ready finance available for house building on a reasonable term (20 to 30 years), and we are unable to obtain the desired amount. These matters will be discussed at the conference.

HUNCHEE AND RAL RAL CREEKS.

Mr. CURREN: Recently a contract was let by the Lands Department for the desnagging of the Hunchee and Ral Ral Creeks in an endeavour to improve the supply of water to the Chaffey and Cooltong pumping station. Can the Minister of Irrigation say whether this work has been completed and whether there has been any significant change in the flow and quality of water for this settlement? Also, can he tell me the salt content of the river water at other pumping stations?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The desnagging of the Hunchee and Ral Ral Creeks has been completed. This has resulted in a somewhat improved flow in these creeks, and this flow remains satisfactory at this stage. The salinity in the bed of the creek has improved considerably to 6,000 parts per million. The water pumped at Chaffey has remained continuously between 190 and 200 parts per million from January 19, 1966, to February 2, 1966. The weir across the inlet canal is expected to be completed this week, and the only problem at Chaffey at present is the entry of duckweed into the area of the canal between the weir and the pump intake pipes. This aspect will need watching. Regarding salinity in other parts of the river, at Loxton, Berri and Cobdogla it has been reduced to the range of 250 to 270 parts per million, and at Waikerie to 330 parts per million.

TORRENS RIVER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier knowledge of a plan discussed a year or so ago for the bed of the Torrens River between the districts of the Corporations of Walkerville and St. Peters to be developed as an oval? Also, has he information of recent approaches to him on this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I cannot answer the question offhand, although Cabinet has considered matters associated with this project. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

HILLS WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question results from the bad bush fire in the Mount Lofty area which was burning yesterday and which is probably not yet out. This fire, according to a report I have had this morning, menaced an area of the District of Mitcham, west of Waverley Ridge. This area has no reticulated water supply although the residents have made approaches over the last four years to the present Minister and to his predecessor. One of the main reasons they have given for asking for a supply and emphasizing its urgency is the danger of fires. This morning, I was informed that, if the wind had not changed last night, houses in this area would have been engulfed in flames, as no reticulated water was available to fight the fire. On December 9 last, the Minister wrote to me explaining that nothing could be done for about two years. Residents in the area find it galling to see water connected to new subdivisions farther into the hills, whereas they, who have been established in their houses for many years, have to wait. In view of what could have been a disaster last night, will the Minister of Works re-examine this matter to see whether

something cannot be done to provide a reticulated water supply for this area in a shorter time than that set out in his letter to me last December?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Many hills areas require a reticulated water supply. The Leader of the Opposition came to me with a deputation and put a strong case for water reticulation in the Mount Lofty area and the member for Onkaparinga has put a case similar to that of the member for Mitcham. Both my predecessor and I have viewed all correspondence and requests with the utmost sympathy, although the honourable member may say that sympathy does not give a water supply. The department and the Government, and I should say the previous Government, would have liked to give a supply ere this, but the economic position and the general welfare of the State have to be considered. However, in view of the question I shall re-examine the position and inform the honourable member of the outcome.

HILLS ROAD.

Mr. SHANNON: The Highways Department has constructed, at Stirling, a by-pass from near the Church of Christ at Snows Road for about 400 yards of widened road. That widening permits vehicles travelling in either direction to pass safely. I understood the Highways Department was planning a number of such road widenings between Crafers and Aldgate to facilitate the traffic flow along this bottleneck. Although for some years I have noticed pegs on the bank on the southern side of the Mount Barker Road, between Crafers and Stirling, nothing has yet happened. As the new freeway is still a long way from completion, will the Minister of Lands ascertain from his colleague whether any further road widening is planned in this area?

Secondly, I cannot understand the reason for the painting of diagonal white marks measuring about 1ft. by 8ft. on the northern side of the widened section of the road. I know that many drivers are not using that part of the road, apparently because they believe they are not supposed to. It is a pity they do not, because that would facilitate the passing of vehicles. Will the Minister obtain some information on this and the previous matter to which I have referred?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, I shall be pleased to obtain that information.

LAND TAX ASSESSMENTS.

Mr. RODDA: As I understand that the new quinquennial land tax assessments are ready to be forwarded to landholders, can the Treasurer say what percentage increases are involved?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall obtain the necessary information and make it known to the honourable member.

FISHING LICENCES.

Mr. RYAN: On behalf of professional fishermen in my district I have led several deputations, and discussed with the Director of Fauna Conservation, the matter of issuing, say, A class and B class licences to professional and amateur fishermen respectively, for the benefit of those in the industry endeavouring to gain a livelihood through selling fish, as against those who engage in fishing purely on an amateur basis, and who do not rely on any proceeds for a livelihood. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this matter has been further considered by the Department of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation and whether a decision in respect of issuing licences (or some other method) has been made?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Last year at the request of my colleague (now the Minister of Lands), who was then indisposed, I met a group of fishermen at Millicent, most of whom resided in that district, but some of whom came from as far away as the West Coast and Port Adelaide. The gentlemen concerned requested that consideration be given to issuing two separate types of licence: the first to be for the professional fisherman (who they suggested should derive at least 75 per cent of his income from fishing), and the second licence to apply to amateur fishermen. It was also suggested that the licence fee in respect of professional fishermen be increased, thereby giving them the right to sell fish, and excluding amateurs (with a B class licence) from doing so. Following this, I had many representations from people who were legitimately engaged part-time in this business and who were perhaps seasonal workers. This applies particularly on the West Coast, where some people do various kinds of seasonal work and supplement their income from fishing. This presented a difficulty. I know the main concern of the full-time fishermen is that people in other full-time employment (either men on the land or employees) are able to compete with them by paying only £1 for an annual licence. These people have the right to sell fish the same as has the man making most of his living from the industry. There is a fear, particularly in the crayfish industry, that the grounds might be fished out. I appreciate the difficulties and

thoughts of the fishermen, and I have given the matter much consideration and discussed it with the Director of Fauna Conservation. As this affects several members of this House and of another place, I should like to meet them and discuss the problem with them, because there are difficulties whichever way one looks at it. If this course meets with the approval of members in whose districts fishing is carried on, I shall be only too happy to arrange the meeting soon, and I should like in the next day or two to see whether it can be arranged. I have in mind submitting certain proposals to them and asking them to consider the matter and discuss it with their constituents.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Doesn't the Minister think the proper place to discuss this is Parliament?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I think that could be so, but there are some complications. Although members can discuss this in Parliament, I should like in the first instance to put before them certain things that could be to the advantage of the industry.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: A sort of secret meeting?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, the meeting could be open. In fact, I will invite the Leader to be present and take part. I hate to think that this important industry is being held up to ridicule, as I think it is at the moment. This is a genuine attempt by the Director of Fauna Conservation and me to solve a difficult problem. If the members concerned are not interested, we shall have to have another look at the matter, but I think representatives of districts concerned with fishing will be pleased to co-operate, and I make this suggestion to them.

KIMBA AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: In March, 1963, the District Council of Kimba entered into an agreement to purchase amenities and buildings at the old Kimba school, in return for which the Government promised to provide certain amenities at the new school. On August 1, 1963, the council paid the department £500; in April, 1964, it paid £334; in April, 1965, it paid £834; and the balance of £832 is due next April. Although the school has been built for nearly three years, no amenities have yet been supplied. In August last year the Minister, in reply to a question, informed me that Arthur Hall, Ackson and Company had been given a contract to provide tennis courts, a cricket pitch, basketball courts and other amenities at the school. These have still not been started. In order to enable me to tell the Kimba school committee the position, will the Minister of Works ascertain when this work will be done?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will call for a report and inform the honourable member when it is to hand.

WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. CLARK: Over recent weeks I have been approached by many of my constituents, and they are most concerned about the possibility of water restrictions because of the abnormally dry summer conditions. Can the Minister of Works say whether water restrictions are likely to be imposed in South Australia in the coming months?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I had a discussion about water supplies for the remainder of the season with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief this morning. He told me, with some degree of confidence, that no water restrictions would be necessary this season. This has been a most difficult year, as everybody realizes, because of the limited intake into the reservoirs as a result of the dry season. Further, there has been a substantial increase in consumption. I suppose that this was to be expected as a result of increased development and the dry season. However, despite these problems, the department is confident that the season will be completed without any need for restrictions.

MANOORA RAIL CROSSING.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On August 5 last year, I asked the Premier to ascertain whether flashing lights could be installed at the dangerous railway crossing just north of Manoora. In due course the Premier gave a reply, which came from the Signals and Telegraph Officer, who said that he realized that the crossing was dangerous but could not attend to it this financial year. About five months ago an accident occurred at the crossing and a woman was seriously injured: she has been in a coma ever since at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. In view of the dangerous condition of the Manoora crossing, will the Premier ask the Minister of Transport whether a flashing lights system can be installed there?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

STOCKWELL MAIN.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the possibility of tapping

the proposed water main from Swan Reach to serve other rural districts, and about what the rating was likely to be?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The member for Angas asked a similar question in relation to his district. I regret that the answers to the two questions have not come down concurrently, and I assure the member for Angas that I will find out what has happened to the reply to his question. In reply to the question of the member for Ridley, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief states that landowners adjacent to the proposed Swan Reach to Stockwell main will be granted supplies under the usual conditions. The price of water and the scale of rating have not yet been determined.

FORESTRY SHARES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently I received from a constituent of mine a letter which states:

The matter I would now like to refer to you for your consideration is as follows: My mother passed away on January 26. Among the estate left to me in her will was some shares in New Zealand Perpetual Forests and its subsidiary companies. I found documents purporting to record her as selling these shares about 18 months ago to Leo Thomas Lee. As far as I can find she received no payment or value for them. I have been advised by a solicitor . . . that the prospects of recovering about £300 involved are remote. The solicitor has encountered similar cases involving Mr. Lee, and in connection with one case has a summons which cannot be served on him because he is missing. My aunt, Miss L. E. Elliss, of 15 Mansfield Street, Goodwood Park, has also been relieved of her shares by the same person.

As this letter contains information that could affect people in the future, and as it is usually older people that are affected, I ask the Attorney-General whether he knows of the dealings of Mr. Leo Thomas Lee, and whether he can give warning to the public on this matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have had many complaints of Mr. Lee's canvassing persons in South Australia who are holding forest shares of the kind mentioned by the honourable member and getting them to surrender their shares to him in turn for some form of investment in Mr. Lee's enterprises. As these are not public companies and the approach is private, there is little control that can be exercised by the State in the matter. I have had the matter investigated by the Registrar of Companies to see whether there is any action whatever that we can take, because many elderly reputable people have surrendered their shares for, to date, no apparent benefit. Mr. Lee is very difficult to get in touch with, and it would be very difficult for these people who have surrendered their shares to find what they are going to get as a *quid pro quo* for the shares they have surrendered. It has been the policy of my department to warn anybody who inquires of the danger of a transaction of this kind, but, as the law stands, it is not unlawful. I can only hope that as a result of the honourable member's question other people who have not so far surrendered forest shares will take some care about any transaction they may enter into in relation to them.

WHEAT POOL.

Mr. McANANEY: In 1963-64, a second advance was obtained from the Wheat Board within 12 months, but so far there has not been a second advance on the 1964-65 pool. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Wheat Board whether a second advance will be made, and also the estimated amount that will be available from that pool?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

ADELAIDE OVAL BAR.

Mr. LAWN: Recently a cricket test match was played on the Adelaide Oval between England and Australia, and following that test match at least one letter appeared in the press complaining about the conditions under which food and drink were served there. I do not entirely agree with the contents of all these letters, because I was in the members' dining room and I had no complaint regarding the food.

Mr. Clark: But did you try the catering out on the hill? It had to be seen to be believed.

Mr. LAWN: I did not visit the bar in the members' stand, but a letter I have here states that the members' bar was a disgrace, a pigswill. It goes on to say that the counter was afloat with slops and beer-sodden change, and it concludes with a suggestion that the Licensing Court should look at the conditions under which liquor is sold there. Has the Attorney-General's attention been drawn to that letter? If not, will he obtain a report from the Licensing Court? Will he also suggest to the Licensing Court, with the object of eliminating the sloppy conditions under which customers have to drink, that the bars should be sloped towards the barmen so that, if the slops are left on the counter, they drain off towards the barmen and do not get all over the customer?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I saw the letter to which the honourable member refers. Actually, it deals with catering at the oval, and the catering there in liquor is under a

booth permit. Two justices, pursuant to the provisions of section 71 of the Licensing Act, can issue a booth permit to a hotel keeper upon the consent and approval of the police officer in charge of the station nearest to the licensed premises. In consequence, the booth permits do not come under the surveillance of the Licensing Court. This may well be an unfortunate situation, because it means that the court, which is concerned with seeing that liquor for sale to the public in South Australia is supplied in satisfactory circumstances, has in fact no direct power in the matter. This is one of the unsatisfactory features of the present Licensing Act. However, I will have the matter examined to see whether an alternative can be put forward.

KEITH ROBBERY.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last Thursday I asked a question of the Premier relating to the use of small aircraft by the police in the search for escaped convicts or people suspected of being associated with robberies, and I instanced a recent occurrence at Keith. Has the Premier a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Commissioner of Police reports:

On October 23, 1964, Cabinet approval was given for the police to spend up to £50 at any one time for the hire of small aircraft for emergency operations, and an insurance policy was taken out to cover the aircraft and personnel, including civilian pilots and observers, who may be used to advantage on such flights. Persons providing aircraft in these circumstances are therefore compensated for the use thereof and protected against injury and damage by accident. I know of no authority enabling a police officer to "commandeer anything he wishes" to assist in searching for suspects in the case of murder, nor in any other circumstances of emergency, and the practice followed by this department is to ensure reasonable compensation is paid and appreciation expressed to any person who provides equipment at the request of the police.

Following a garage breaking offence at Keith in the early hours of Friday, January 21, 1966, a Mr. Hugh Robertson, of Desert Downs Station, Brimbago, advised the local police that he and his father, Mr. Hugh Robertson, Senior, were prepared to use their light aircraft to assist in a search for the alleged offenders in scrub country near Keith at no cost to the police. The valuable help given by these men in this instance is apparently consistent with their public spirited co-operation shown on other occasions of emergency in that district, as I understand their aircraft is always available for, and often used, to assist in controlling bush fires. Such help is indeed sincerely appreciated and worthy of high commendation. Notwithstanding the fact that the use of the aircraft on this occasion was volunteered, and the expressed wish of the owner that he does not want compensation, a claim from him would be considered for reimbursement as are all claims for expenses incurred by any person who assists the police under similar circumstances.

GRAPES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the stabilization of the grape industry was discussed at the recent meeting of the Agricultural Council, and, if it was, has he a report?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter was not on the agenda, but prior to matters on the agenda being discussed, the Chairman (Mr. Adermann) reported on seasonal conditions, following which Ministers had the opportunity to talk about various problems in their States. I introduced the subject of the control of wine grape prices, and sympathy was expressed by the other Ministers, especially those with similar problems. Nothing definite came out of the discussions, but I am sure that at a future meeting, unless something satisfactory is arranged in South Australia in the meantime, this will be an item on the agenda.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have just opened my copy of the February issue of the *South Australian School Post,* and have been glancing at the editorial written by the Editor and President of the South Australian Public Schools Committees' Association Incorporated (Mr. R. E. King). I see that the editorial is headed "Subsidies" and the first sentence states:

An item causing schools and parent organizations the greatest concern and uneasiness at the present time is the question of subsidies.

Later, after stating that the Minister had introduced a *pro rata* system of obtaining subsidies, Mr. King states:

Many parent organizations are finding that the Government is not able to subsidize every request, and in many cases, the subsidy allocation for this year is a considerable amount less than the previous year's allocation. In some cases, as much as 60 per cent less than the previous year's spending on subsidy is available. Many schools are finding themselves continually more inadequately stocked in aids and necessities, as demands on them and numbers expand.

Finally, he states:

It is time we threw away the yearly yard measuring-stick of 10 per cent increase, which is by no means sufficient to meet the ever-increasing educational needs.

Can the Minister of Education say whether this is an accurate description of the present situation and, if it is, whether the Government

intends to continue the present policy or to alter it so that subsidies will again be available on a pound-for-pound basis without restriction?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Government does not intend to change its policy. In fact, the principle of the increase of 10 per cent on the total provided in the previous year was followed by the previous Government for some years. Therefore, in that respect it should have the support of the honourable member. I invite the member for Mitcham to turn to page 15 of the same magazine, where he will see reprinted the answer I gave to a question by the member for Port Adelaide on subsidies. That answer is a full description of departmental policy on subsidies. If one examines that, one will see that some things have been omitted from Mr. King's editorial, which is, therefore, not a complete account of the Government's policy on subsidies. If it is true that in some cases as much as 60 per cent less than the previous year's spending on subsidy is available at a particular school, I suggest that many other schools are receiving much more than they had last year, because not only is the total amount available 10 per cent greater than the amount available in the previous year, but, in addition, the new policy with respect to swimming pools, canteens and so on, is more beneficial than was the policy under the previous Government.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister has referred to a new policy on the construction of canteens (and, I believe, assembly halls and swimming pools), but I am not certain that it has been announced in the House. If it has not, will the Minister of Education outline it? I believe this money has been provided out of the special Loan Fund, and, if that is so, I should like him to confirm that.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will repeat what I said in reply to a question by the member for Port Adelaide, when I dealt with the matter fully:

Because of the large sum involved (on assembly halls, canteens and swimming pools), requests for the payment of subsidies on the construction of assembly halls have been deferred from year to year and it is most unlikely that they could be met for many years to come. In order to deal with these requests more adequately, a new policy has been approved. As projects such as assembly halls, canteens and swimming pools are essentially of a capital nature, it is appropriate that any Government contribution towards their construction should be met from Loan funds. Accordingly, in future half the cost of approved works in this category will be met from the annual provision for minor works in the Loan works programme, provided that the school committee or council agrees to pay the other half of the cost upon the completion of the work. The previous Government provided a subsidy of £500 towards learners' swimming pools for primary schools and secondary schools costing respectively about £3,500 and £4,500. This was a subsidy of £1 for £6 or £8 respectively. The present Government will provide a subsidy of pound for pound for these pools and considers that more schools will thus be encouraged to raise money for this purpose as the amount to be raised will be more within the reach of the school organizations.

In any financial year the amount to be spent in this way will be budgeted for as part of the total sum provided for minor works. This will mean that a number of less urgent minor works will be deferred in order to contain the total expenditure within the amount provided for minor works in this and future years. The canteens referred to are expressly those which the parent bodies may desire to erect in an existing school. In future new schools it is clearly desirable, wherever possible, to incorporate the canteen in a part of the main school structure. By doing so, the canteen can be located in an appropriate position and the cost of construction should be less as compared to the cost of a separate structure. Accordingly, in future new schools the Government will meet the full cost of the shell of the canteen and the parent bodies will be required to meet the full cost of fitting out the room as a canteen, including the provision of the necessary fixtures, furniture, equipment and completion of the engineering services. In this way, the contribution of the Government and the parent bodies towards the provision of a canteen will be roughly equal and the Government will be in effect subsidizing the cost of the canteen pound for pound.

POLICE STATIONS.

Mrs. BYRNE: Yesterday, in reply to a question I asked the Minister of Education about repair work to be undertaken at the Wasleys Primary School, I was informed that the Public Buildings Department had let a contract to B. L. and M. D. Pridham Proprietary Limited, and that this work was included in a group contract for similar work at other schools and police stations in the area. Can the Minister of Works say where the police stations referred to are situated, and has he any details of the work to be done?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will obtain the details required by the honourable member.

CATERPILLARS.

Mr. RODDA: This morning, I received a report that an outbreak of caterpillars had occurred in forests in the South-East. Can the

Minister of Forests say whether this report is correct and, if it is, how serious is the outbreak, and what control will be instituted?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The situation as outlined by the honourable member is correct. Last Friday it was discovered that the tussock moth was present in the Penola pine forests, extending into the Sapfor forests, and covering an area of about 5,000 acres in each. This caterpillar defoliates the trees, and this has caused concern to the Woods and Forests Department. Entomologists were immediately sent to the South-East to examine the situation; at the moment the Conservator and Assistant Conservator are there, and discussions will take place between the manager of Sapfor forests and Mr. Bednall to determine whether aerial spraying will be required or what other course of action should be taken. I assure the honourable member that everything possible will be done to eradicate the caterpillar. However, it may not be quite as bad as it seems: this caterpillar has a similar effect on foliage to that of a grub found in South Africa where, although trees lost some foliage, they did not die, but came good again. That is expected to occur here.

CITRUS INDUSTRY ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Agriculture say when the other two members and the Chairman of the Citrus Industry Organization Committee will be appointed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Citrus Industry Organization Act stipulates that the other two members and the Chairman must be appointed with the concurrence of the four grower members of the committee. Those grower members have been appointed and notified accordingly. I received information this morning that, because of the busy time these men are having with their harvests at present, they have requested me to postpone calling a meeting until the week after next, when the appointments will then be decided.

STRUAN FARM.

Mr. SHANNON: In the recent absence of the Attorney-General, I directed a question to the Premier relating to Struan Farm School. I point out that, whilst the Public Works Standing Committee investigated the reconstruction of the Magill Boys Reformatory, the committee visited other States and saw work being undertaken under similar conditions to those existing at Struan farm at St. Helens in New South Wales and at a Victorian centre. As the committee was impressed with those places, can the Attorney-General say how the rehabilitation of young people is carried out at Struan farm, and whether the Government has plans in this regard? The committee believes that Struan farm could be expanded and made much more valuable to the State in the recovery of some of the unfortunate young people because of the training they can get there.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Struan farm serves two purpo . First, it provides training and rehabilitation for boys where it is believed that a boy, even though he may not go into a rural occupation, will benefit from training in a rural setting and in the kind of work undertaken at Struan farm. This work is, of course, not confined to people in reform institutions: some of the best people go to country schools in which rural and rugged training is given. Training of that kind is provided at Struan even for boys who are not going into rural activity, but it is also aimed to provide vocational training for those interested in a life on the land. In both of these ways the farm has been successful.

A boy is sent to Struan only after possible alternatives have been considered, and when it is believed that he is suitable for the home and will benefit from the experience. Personally, I believe, having had a look at the figures of those in other institutions and at the number at Struan over the last five years, that more use could be made of Struan than has so far been made, and that we could expand the number at Struan without much added cost but with considerable benefit. I hope to be able to do that during this year. In relation to the results obtained at Struan in the last five years, on July 1, 1960, 17 boys were in residence, and during the five years to June 30, 1965, 130 new admissions took place. On June 30, 1965, 21 boys remained, so that 126 had left during the period. Of these, 43 were placed in other departmental homes or institutions. It was found that work at Struan, for one reason or another, was not suitable and that the boys needed some other kind of institutional care before their ultimate release. Some of them had absconded and committed offences necessitating their placement elsewhere. Others made little progress, needed hospital or other attention near Adelaide, or were placed where relatives could visit them more easily. Two completed their term with the department at Struan and left. Of the remaining 81, the department placed 52 in country employment, and 29 in non-country

employment. Of the 52 in country employment, 28 boys subsequently left that employment either temporarily or permanently, although it is believed that some of those 28 went to other rural avocations in due course.

PARUNA SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Education further information concerning the opening of the Paruna school and the progress made up to the present?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been told today that the new area school (called the Brown's Well District Area School) has made a good beginning under excellent leadership. Members may recall that the department undertook to have this school opened on time for the beginning of the school year. The enrolment of scholars totalled 115, comprising 94 primary and 21 secondary students, of whom three secondary students travelled from Wanbi through Alawoona. The following relates to the number of pupils travelling on the various bus services: Peebinga, 24; Meribah, 23; North Paruna (subsidized service), 12; Nadda, 17. and Veitch 19 (with an anticipated increase of three soon). The transport services all operate smoothly and efficiently. The school is using four rooms at present, two previously used by the Paruna Primary School (one wood, one stone), and two classrooms recently erected by the Public Buildings Department.

WHYALLA DEVELOPMENT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question refers to a report recently published in relation to a committee set up to develop Whyalla, in which it was stated that the Whyalla Town Commission opposed the Minister's action in not allowing a representative of the commission to be appointed to a committee primarily concerned with the development of Whyalla. I do not know whether the report is accurate but, if it is, I ask the Minister of Lands whether he has seen the provisions of the Planning and Development Bill now before the House which, rightly in my opinion, gives a greater representation to local government authorities in relation to town planning. Will the Minister say whether the report is correct and, if it is, will he have another look at the position and perhaps consult his colleague, the member for the district?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The report, which I believe appeared in the *Advertiser* and which stated in part that Mr. Ryan, the Chairman of the commission, had taken strong exception to the fact that he had not been included on the committee, was correct. The Minister of Local Government twice referred this matter to me and, after consideration, in the first instance I wrote back to the Minister pointing out that if the commission was represented on this committee it would hinder its work, as it would meet in Adelaide. I also pointed out that every opportunity would be given to the commission at any time it wished to present evidence to the committee on any matter concerning Whyalla. This is far more than the commission has previously been able to do. The Minister of Local Government, as a result of a further communication from Mr. Ryan, contacted me again, and I reaffirmed my previous decision for the same reasons: that the committee might have to meet at short notice and often, and that having a member of the Whyalla Town Commission on the committee would hinder its work. As the Leader has suggested that I discuss this matter with the member for the district (the Minister of Education), I am willing to do so.

HACKNEY BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked on January 25 about the reason for the cessation of work on the building of the new bridge at Hackney?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Minister of Roads has reported that the substructure of the Hackney bridge was completed late last November and that it was expected that fabrication of the steel girders would have been completed early in December. However, in the course of inspections during the fabrication certain faults in the form of laminations were discovered in the steel from which the girders were being made. Extensive testing was carried out in December by the use of sonic testing equipment, and the tests revealed considerable lamination in various sections of the girders. Consultations were held with Professor Bull and other officers of the University of Adelaide, who recommended further testing with special equipment in the university laboratories. These were completed on January 26, and fabrication of the girders is expected to resume next week. Work on the site, however, cannot resume until the girders are completed, probably late in February.

ABATTOIRS BOARD.

Mr. McANANEY: Several years ago the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board spent a considerable sum in engaging a private consultant to report on its activities. No doubt some of the recommendations were followed, but others were not. Now Parliament has had

another report setting out various improvements that can be made. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate any possible action that will be taken by the board on these suggestions?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have asked the Public Service Commissioner, who was one of those who reported on the abattoirs board and who suggested certain improvements, to discuss the matter with me. He has agreed, and I expect to talk with him this week. Following that discussion, I will determine what I shall take to Cabinet in relation to the suggested improvements.

INNER SUBURBAN REDEVELOPMENT.

Mr. COUMBE: Does the Attorney-General, as Minister in charge of town planning, recall announcing last year that a plan for developing the inner suburbs of Adelaide was under way and that he had made approaches to some councils and municipalities with a view to their making suggestions to him in about April of this year? What progress is being made on the proposal and, if and when the Attorney-General receives this information, will these proposals be implemented under the provisions of the Planning and Development Bill now before the House?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have some information about how the work of the consultants of the councils concerned is proceeding. In fact, I was told on Monday night by an associate of the consultant of the Kensington and Norwood council that they were working desperately to meet the April deadline for submissions. I know that work is going ahead in each of the areas concerned to prepare the outlines of redevelopment plans. When these have been submitted, they will be examined to see what work can be done by the authority and by other Government agencies in obtaining inner suburban redevelopment. It will be clear to the honourable member from the terms of the Bill that provision is made for redevelopment work either by the authority itself or by the authority in conjunction with other authorities represented on it. However, progress on inner suburban redevelopment will depend on our obtaining money to underwrite the cost of land acquisition in the area. Strong submissions have been made to the Commonwealth Government by other State Governments that a provision for underwriting the cost of redeveloped land be placed in the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, which is due for renewal this year. Of course, this matter would have to be discussed by the Premier and I know that it is listed for discussion in relation to that agreement. If we do not obtain moneys from that source, we will have to examine other means of providing money for such development. As at present advised, we are hoping that something will come from the Commonwealth Government on this score, and it is not intended to put any other proposition before Parliament until we see whether something can be obtained from the Commonwealth Government in this way. However, legislative machinery is being provided to enable us to proceed if we get the money to do so.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: If it came under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, wouldn't that mean less money to build houses?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, the submission is not made on that basis. It is hoped that the Commonwealth Government will see the overall social benefit that will result from the reduction of other social costs because of such redevelopment, and that any grant on this score will not reduce the money otherwise provided by the Commonwealth Government.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Was the Minister born under an optimistic star?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am always hopeful of good things, even from the Leader's colleagues in Canberra.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that the staff in the Crown Solicitor's Department has been considerably depleted by resignations in the last few months.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Why?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: One can put one's own interpretation on this. Perhaps I could mention that one of the officers involved has become a partner in the Attorney-General's private practice, although I do not suggest in the circumstances as I know them that the Attorney-General has filched this officer away from the department. Can the Attorney-General say what steps he or the Government (whichever is appropriate) intends to take to increase the staff of the Crown Solicitor's Department, which I know is working under heavy pressure?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True, the Crown Solicitor's Department has insufficient staff at present and there have been resignations, some of which were projected and had been announced as intended at the time this Government took office. In the case to which the honourable member referred I found it

peculiarly embarrassing when a member of the staff left the Crown Solicitor's Department to join my firm, but I suppose it was no more embarrassing than when an officer of the department left it to join the honourable member's firm when he was a supporter of the previous Government. The Premier, the Minister of Labour and Industry and I interviewed the Public Service Board concerning the future of the Crown Solicitor's Department, and we have established (at least with the Public Service Board) that there is to be a specific establishment for the department, and increased remuneration has been fixed and additional positions have been recommended by the Public Service Board. Therefore, we are able to compete favourably with people in outside practice and with the Commonwealth Government for trained staff.

Mr. Millhouse: Is there to be any split in the present Crown Solicitor's Department?

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask that there be no debate. The Minister will answer the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No decision has been made on that score, but some suggestions have been made by the Public Service Commissioner to the Crown Solicitor concerning a recruiting campaign for his department, and I understand that certain steps will be taken within the next week or so. In the meantime, a post has been created in the Attorney-General's office for a solicitor who will have four main duties. He will oversee the companies investigators for whose positions applications have now been called. There is much companies work awaiting this officer, and at the moment the Crown Solicitor's Department cannot supply an officer to do it. Secondly, the new officer will have research work to do for the Attorney-General's Department on a number of projects, both those initiated within the State and those coming from the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. Thirdly, he will have the work of the officers' conferences held in connection with the Standing Committee. It is now possible for us to supply only a junior officer for this work, although other States have the Solicitors-General attending these conferences. Fourthly, the new officer will act as junior to me in cases I take. At the moment applications are being called for this post, too.

SITTINGS.

Mr. JENNINGS: Can the Premier explain, for the benefit of the House, his intentions regarding the sittings of the House?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The House will sit next week as usual, including Tuesday and Wednesday nights, and it will adjourn on the Thursday to enable members to attend a certain function in another State. Parliament would not then resume until March 1, and if members are prepared to give serious consideration to the matters before us we may be able to avoid calling the House back for the week commencing March 8. If members are co-operative, we may be able to finish the sittings before the Festival of Arts. I hope that second reading speeches may be given while conferences take place, provided that no vote is taken.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I think we can help the Premier in that regard.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I should like to be able to say that we can conclude this session on March 3, and I believe we can do so, provided that members are willing to assist.

GOVERNMENT WORKS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government has indicated to certain contractors that it desires those contractors to slow down some of the work which they are at present undertaking? If that is correct (and I have received a report to that effect, although I have not been able to confirm the statement), can the Minister tell the House the reason for this indication to the contractors?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I would say that the report is definitely incorrect. However, I admit that in regard to the works carried out by the department, because of the Government's inability to finance that work, people who have left the job have not been replaced. That is the only steadying down method that we have adopted.

EDUCATION GRANT.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the debate on the Flinders University Bill last week I raised the matter of the £200,000 which this State will lose in the present triennium because it is not able to go ahead with the erection of a hall of residence at Flinders university and, therefore, to match the grant offered by the Commonwealth Government. I was pleased to see in the press last Friday that the South Australian Government intended to approach the Commonwealth Government to hold over money available in somewhat similar circumstances for mental hospitals. In view of the importance of a hall of residence for Bedford Park and the great misfortune if the Government loses the £200,000, can the Minister of

Education say whether (even though it may be a slim hope in view of what Senator Gorton has said) the Government will make a similar approach to the Commonwealth Government to see whether it would not be possible to hold over the £200,000 into the next triennium?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I should like to inform the honourable member that, in view of the importance the Government placed upon the question of the residential hall at Bedford Park, last year when in Canberra I had the pleasure of meeting Senator Gorton on a number of educational matters and this particular question was thoroughly discussed. I asked Senator Gorton whether he would make available this balance of money in the next year, in view of the fact that we were not able to match the total grant. I pointed out the importance of it, but we could get nowhere at all.

Mr. Millhouse: We have just lost it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: This talk about having lost the money means that the money for the residential hall would be placed in another triennium, I presume, because I cannot imagine the Commonwealth Government being so short-sighted as to say, "You cannot have any money at all for a residential hall." Therefore, the term "lost" is strictly not true: it could be postponed, shall we say. However, I expect to meet Senator Gorton within the next two days in Sydney, and I shall again raise the matter with him. I point out that in these matters we do not appear to get much co-operation in regard to matching grants. If the honourable member casts his mind back to the question of research grants, he will remember that the terms of reference regarding the distribution of the £2,000,000 of the £5,000,000 to be applied to research grants were altered, and, as a State, we were placed in the position of having to find £60,000 more than we had originally budgeted for. Although we pointed this out to the Commonwealth Government, we could get no consideration of our request. Unfortunately, this still seems to be the view of the Commonwealth Government regarding these grants. I think it is unfortunate, because I believe that when a State is prepared to do the work there should be an assurance that the money will be forthcoming and that the work will be carried on accordingly, instead of which we find, under the present system, that whenever there is some hiatus in the provision of the matching grant in this matter some people get up and make political capital out of the situation.

c11

COST OF LIVING INCREASE.

Mrs. STEELE: Some days ago I addressed a question to the Premier regarding the cost of living increase, and he undertook to get a report from the Prices Commissioner. Has he that report?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Prices Commissioner has reported that the consumer price index, which is compiled by the Commonwealth Statistician, showed an increase in the December quarter of 1.5 per cent for Adelaide. This is estimated to amount to 5s. a week. It is understood that the statistician notes prices of all categories except food on the middle day of the middle month of each quarter; consequently, certain increases which occurred in the last half of the September quarter were not reflected in the index until the December quarter, for example, increases resulting from the Commonwealth Budget. Price movements relating to the various categories are as follows:

Food Group—estimated decrease 3d. a week: meat—estimated decrease 1s. 3d. a week; potatoes—estimated increase 3d. a week; other foods, including bread, flour, some breakfast foods, eggs and onions—estimated increase 9d. a week.

Clothing and Drapery—estimated increase 3d. a week: minor increases in several items including some woollen outerwear and some cotton sheeting.

Housing Group—estimated increase 1s. a week: increases in some rents, local government rates, and charges and repairs and maintenance.

Household Supplies and Equipment Group—estimated increase 3d. a week; minor increases in a number of items including toilet soap, soap powders, and detergents.

Miscellaneous Group—estimated increase 3s. 9d. a week: the main price increases in this group are: petrol (Commonwealth Duty), 3d. to 3½d. a gallon; cigarettes (Commonwealth Duty), 3d. a packet of 20; tobacco (Commonwealth Duty), 3d. a 2oz. pack; draught beer (Commonwealth Duty), 2d. a schooner; bottled beer (Commonwealth Duty), 4d. a bottle; bus fares, 6d. for some sections; cinema prices, small increases by some theatres.

The estimated movement of the index for all capital cities for the year ended December 31, 1965, is as follows: Adelaide, increase 10s. 3d.; Sydney, increase 12s. 3d.; Melbourne, increase 13s. 6d.; Hobart, increase 13s. 6d.; Perth, increase 13s. 9d.; and Brisbane, increase 16s. 6d.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works) 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 Industrial Code, 1920-1965.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

First, I apologize to the House for not having this Bill on file until this moment. I have supplied the Leader with a draft and some amendments but the Bill will be on file late today or early tomorrow. Although this is a long Bill it deals principally with industrial tribunals having jurisdiction to make industrial awards. The Government has decided to alter the constitution of the Industrial Court, and to provide that the award-making tribunal will in future be constituted of a President and two Commissioners instead of the President and up to two Deputy Presidents, as is now provided in the Industrial Code. A person cannot be appointed as President or Deputy President unless he is qualified to be appointed as a judge of the Supreme Court. The Bill provides for the establishment of an Industrial Commission which in general will have the same award-making jurisdiction as the Industrial Court now has. This jurisdiction will be exercised by either the President or a commissioner or a full bench. The Bill also provides for matters to be referred to the full commission for initial hearing, and for rights of appeal against decisions of commissioners.

The present President of the Industrial Court will continue in that office and no alteration is being made to the requirement that the President must be a person eligible for appointment as a judge of the Supreme Court. As well as being President of the Industrial Commission, he will be the Judge of the Industrial Court with jurisdiction to deal with legal matters. The Government considers that there should be an Industrial Commission to deal with industrial matters separate from the Industrial Court because the word "court" has a legal connotation and it would not be proper for lay commissioners to be appointed to a court. It will not be necessary for the two commissioners to have legal qualifications.

The Bill also provides that the present industrial boards will be called conciliation committees, and that the commissioners will be chairman of these committees. The President will allot commissioners to the committees in each case for a period not exceeding three years. Within the ambits of their respective constitutions, the conciliation committees will be given the same jurisdiction as to industrial matters as the Industrial Commission. For the time being the area of operation of the conciliation committees will continue as at present, which, with the exception of Government and local government employees, is the metropolitan area of Adelaide. The Bill provides, however, for the full bench of the commission to recommend to the Minister the alteration of the geographical area of jurisdiction of any conciliation committee. It has been the practice for over fifty years for industrial boards to meet after working hours. Although the Bill does not, in so many terms, refer to the times of sitting of the committees, it is intended that they will in future meet during working hours. If the process of conciliation fails to result in agreement, the Bill provides that the chairman will sit as a commissioner to determine the unresolved matters. There will also be rights of reference and appeal in these cases.

Consequentially upon these alterations the Board of Industry is being abolished, its functions, with one exception, being given to the Industrial Commission constituted of the President and two commissioners. The exception relates to demarcation disputes which will be dealt with in the same manner as applications for awards. The Government considers that there is ample justification for amending the Industrial Code in the way which I have mentioned. The Industrial Court and the industrial boards, as at present constituted, have served the State well since 1920. It is clear, however, that vastly different conditions exist today from those which applied 45 years ago. There is no need for me to go into detail on the industrial development of the State since then, or to refer in detail to the much wider sphere of activities of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in the making of awards. The South Australian Industrial Court is now the only industrial tribunal in Australia which is constituted solely of men with legal qualifications. Excluding Victoria and Tasmania, where wages boards are the only bodies which have jurisdiction to make awards and the chairmen of those boards are laymen, there are two States

(Queensland and Western Australia) where no member of the award-making tribunal need have legal qualifications. In the Commonwealth Commission and the New South Wales Industrial Arbitration Commission, the judges are members of the legal profession, while the commissioners need not necessarily have legal qualifications.

Since the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act was amended by the Chifley Government in 1947, the system of using conciliation commissioners as well as presidential members with legal qualifications has become firmly entrenched in the Commonwealth jurisdiction. If South Australia is to continue to develop industrially, there seems to be no reason why we should not have our industrial tribunal constituted in a manner which is in accordance with current practices elsewhere. The Government considers this to be an important Bill. After Cabinet had decided to amend the code in this way last year, the Minister of Labour and Industry confidentially advised the Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia and the Presidents of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures and the South Australian Employers Federation in order that they might be aware of the Government's proposal, and it is hoped that the measures contained in this Bill, which the Government believes will considerably improve the industrial arbitration machinery in this State, will be accepted by this House. The Government has introduced the Bill in this form, containing as it does amendments dealing only with the constitution of the Industrial Commission and conciliation committees and one other matter to which I shall shortly refer, because it desires that these alterations should be made as soon as possible.

The President of the Industrial Court has carried on, since December, 1964, as the only member of the Industrial Court. This he has done with considerable difficulty. It is important that early appointments should be made to remedy this position. The Bill provides that one of the commissioners to be appointed is to be a person who has had experience in industrial matters on the trade union side while the other is to be a person who has had experience in industrial matters on the employers' side. The Government has received requests for many other amendments to be made to the Industrial Code, and this matter was mentioned in the Premier's policy speech. The present Bill is confined to the matters to which I have referred, and to one special clause to which I shall now refer, contentious issues being omitted, but the Government is giving consideration to other aspects of the code.

The only clause in the Bill which does not deal with the constitution of the Industrial Commission, and matters associated therewith, is clause 80, by which a new section 132c is included in the code. This section authorizes the President, the Commissioners and the Industrial Registrar, to decide on claims for under-payment or wrongful payment of wages, etc., as an alternative to prosecution in a court of summary jurisdiction. They will not have power to award any penalties, but simply to decide on the merits of a claim. Their decisions will be enforceable in the same way as judgments of local courts. If any party chooses to use this method to have his claim decided, he will not have the opportunity of subsequently seeking to prosecute. Where the amount of the claim exceeds £30 ($60) there will be a right of appeal to the President from a decision of a commissioner or of the Registrar. In a Bill of this length it is not desirable to refer to every clause in detail. Most of the clauses in the Bill contain amendments consequential upon the matters to which I have already referred. I shall therefore now refer to each of the principal amendments.

By clause 18, section 17 of the principal Act, which sets out the jurisdiction and powers of the Industrial Court, is repealed and a new section 17 inserted in which the new jurisdiction of the Industrial Court is set out. It will be seen that each of the subjects referred to in new section 17 covers questions of law or appeals. Clauses 19 to 28 are in the nature of consequential amendments in that they repeal and amend sections relating to the powers of the court in view of the transfer of its award-making functions to the commission. Clause 29 of the Bill provides for the inclusion in the code of a new division concerning the constitution, powers and jurisdiction of the Industrial Commission, which as mentioned earlier will be constituted by the President and two commissioners (new section 29a). The general powers and jurisdiction of the commission are set out in new sections 29b to 29m. In general, the powers referred to in these sections are identical with those which are now vested in the Industrial Court, but which are now to be vested in the Industrial Commission. I should add that new section 29g deals with demarcation disputes which at present are dealt with by the Board of Industry.

Provisions regarding the procedure of the commission and the powers of the commission in relation to appeals from awards of commissioners or conciliation committees and in relation to references from the commissioners and committees are included in new sections 52a, 52b, 52c and 53, which are inserted in the code by clauses 51 and 52 of the Bill. The provision made in the Bill for commissioners to refer matters for initial hearing by the full commission, constituted by the President and the two Commissioners, is along somewhat similar lines to the reference provisions of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act. Clause 59 of the Bill deals with this matter. I have already dealt with clause 80 providing for a new procedure for the recovery of amounts due under awards and orders. Clause 86 of the Bill provides for the constitution of conciliation committees, which will replace the present industrial boards. The power of appointment of members to these committees will remain with the Minister, while recommendations of the geographical areas of the State in which the committees will have jurisdiction will be made by the full commission constituted by the President and the two commissioners (clause 96), and recommendations for the selection of members to the committees will be made by the President. Clause 93 which repeals and re-enacts sections 151 and 152 provides that the President will allocate a commissioner to act as chairman of each committee for a period of not more than three years.

Although the present industrial boards only have jurisdiction within the metropolitan area of Adelaide, except in respect of employees of the Public Service, Railways Commissioner and local governing authorities, the full commission, as I have said, will be able to recommend to the Minister the area of the State within which any conciliation committee shall have jurisdiction. Clause 101 of the Bill enacts a new section 157a which will preserve all determinations of industrial boards which are in operation when the Bill comes into force.

By clause 102 of the Bill, section 167 of the present Act is repealed and a new section inserted in which the jurisdiction and duties of conciliation committees are set out. It will be seen that, generally speaking, the committees will have the same jurisdiction as the Industrial Commission.

The emphasis of conciliation committees will, as the name implies, be on conciliation. By an amendment to paragraph (*f*) of section 180 of the code, which is made by clause 114 (*c*) of the Bill, it is provided that if the chairman of a committee is unable to bring the majority of the members of the committee to agreement with respect to any matters, he will hear submissions in respect of those matters as a member of the commission in the same way as if they were within the jurisdiction of the commission and not of the committee. By new section 180a, which is inserted in the code by clause 115, when the commissioner has made his decision on those unresolved matters, the committee will make an award incorporating the matters which had been agreed on before the committee, as well as those decided by the commissioner.

There have always been provisions in the Industrial Code providing for the right of appeal against determinations of industrial boards and this right of appeal against decisions of commissioners or conciliation committees is preserved by new section 196, which is inserted in the code by clause 131. Because one commissioner will be the chairman of each conciliation committee, a new provision is included to enable the appeal to be heard by a bench of three. It would be improper for the commissioner whose decision was being appealed against to act as a member of the appellant tribunal, and provision is accordingly made for the Industrial Registrar to act with the President and the commissioner not concerned in the matter, which is the subject of the appeal, in such cases.

By clause 132, new sections 198 and 199 provide for the reference of matters to the full commission by the Minister or a commissioner. I have already referred to this matter. Clauses 154, 157, 166 and 168 deal with the abolition of the Board of Industry and clauses 155, 156, 158 to 165 and 167 deal with the transfer of its functions to the commission constituted by the President and two commissioners. The clauses of the Bill to which I have not referred deal with consequential amendments such as the alteration of appropriate headings in the code wherever required (clauses 4, 6, 32, 57, 61, 83, 84, 109, 119, 133, 152 and 153); removal of provisions concerning the deputy president and assessors (clauses 8 to 16); amendments to the interpretation section (clause 5); and the removal of obsolete provisions (clauses 7 and 43 (*b*)).

The remaining clauses of the Bill effect amendments consequential upon the establishment of the commission and its jurisdiction and the substitution of conciliation committees with power to make awards for industrial boards

with power to make determinations. The vast majority of these amendments substitute "commission" for "court" in various places of the code, "award" for "determination" and "committee" for "board".

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 3801.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I find that the Bill contains some rather interesting and worthwhile provisions, but I intend to offer some criticism to others. In Committee I may move some amendments. However, in its general principle, I support the second reading of the Bill. In looking at a Bill of this type, which deals with the training and education of apprentices, we should consider two main points. First, do the amendments to the Act contained in the Bill improve the education and training of apprentices, thus making them better apprentices, and secondly, will the provisions in the Bill increase the number of apprentices that can and will be taken into and trained in industry? I find some definite benefits in the Bill with regard to the improvement of apprentices. Also some administrative difficulties will be straightened out.

However, I have some doubts about one or two other matters. I doubt whether the Bill will lead to an increase in the number of apprentices to be taken into industry: there could possibly be some decrease. As a general premise, we should remember that the more difficult and expensive it is made for employers in this State to train apprentices in the various branches of industry, the fewer apprentices will be indentured. Legally, no obligation whatever exists on any employer in South Australia to engage and train an apprentice. Therefore, we should not make it more difficult for employers to indenture apprentices. It is a fact of the industrial history of Australia that, in periods when jobs for tradesmen have been in short supply, tradesmen applying for a job who held certificates of apprenticeship signed by a qualified authority always received preference. This highlights the desirability of boys (and girls in some cases) doing an apprenticeship and learning a trade.

Of course, the position to which I have referred does not apply now. During the last 10 years or so, job vacancies have far exceeded the number of tradesmen available to fill the jobs. To stress this point I direct the attention of members to "situations vacant" columns in the daily newspapers. Column after column and, in some cases, pages are filled by advertisements for men to fill jobs. Therefore, in other States, as well as in South Australia, skilled labour is at a premium. There are too many unskilled men and not enough skilled men, and this position must be rectified. This shortage that we have been experiencing for some years now has meant that some large projects, especially in the engineering and constructional fields, have slowed down. I know that some have been postponed because of the lack of skilled tradesmen. Therefore, there is no need for me at this stage to emphasize the dire necessity for increasing the intake of apprentices into our industry.

In the last few years a welcome approach was made by the Commonwealth Government, the State Department of Industry, and other organizations, when they carried out an intensive campaign throughout Australia in an effort to recruit more trainees to apprenticeship. Appeals went out to employers of various categories to increase their intake of apprentices. It is a matter of fact that as a result of that appeal the employers, particularly those in South Australia, have responded with a very marked increase in the intake of apprentices. The figures are rather startling. In 1962 we had 1,841 apprentices being trained in all trades. The latest figures available show that in 1964 this figure had risen rather markedly to 2,500. We find that under the provisions of the existing Act, without this amending Bill, there has been a very marked increase in the number of apprentices.

I refer the House to the annual report of the Department of Labour and Industry where this feature is highlighted. The report I have here (the latest on our files) is for the year ended December 30, 1964. I have pointed out already that in 1962 the figure was 1,841 and that it has now risen to 2,500. In that total, the significant thing is the increase in the last couple of years. Taken on a five-year indenture period, we find that the first year indenture at this moment contains 2,357 apprentices and the second year, 2,310. Then we get a drop in the third, fourth, and fifth years which represent the level before this appeal was made to employers to take in more apprentices and to which there was such a magnificent response. In the third year the figure is 1,686, in the fourth year it is 1,654, and in the fifth year it is down to 1,387.

This, as I say, shows that in the last couple of years, working under the existing Act without any amendments, the employers have responded magnificently to this plea to take in more apprentices. I suggest to the House that above all things we have a responsibility to keep this intake going and to prevent it from drying up. We must not make it more difficult or more expensive for masters to train apprentices, but rather we should come up with some positive suggestion on how this flow can be kept going or even increased by making it perhaps easier rather than more difficult for employers to engage more apprentices. I emphasize once again that if we make it too hard or too expensive employers will not be bothered to indenture new apprentices. I repeat that there is no obligation whatever on any employer in this State to engage one single apprentice.

The reason employers engage apprentices is to ensure the continued flow and availability of trained and skilled tradesmen so that work can proceed and so that projects can be developed. This training of apprentices is the only way that we will get an adequate flow of tradesmen. We do get some of these tradesmen through migration, but this is not a very significant proportion compared with the number of men that we train ourselves. Some of the migrant tradesmen from overseas are most welcome, and they have played a significant part in the development of South Australia. In fact, I believe that some of the projects we have undertaken would not have been able to proceed very far, certainly not at the rate they have proceeded, had it not been for migration.

The Commonwealth Department of Labour, under the Honourable Mr. McMahon when he was Minister, brought forward a proposal for the payment of subsidy to the employers who increased their former level of apprentices in special circumstances and where special training periods were involved, such as the special short-term and baggage deal education systems that were envisaged. This has been working for only a short time, and it is not possible yet to evaluate the true worth of this scheme. However, it is a rather interesting innovation, and it has definitely brought lads into engineering and other trades as appprentices when they would have been lost forever because they had reached the age of 17 years or more. Perhaps this scheme could be considered a little further by the relevant authority in this State. I believe we should aim to maintain a high level of apprentice intake and an adequately trained skilled labour force. At the same time, we should try to achieve this at the lowest possible direct cost to the employer, and also at a minimum cost to the Government concerned.

Since a Bill of this nature was last considered in this House a change of administration has taken place. The administration of this Act was committed last year to the care of the Minister of Labour and Industry, whereas before it was jointly administered by that Minister and the Minister of Education, the former handling the industrial side and the latter the training side. Clause 5, which deals with a new commission, abolishes the present Apprentices Board, which has existed for a number of years, and in its place sets up the Apprenticeship Commission, which will consist of a chairman and five members appointed by the Governor.

The present board has operated for many years and during its history has had serving on it South Australians distinguished in commerce, industry, education, and trade union matters. That is now to be replaced, and instead of a board of eight we are to have a commission of six, including the chairman. Let us have a look at why this is being done. Although I do not object to it, I think it should be explained further. I will read the composition of the present board to the House so that members will see the calibre of the people that have been administering the apprenticeship conditions in this State. The Chairman is the Superintendent of Technical Schools, the present occupant of the position being Mr. Bone. I think we all agree that the Superintendent of Technical Schools would be a very fair and impartial man. He would be the officer in the Education Department most vitally concerned with technical education, and he should make a splendid chairman. The Deputy Chairman is the Chief Inspector of Factories, at present Mr. Roberts, whom most of us know and admire for his work. Traditionally, the Chief Inspector of Factories has been the administrative head of the apprentices for many years. He is an officer well qualified to know conditions in factories and conditions of apprenticeship. Two representatives of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia are Mr. Hayes and Mr. Shannon, both well known in industry; the South Australian Employers Federation is represented by Mr. Cole, and the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures is represented by Mr. Keith Forwood, a former apprentice in fitting and turning. There are two nominees of the Governor: until recently

one was Mr. Fargher (the former Railways Commissioner), who has been replaced by Mr. Crossman (Chief Mechanical Engineer for the South Australian Railways) who is eminently suited to this office, as he is one of the greatest single employers of apprentices in this State.

The other member appointed by the Governor is Dr. Evans (Director of the South Australian Institute of Technology). Concentrating on the technological education of men and women in this State, the institute is the successor to the old School of Mines which trained apprentices before the Education Department undertook that task.

This is the board that is to be replaced. All these men are eminently suitable, well trained and well versed in apprenticeship matters and, although I do not object to the Bill, I see no reason why they should be replaced—not necessarily the actual person, but the holder of the office. As far as I know, the board meets whenever it is needed, usually about once a month. It is intended that instead of the board, a commission with a chairman and five members shall be appointed. Of the five members, one shall be nominated by the Minister of Education, two by the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, one by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce, and one by the South Australian Employers Federation. Two members will represent union interests, two will represent employer interests, and one will represent the Minister of Education. It is intended to have a full-time chairman.

Mr. Shannon: Did you know that the chairman gets a deliberative and a casting vote.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes.

Mr. Shannon: Have you worked out how that can possibly work?

Mr. COUMBE: It is not necessary to appoint a full-time chairman. Possibly the Minister has considered that the chairman may perform duties being done by officers in the Department of Labor and Industry, but with only 2,500 apprentices in this State, this appointment is not necessary. I agree that the chairman should be available for a longer period than is the present chairman, who gives only part-time service to the board. The present set-up conforms with many boards operating in the State today with a part-time executive chairman and part-time members. It is intended to appoint a secretary, and the members and chairman will be paid: a large expense will be involved by appointing a full-time chairman. In another State this position exists, but in New South Wales the population is three to four times that of this State with the apprentice population proportionately higher and with a greater classification of apprenticeship trades, and no doubt this justifies the appointment, especially in a State with several large provincial cities such as Wollongong, Port Kembla, and Newcastle with their own apprentice training centres. I believe there is no justification for the appointment of a full-time chairman, and ask the Minister to explain the basic reasons for altering the present composition of the board and the real reason for appointing a full-time chairman.

I accept the provisions providing for the approval by the commission of the employer. We know that abuses have occurred in the past in the training of apprentices, and that some employers have not played the game in this respect. Some have almost neglected the training of apprentices indentured to them, and this provision will overcome that position. The provisos are important in that any employer who, prior to the passing of this legislation, has an indentured apprentice in a trade will receive automatic registration for that trade. Alternatively, if he is engaging apprentices at present or has been doing so, he will be permitted to continue. I welcome this proposal, as I also welcome the proposal relating to group apprenticeship. However, some rather ticklish administrative difficulties may be involved in the group scheme, especially when it is noted that the net cost of training an apprentice over the five-year period (which may be anything from £400 to £1,000) is the greatest in the first three years. Of course, that cost has varied over the years, and varies from industry to industry. I differ slightly in respect to the minimum standards of education as provided in the Bill. I am the first to admit that it is desirable to increase the standards of education on an apprentice's admission. It must be borne in mind, however, that different trades require different standards; an apprentice going into the radio or electrical trade requires a much higher standard of mathematics than, say, that of a youth going into the trade of a bootmaker.

Mr. Clark: The board would surely be aware of that.

Mr. COUMBE: These are obvious things, but the board has a specific direction in this regard. The employer has always had the right to engage or not to engage an apprentice and, surely, the initiative should always remain

with the employer, for he has the responsibility for the full training and payment of an apprentice. I suggest that, whilst we should always encourage the highest standard of education to be considered at entry into apprenticeship, there should not be a rigid prescription in relation to the minimum standard. The Bill provides that the trade committees can be set up, and can advise the commission, and I agree that such committees fulfil a vital role in this whole set-up. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Another of the main effects of this Bill is to give far more emphasis to the industrial side of the employment of apprentices than has been given in the past. The Apprentices Act, as it now stands, deals to a large extent with the training to be given to an apprentice, either in a trade or technical school or by correspondence. The Government considers that more emphasis should be given to the industrial aspects associated with the employment of apprentices.

When I read that, I rather wondered what was meant by "more emphasis should be given to the industrial aspects", because I knew that one of the main features in any apprentice Bill related to education, and that the trade committees that have worked so well in the past in advising the Apprentices Board on matters dealing with indentures have principally engaged in advising on training and educational matters. Indeed, an emphasis has been placed on education, which makes it difficult to understand why a change has been made in this respect. However, I was glad to see the provision that will retain the trade committees and, as the Minister of Education is handling the Bill in the House, I hope that he will try to exert his influence to ensure that the emphasis of trade committees' investigations and advice to the commission will be on education. I see no objection whatsoever to full-time apprenticeship training, where a central establishment is set up, provided that no suggestion or implication is made that employers or groups of employers should be required to pay for establishing these centres. I believe group training is a good thing if it can be worked. Special circumstances exist in some industries in some localities where it can be worked, and provision is made in the Bill for it to be done where it is possible and convenient.

I have doubts about the provision relating to the attendance of apprentices at school, which is the contentious part of the Bill. When talking about the compulsory attendance of apprentices at school, in his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

The Labor Party has considered for many years that there is no valid reason why an apprentice should be required to attend trade schools during his leisure time.

Obviously that is Labor Party policy, and I have heard that same sentiment expressed before. However, with due respect to the Minister (and I have heard him make good speeches before), I regret to say that that is one of the most fatuous statements I have heard for a long time. If one analyses the statement one finds that the Minister is suggesting that there is no reason at all that an apprentice should study at night. The only reason the Minister has given for his statement is that the Labor Party sees no valid reason why apprentices should study at night or in their leisure time. That is the only explanation given for this daylight training. I regret that the Minister made this statement because it is tantamount to suggesting that apprentices should not train at night, and should do no training whatever except in the time paid for by employers.

Without dealing with the economic aspects of this question, we know that throughout the State schoolchildren in the upper grades of primary schools have to do homework. High school students at an Intermediate and Leaving level generally study to 11 p.m. or 11.30 p.m. every night of the week. In primary and secondary schools homework is set by teachers, and a student has to produce that work on the next day or suffer a penalty. The encouragement of home study is an integral part of our education system. However, under the Bill, apprentices are not to go to night school although this education is provided free of charge. After they have finished their training in the day-time or at night, nurses have to study in their leisure hours. Some time ago an argument was evinced that apprentices would be too tired after work to go to school. A nurse is on her feet all day and yet she has to study in her leisure time. Surely primary and secondary schoolchildren are tired, and yet they must work at night. However, it is suggested that apprentices should not study at night.

Throughout the State thousands of adults attend high schools at night as part of the greatly spreading adult education system. These people study practical and theoretical subjects and pay fees to study. They attend classes to improve themselves. Those who would like to be apprentices but are too old must improve themselves in this way. All that apprentices are asked to do at the moment is to attend school one night a week for two hours,

and their education is provided completely free of charge. People who attend adult education classes are learning subjects that apprentices are paid to be taught. If the Minister wanted to bring in daylight training, he should have said that it was the Labor Party's policy to engage completely in daylight training; he should not have made the fatuous statement he made in this respect. From the beginning of next month thousands of students will be studying part time in the evenings at the university, the Institute of Technology and at various business colleges. They will be doing technical, accountancy and business administration subjects. At one time or another the great majority of members of this House have studied or attended lectures at night. Therefore, I suggest that it is only fair that apprentices should be asked to go to school on one night a week.

An apprentice attends school to improve himself, and I thoroughly approve of the schooling provided under the Apprentices Act. The whole basis of apprenticeship is that the technical education of apprentices is designed to supplement the technical training they receive in workshops and not to dominate it. In South Australia there is a tripartite agreement between the employer, the parents and the apprentice. The employer undertakes to train the apprentice and to pay for him to go to school. The aprentice is obligated to learn his trade, to apply himself, to keep himself sober, to keep his master's trade secrets, and to study (which he does at his master's expense). In return for this free education all he is asked to do in his own time is to attend school for half the number of hours that he receives from the school in his employer's time. However, the suggestion is made that this is too much for the poor apprentice; as he has worked all day, he will be too tired and the master should provide all the paid schooling in the master's time. I suggest that this is rather farcical and that if the agreement is to work properly the apprentice should at least play his part and go to school one night a week.

In many quarters today the position is that there is too much leisure time for the younger section of the community. It has often been expressed, especially in reports from the courts, that there is too much misbehaviour and that too many lads, and girls, too, are roaming the streets. Many appeals have been made for these young people to join the various youth and church organizations that are doing such wonderful work, and to engage in community projects, yet apprentices are being told not to go to school at night, that they are to be free at nights to do whatever they like.

I am sorry, but I cannot agree with that proposal. I admit that the employer is going to get some benefit under the existing provisions, but it is the employee who will get the major benefit. What he learns and the training he gets in the first three years of his five-year indenture is going to make him a better man and better tradesman, and he will enjoy the benefit of that for the rest of his life. When he has completed his indenture he will be classed as a journeyman; he will have a certificate to say that he has completed an indenture and that he has gone to a trade school; he will receive a certificate of competency; he will be able to apply for a position anywhere in Australia or even in other countries if he travels; and he will be able to get a job in the trade in which he has trained, above a man who does not have this certificate. This will be a worthwhile benefit to him for the rest of his life. All we ask at this moment is that during the first three years only of his time he go to school one night a week. The Minister says, "No, this shall not be so; the whole of the schooling shall be done in the day-time."

I believe, further, that some of the greatest men in industry in this country have achieved their pre-eminence today because of the part-time activities and the part-time studies that they were able to undertake. I guarantee that almost every member in this House at some time or another has studied at night or undertaken lectures. I know that for the first three years of my apprenticeship I studied four nights a week at the Technical College in the old School of Mines, and I do not regret it, although it did not necessarily get me here. However, I consider that in this regard going to trade school one night a week is no great hardship, and, quite frankly, I believe that this practice today is acceptable to any worthwhile apprentice. I know that from time to time we may have complaints in this regard from apprentices, but I suggest that this system has worked extremely well over the years and, as I say, that it is acceptable to any worthwhile apprentice. It is not suggested for a moment that apprentices' wages should be reduced to make up for the extra time they are going to lose out of the workshop and for which the master is going to pay them. I am not suggesting that, and I have not heard any honourable member suggest it.

We find that under the Act today the apprentice is required to attend school for four

hours a week in the employer's time and two hours a week in his own time. As a matter of convenience, this has been changed by agreement between the appropriate authorities to eight hours day-time schooling in alternate weeks, and this has worked extremely well. Therefore, in effect the apprentice receives eight hours' day-time training over the fortnight at a technical school; the employer gives up the services of that apprentice for eight hours a fortnight, and he pays the apprentice for the time he is attending school. This is eight hours a fortnight, which is equivalent to the two 4-hour periods actually prescribed, and everyone is very happy with that arrangement. What is being suggested now is that instead of eight hours every fortnight the time to be spent at trade school shall be eight hours each week.

Of course, what will happen is that this will immediately impose an extra cost to the employer. I am not able to say what the exact cost will be, but the apprentice will be out of the shop for twice as long as he is at the moment, and the employer will be losing any output that may have come from that apprentice. Therefore, the industry as a whole is now being asked to double its obligation regarding the amount of payment made to an apprentice when attending school, and to lose twice as much time in a workshop by virtue of the apprentice not being there. As the Minister knows very well, in some industries, especially in engineering, it is a custom for an apprentice to be assigned to a particular machine for some weeks at a time, and then possibly moved to another machine. If that machine is idle for an extended period, as it will now be, there is an extra expense to the industry. This is just another item that is going to add to the general cost structure in industry, and unfortunately it will occur in South Australia where we find today that we must have greater efficiency in industry. We must reach a peak of efficiency and economy so that we can transport our products to other States and sell them there at rates comparable with the rates in those States. It may be that other speakers may want to deal with the aspect. It is mainly on the other ground, the fact that I consider an apprentice should play his part, that I attack this measure. I believe it is completely futile and fatuous to suggest that an apprentice should not work at night.

I now wish to refer to debates that took place some years ago. The late Mr. O'Halloran, when Leader of the Opposition, (as also did the present Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition) introduced legislation on this feature. It was sought to increase the number of hours of attendance at trade school, I think to 12 hours a week. Now, that provision is not contained in the Bill before us today, so for some strange reason the Labor Party has changed its opinion on the question of hours. This is a matter for the Labor Party itself, and it is not for me to comment on it. I wish to refer to a report prepared at the time by Mr. J. S. Walker (then Superintendent of Technical Schools, and now Deputy Director of Education). This officer has had a background of technical training, and I believe at the time this report was written he was Chairman of the Apprentices Board.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What date is that?

Mr. COUMBE: *Hansard* of October 1, 1958, at page 1006. Mr. Walker, in conjunction with Mr. Lindsay Bowes, prepared a report dealing with training and other aspects, but their views did not coincide. Mr. Walker referred to various other aspects of training and said that in other States day-time training operated. This is the significant quotation from the report:

In regard to the proposal for so-called "all daylight" training, although there is a strong body of opinion among people in the apprentice training field which favours it, I do not subscribe to the view that compulsory attendance at evening classes should be abolished. The employer is making his contribution to the technical school training of the apprentice by allowing him to attend the school in the employer's time, and I think it is only reasonable to require the apprentice to reciprocate, at least in part, by devoting some of his own time to study which is designed to benefit him as well as the employer.

That was the considered opinion of the then Chairman of the Apprentices Board. Mr. Walker's views should be considered now, because he is a competent officer holding a high position in the Education Department and one who has been associated for many years with the training of apprentices.

Mr. Clark: He didn't exactly condemn it, did he? He said they should do work in their own time.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes.

Mr. Clark: No-one would disagree with that.

Mr. COUMBE: That is the tenor of my argument. This is a two-sided arrangement, and an apprentice should be required to give up some of his time on one night a week for about two hours and play his part by attending a technical school to receive free education, in return for what his employer is doing to train him and to pay him to go to technical school

in the daytime. The Bill refers to a satisfactory course of study, with which I agree, as I believe that it is right and proper that an apprentice who fails to achieve the required standard shall be required to attend school for further instruction in his own time. The provision whereby an outstanding student is offered another year or two's study at the trade school in the employer's time, is also a good one. Not every student is offered this facility, as the department does not have the equipment or time to do this, but most employers are happy with it.

Mr. Clark: It would be a compliment to the employer?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. We have come far from the old days which perhaps were not so enlightened. When my grandfather employed apprentices the parent had to pay a fee to him for the privilege of having the boy trained.

Mr. Millhouse: That is done with law clerks.

Mr. COUMBE: I am speaking of the engineering profession, which got rid of this archaic provision many years ago.

Mr. Clark: That has happened not so long ago, too.

Mr. COUMBE: It may have happened in my father's time when he employed apprentices.

Mr. Clark: It could have happened when you were a boy.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not know how much my father paid to train me as an apprentice, but he probably did not get full value. I have employed many apprentices but have never been paid to do this. Today, boys are taught at school and I thoroughly favour this. However, the position must be considered realistically. If too many difficulties and expenses are placed on the employer he will not bother to increase his inflow of apprentices, and may reduce the number or refuse to take them at all: no obligation exists under any law to compel an employer to train an apprentice. The section dealing with the training of country apprentices is important. At present, we have block training where a group of boys come to the city for several weeks for an intensive course at the school appropriate to their calling. I favour this system because I know the problems of training boys in the country. There is an excellent training centre at Whyalla, and there are others at Mount Gambier, Port Pirie and Port Augusta. But we have far too few of these centres, so the lad in the country, especially in isolated parts, can get his education, which is compulsory, only by correspondence or by coming to the city.

The system of optional release should be mentioned. I believe it has worked satisfactorily, but to suggest that employers should be forced to pay the fare of their apprentices and for their accommodation in town is going a little too far. The standard of accommodation is not even prescribed. At present, when these lads come to the city for their intensive training, they are usually accommodated with friends or relatives and, therefore, accommodation charges are reasonable; but there is nothing to stop a boy going to stay at a fairly lavish hotel—to take an extreme case. The employer in that case would be up for a big bill. The department should look at this matter carefully.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That would encourage them, would it?

Mr. COUMBE: No; but I am citing an extreme case.

Mr. Hurst: It would encourage lads to come, though.

Mr. COUMBE: That is the position. I suggest that the Education Department look at this, because at present the department pays subsidies to teacher-trainees who live in the city for a certain time. There is the living allowance especially for some country secondary students who come to the city to study. I imagine this to be an aspect caught by some provisions of teacher training and living-away allowances for students because, after all, these lads are students. This should be looked at, because it is unfair to ask the employer to pay not only the travelling but also the living expenses of the boy concerned.

In saying these things, I have been concentrating mainly on the metal trades industry (the apprentices working under the Metal Trades Award), deliberately, for two reasons. First, they are the largest group of apprentices being trained. The various trades are listed under that award. Secondly, the Metal Trades Award is used as a yardstick in assessing many other awards, and the tradesman who is a fitter or turner is usually taken as the standard when assessing other trades or branches of trades. But we have to look at the large diversifications covered by this legislation. There are a surprisingly large number of trades. We find that the metal trades head them all with over 1,000 apprentices being trained. I am now quoting from the department's report. Under "electrical" we find radio. Then we see that

"building" includes carpentry, bricklaying and plumbing. Furniture and its associated trades include carpentry (once again) and french polishing. The printing trade, which includes the sheet metal trades, is another one. Then there is ship and boat-building, boot-making, clothing, and "coopering", which is a trade that may one day disappear entirely. Then there are food, hairdressing, leather and canvas goods, male and female tailoring and hairdressing and female jewellery. All that accounts for a total of 9,394 apprentices. So there is a fair diversification that we have to consider.

We must remember that we have in this group of apprentices many women, particularly in the hairdressing trade. Where years ago many girls were apprenticed to tailoring, today there are only seven female apprentices in that trade in the whole State, but there are 847 women trainee hairdressers, which is a remarkable increase over the year. Also, 150 boys are training in hairdressing, many of whom will be working in women's hairdressing salons later; not all will be working in men's hairdressing establishments. There are many other minor additions taking care of females that have crept into the Act in recent years—the signing of indentures and the assigning of apprenticeships. I agree with all these. I am curious about clause 18, which amends section 27 of the principal Act and deals with requirements as to indentures. When an indenture is signed, the full-time Chairman of the commission—

. . . shall advise the secretaries of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated and the South Australian Employers Federation the names of all apprentices in respect of whom indentures of apprenticeship are received after the commencement of the Apprentices Act Amendment Act, 1966, and the trade to which, and the employer to whom, they are indentured.

So, the moment an indenture is signed by an apprentice and his employer, the Chairman of the commission has to inform the secretaries of those bodies as to whom that apprentice is indentured and as to what is his trade. What on earth has this to do with the indentures of apprenticeship? Hitherto, we have been dealing with indentures that are a three-sided contract, where the parties to the agreement are the parent or guardian, the employer himself and the apprentice. They are the three parties to the contract, and the contract is binding. An obligation is on the employer to send one copy of this indenture to the commission. He retains one himself and the parent gets the other. But now there are being brought in three other bodies that have nothing to do with the indenture. They are not responsible for it, they are not bound under it, and there is no signature in their names under the agreement. They are not a party to it in any sense. Eventually, the representatives of these three bodies that I have mentioned, who will be members of the Apprenticeship Commission, will be advised of this themselves, sitting on the commission. Why go to the trouble of advising these three bodies? They are not party to the Act. No employer organization, or union for that matter, has any right in this regard. The contract purely relates to the apprentice, his parents, and the employer. I believe that the existing Act provides that any variation of this tripartite agreement can be made only by a party concerned. Indeed, I believe that in any indenture signed today a provision exists that if a parent is dissatisfied with the training given to his child, he should have the right to complain to the employer and also to the commission. That is a fundamental right. The apprentice, too, should have the right to complain; and so, obviously, should an employer have the right to complain if an apprentice is unsatisfactory. However, for the commission to commence an investigation of its own volition seems to me to be going too far. I suggest that the Government examine this aspect.

Mr. Millhouse: I bet it won't!

Mr. COUMBE: As far as I can see, the rest of the provisions in the Bill are acceptable to me and to my Party, and should be agreed to. The views I have expressed in regard to education are my own and may or may not be similar to those expressed by other members of the Opposition. We should establish an Act that will be really workable in this State, because the training and recruitment of apprentices is terribly important today. In considering a Bill dealing with apprentices, two things should be borne in mind: do the provisions of the amended legislation improve the lot of the apprentice and his training, and make for a better apprentice? Secondly, will the legislation increase the number of apprentices to be trained in this State? I believe that, rather than make things more difficult or more expensive for an employer to take on apprentices, we should make them easier, and thereby enable him to engage more apprentices. We must not take away an employer's rights, because if too many difficulties and expenses are involved we shall find that many employers will simply not be bothered with this aspect at all; the flow will cease and we shall not

achieve the desired increase in apprentices. When we reach Committee I shall again speak on the matters I have raised, for I sincerely believe that some of them require amending. I support the second reading.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I support the Bill, for it is a progressive step in the training of apprentices in South Australia, and clearly seeks to improve the standard of training in apprenticeship trades, and to facilitate the intake of apprentices, as well as provide a much wider scope for training than has been provided under the existing Act. The training of apprentices is a vital matter not only to South Australia but to the Commonwealth as a whole, about which many honourable members on both sides of the House should be aware. Indeed, this particular aspect has been investigated by various experienced authorities since about 1949. First, an apprenticeship inquiry committee, presided over by His Honour, Mr. Justice Wright (a member of the Arbitration Commission, and a former South Australian), made extensive investigations into the methods of training tradesmen in every State, because the Commonwealth Government apparently realized the necessity to provide Australia with more skilled and properly trained personnel in the interests of increasing Australia's industrial activities. Regrettably, however, that committee's decisions were placed in a pigeon hole, and were never put into effect. Consequently, much public money was spent on an inquiry that might have benefited the country, but none of the findings of that responsible body (after it had taken evidence from employers and citizens throughout the Commonwealth) was implemented. However, the trade union movement advocated that, if all these recommendations could be considered, steps ought to be taken to implement certain of them. There was an active campaign in South Australia to secure the improvement of the Act and, as was mentioned by the member for Torrens, Bills were introduced by the then Opposition to do this.

The South Australian legislation has been outdated and ineffective for some time. Further, it has never provided for adequate facilities for the training of apprentices. True, the Education Department has, with the limited money available, provided some facilities and in recent years that department has begun to extend those facilities in order to afford to people in trades an opportunity to advance their technical knowledge to meet the progress and technical development taking place in Australia today.

Mr. Ryan: That was greatly appreciated by the employers as well, wasn't it?

Mr. HURST: The employers recognized the benefit of the efficient and sound training of apprentices. The Bill before us would have the backing of the many employer organizations whose members are sincere in their desire to advance the training of apprentices. Extensive changes are being made by the Bill. The present provisions were badly in need of overhaul and the Act was more in the nature of one that could be and was taken advantage of by certain people, to the detriment of the apprentices.

When one looks through industry and sees what is provided at certain undertakings, not by Act of Parliament but by a realistic approach to the training of technicians and tradesmen, one sees that employers appreciate the value of the provision of such facilities. The member for Torrens said that he supported the provisions of this Bill, and I was glad to hear that. I sincerely hope that other honourable members opposite realize the wisdom of that statement and also support the measure. I propose to refer to some of the matters that he has mentioned, because I consider that I can clarify some of the clauses that he says are not in the best interests of those concerned.

The training of apprentices necessitates the co-operation of employers, apprentices and the Education Department. There has been much misunderstanding regarding the obligations of the parties. When a person enters an apprenticeship, he signs a contract to serve for a time and that contract is obligatory on the employer, the apprentice and the parents. The parents are parties to the contract and should see that its terms are fulfilled to the best of their ability.

I have had considerable dealings with apprenticeship, particularly in South Australia, because I represented the Electrical Trades Union on the Electrical Trades Committee of South Australia for about 16 years. That committee assisted the advisory committee that had been set up under the Act in force at that time. I was also a foundation member of the Radio Committee in South Australia until I was elected to Parliament. In addition, I was a foundation member of the Automotive Electrical Trades Committee in this State. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, and members that during my time in industry I have taken much interest in this important subject. I interested myself in the matter not only in South Australia but also in other States that I visited on many occasions while

I was a trade union official. Indeed, when I was overseas I gave as much time as I could spare to investigating the training of tradesmen in the countries I visited.

The system of training in Australia is admired in oversea countries but there have been many deficiencies in our system and we have been lagging behind the other States in regard to protection machinery and facilities for safeguarding apprentices. There is a form of dual system in relation to control, in that we have Commonwealth awards and State awards. In most of the Commonwealth awards, greater care has been taken to safeguard the interests of the apprentices and the employers than has been taken under the State award. Under the legislation that operated in this State previously, no facilities were provided and in many cases apprentices were not taken on to serve a trade, but to be exploited as cheap labour. Members opposite know that a grocer could have indentured a person to serve an apprenticeship as a fitter, electrical mechanic, or whatever the case may have been. Was that practicable? I think we all realize the futility of an act that has permitted such things, and they did occur.

Many employers, through ignorance of their obligation to train, often used the indenture system to retain labour, not on the work of the trade in which the apprentice was indentured, but on work attracting a lower rate of pay. This was contrary to the intention regarding the training of apprentices. The Commonwealth awards provided that where an apprentice or employer was not satisfied in regard to the training, the party concerned could make an application to a tribunal comprising representatives of the trade union and the employer and presided over by a member of the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission. By this method both sides could put their case. Some boys served two or three years of apprenticeship and, because of a clash of personalities not related to any major issues in their training, they were deprived of the opportunity to complete their apprenticeship. This costs the public money, as has been emphasized by the member for Torrens. I have not investigated this matter recently, but I do not think it would be possible to train a tradesman thoroughly for less than £3,000. It is necessary to ensure that the job is done properly, because this Parliament has an obligation to the public to see that money is spent to the advantage of the State.

The previous legislation provided for an advisory committee. As the member for Torrens has spoken about the constitution of that committee, I will not repeat what he has said. Advisory trade school committees, whose function it is to advise the advisory committee (which in turn advises the Government), have been established. However, the committee has produced negative results, probably because it has not been able to give effect to recommendations. That is why we have been lagging behind most other States in this field and why this Bill is now before us. We believe a more realistic approach should be made to provide facilities which are highly desirable and which will assist towards the progress and development of better training of these men.

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 deal with preliminary matters. Part II contains administrative provisions and provides that the commission is to be constituted of a chairman and five members appointed by the Governor. Of these five members, one is to be nominated by the Minister of Education, two by the United Trades and Labour Council, one by the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated, and one by the South Australian Employers Federation. This will give employers and employees representation so that their points of view can be submitted and discussed.

The chairman will be a full-time chairman. The member for Torrens questioned whether the work would be sufficient to keep him fully occupied, but I say without any hesitation that, if this work is to be carried out effectively, it will require his services on a full-time basis. He will take over many of the duties previously performed by the Chief Inspector of Factories and the Registrar of Apprentices. It must be remembered that under Commonwealth awards it has been possible to go to the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, whereas under State awards the Registrar of Apprentices has had no authority to act. If a difference arose between employer and apprentice, no machinery or facilities were provided so that the facts could be argued and adjudicated upon. Instead, civil proceedings had to be instituted for breach of contract, and this was most unsatisfactory. Obviously, if three parties do not agree, one of the three is in breach of a contract. I have known an employer to say that an apprentice has not been doing his job, the trade school teachers have advised that the boy is efficient, and often on examination one could not agree with either. The only recourse has been civil action, which has caused delays. This legislation will provide facilities

in the State field similar to those in the Commonwealth field. The nominees will listen to evidence and make a decision that will be observed by both parties. Litigation does not get anyone anywhere, and other action will do more for the employer, employee and the State. During their apprenticeship many boys overstep the mark, but often after being called before the board the same boys have become competent tradesmen, some becoming foremen. That has thoroughly justified the actions of the board. That is why I believe that this is a step in the right direction. Machinery will be provided to deal with these matters on a more practical and humanitarian basis than was the case before. The chairman of the commission will have quite a lot to do, as the problems associated with his work will necessitate much attention. The position itself will be rewarding because the chairman will be able to do much to improve matters. He will have to make himself aware of the variety of matters with which he will have to deal. He must know the position regarding apprentices because he could not carry out his duties unless he did. The facilities in many establishments vary and many industries have different training for their apprentices. It is only right and proper that the chairman should be familiar with these variations.

Provision is made in the Bill for the commission to approve group apprenticeship schemes. This is a good move and has been advocated for many years. It was previously put forward and not properly understood. I remember reading a report from the Secretary for Labour and Industry (Mr. L. B. Bowes) in relation to a conference held about three years ago. It was convened by the Commonwealth Government, and employers and Government representatives considered this important question. I read the report with interest. It expressed amazement at the lack of understanding about group apprenticeship schemes. Apparently many smaller employers did not cotton on to how these schemes could work. However, since then much interest has been shown in this matter. Before I entered Parliament I received telephone calls from employers in industry stating that they would like to assist in training apprentices. The most sought after tradesmen are those from the engineering and electrical trades, and people from these trades were among those who said they would like to play a part in training apprentices. However, under the present system if they wanted an electrical mechanic they had to undertake his training for five years. They did not have the facilities in their establishment to do that. If some method could be devised they could continually have an apprentice. He would change and rotate from one form of training to another. However, in one factory only a limited field of training would be available and dozens of industries are in this position in South Australia. The chairman of the commission must consider these aspects because they need attention.

As the commission becomes established its work will grow, and when the duties are considered it can be seen that a full-time chairman will be valuable. The State will benefit because additional numbers of apprentices will be trained. I do not consider it necessary to deal with every clause in the Bill because that can be done during the Committee stage. However, I have dealt with the matter of the chairman because the member for Torrens was concerned about whether the chairman could be usefully employed. I think the honourable member knows enough about industry to realize that the chairman will be fully occupied by this rewarding work. Clause 5 also provides for the appointment of advisory trade committees and the constitution thereof. These committees are in addition to the commission, and I believe that they are necessary and will provide an important part of the machinery. They seem to follow to some extent the principle laid down under the previous Act. It would not be practical to expect the commission to know every detail and be thoroughly conversant with the requirements of every trade, considering the scope of apprentice training. With my experience in industry I am familiar with the electrical and metal trades. However, I confess that I was appalled to hear reports about what happened in other trades. I heard that people were not carrying out their obligation. It is commonly known that in the hairdressing trade, for example, employers would sooner pay fines imposed on their apprentices for non-attendance at trade school because the apprentices could work at Easter or during a holiday period. That is wrong and is not in accordance with the principles of the contract. However, it has been going on in this particular trade and I daresay it also goes on in other lesser trades. We should remember that the Government provides the money and facilities for trade schools. Teachers are paid to teach. Why should the employers completely ignore the contract and do these things? Surely this warrants some tribunal with authoritative powers to deal with the matter, because the public money is being abused. People

who do this have little interest in advancement of the State; they are interested in personal gain.

I know of cases where apprentices have served two or three years at the trade and as soon as they get to the stage where they start to go on to a higher rate of remuneration, which makes things a little better for them, they are dismissed without reason. I have seen this happen to competent apprentices without any reason being given. To substantiate what I am saying, people dismissed, after looking around, have been employed by other employers and have done their jobs successfully. Their services were dispensed with only because of the rates of pay. Those employers then brought in more apprentices at a lower rate of pay. That exploitation is going on, and that is something which no member of Parliament would support. The system is designed to train people, not to be used for the purpose of gaining cheap labour. At present we have a paucity of legislation with which to cope with that state of affairs, and this Bill will go a long way towards overcoming that position.

We all know that different trades require different standards, because the various trades have different peculiarities. We know, for instance, that in the radio trade the knowledge required is about 85 per cent theoretical and the balance practical, whereas in the furniture trade it is mostly practical knowledge that is required. I think that, provided that the committees to be set up under the commission have the authority to recommend standards, that will be a far more suitable and practical course than the commission's having to decide this matter without details of the trade concerned. Some people may ask why it is necessary to set out standards. The answer is that we must consider the position of the technical schools and their staff. They do not have accommodation to spare, and it is necessary for their classes to be designed in such a manner that every pupil gets the maximum benefit. A class may have 15 youths being trained in a subject, and their school standard may range from Leaving down to Progress certificate. This makes the job of the teachers most difficult.

I know from my personal experience through my representation in the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission in relation to cancellation of indentures that this can have a serious effect upon a boy. It is true that many industries themselves lay down a standard, but we get small and large industries and tremendous differences of opinion between employers. Often it is difficult to reconcile those differences of opinion, and because of the different standards it is difficult to effectively train these boys at the trade school. I know that in respect of the Electrical Trades School it was recommended to employers that they should try to enlist boys of about the Intermediate standard in certain subjects, and that has been done. However, we still find up to about half a dozen boys in the one class who have attended only primary school, and as a result they cannot do their mathematics; they are then looked upon by the other lads as dunderheads, and this causes friction. Also, I believe it affects the outlook of these lads.

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

Mr. HURST: Before the adjournment I clearly illustrated the desirability of trying to get boys to a minimum standard, as this would assist the teachers and perhaps prevent the boys from getting a complex and discontinuing the course. This clause provides that the chairman shall be *ex officio* chairman of all committees, and this is desirable: the chairman should keep abreast of the activities of the various committees. Clause 6 (3) is important, as it provides:

The Governor may also, by proclamation, declare in respect of any trade to which this Part has been applied that an employer shall not employ a minor in that trade except under an indenture of apprenticeship, and may by proclamation revoke any such proclamation.

This is a desirable feature and accords with the industrial practice that has existed here. For many years Commonwealth awards have prescribed certain trades to which boys must be indentured if they are to be employed. This sound provision avoids industrial confusion where boys receive different rates for doing the same job because one is indentured and the other is only a youth labourer. The member for Torrens referred to the clause providing that a youth should attend classes in the employer's time for eight hours each week, and clause 7 permits this provision to be implemented gradually. Unfortunately, South Australia has lacked this provision for many years and is the only State in which it does not operate. In the Commonwealth sphere hours of employment are determined, provision is made that an apprentice shall be taught a trade, and rates of pay on the basis of a 40-hour week are prescribed. As a result, youths in this State are at a disadvantage because, although they work by order of the court and comply with the provisions of the Education Act, they are working longer hours than those in

other States. We are not opposed to boys attending classes in their spare time: indeed, this is encouraged by both the trade union and the Labor movements. But, when it is part of the job and their rates are determined on that basis, they should at least not be at a disadvantage with boys in other States.

A survey of this position was made some years ago. I was alarmed at the number of hours that apprentices were required to put in in one day. Not all boys live within the square mile of Adelaide. Possibly some live at Christies Beach. In such cases, the time taken from leaving home in the morning to returning home at night from work can be 16½ or 17 hours. In modern society it is grossly unjust to expect a youth to spend so much time working and travelling, this being required of him by law to fulfil his obligation. Possibly, a boy stops work at 4.30 p.m. but has no time to get home to an evening meal, so he has to hang about until the trade school opens. As a result, many boys have to put in long hours to meet their legal obligations. It is not right that a boy who works in industry for eight hours a day should have to study at night. We are not getting the best out of them. It is grinding them into the ground. It is only reasonable that the boys should do it within their working hours and then, if they desire, they can take additional classes in their own time. That is being done not by apprentices but by adults in industry who are keen to keep abreast of the latest knowledge. To compel boys to put in these hours that the court stipulates is unjust and unfair. The employers will appreciate that this is not an obligation. They should not expect greater concessions in South Australia than employers get in other States, because that is not in accordance with good practice.

Reference was made to a report by the then Superintendent of Technical Schools (Mr. J. S. Walker) who suggested that this was not a good thing. We know that circumstances of that time guided the statement made by that responsible officer, because we all know that for many years there was a lack of training facilities and accommodation for boys. In regard to technical training and tuition, it is not practicable for the Education Department and the trade schools to accept everyone who wants to come in, even adults, where it should be encouraged for the benefit of industry. Because of the lack of accommodation and the backlog that has existed for many years, people who desire to do advanced classes find even today that facilities are not available. We all know Mr. Walker had a job to do, and we are aware of the attention he has paid to this aspect. However, we realize that his decisions must be guided by existing circumstances. I am not saying it is possible immediately to implement this provision; in fact, the Bill prescribes that it shall be brought in by regulation, for sufficient accommodation does not exist at present.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't it a fact that some apprentices went to classes at night because the accommodation was not available in the daytime?

Mr. HURST: Day-time accommodation just did not exist. The situation has further deteriorated because of lack of attention to the basic training of apprentices. About 18 months ago, as a result of conferences held between the Commonwealth Government and State departments, awards were amended to provide for a full-time training period of up to six months. Of course, this can only create embarrassment when sufficient accommodation is not available. This situation has been allowed to exist for too long. I know that the Minister of Education will have a difficult task to perform, but I have no doubt he will do the best he can with the existing facilities.

Another desirable feature in the Bill is the Government's consideration to country apprentices, who have been neglected in the past. Country youths are entitled, as near as practicable, to the same attention as that paid to their counterparts in the metropolitan area. True, over the last few years correspondence courses have been introduced, but I point out that in the country they are undertaken in the youths' own time. The Bill provides that they will be able to receive instruction during working hours, and makes certain provisions in respect of arrangements to be made by youths with their local technical schools. The member for Frome is greatly interested in this matter, and I give him full credit for his activities in this field. Why should not youths in his district be entitled to the facilities available to youths in the metropolitan area? The Bill also provides for country youths to come to the city, and nothing is more beneficial to their training than their inspecting the city's industries, such as powerhouses and the General Motors-Holden's establishment. The small cost of fares, board and expenses will be recouped by virtue of the extra knowledge obtained and applied in the trades.

The Electricity Trust provides facilities for training apprentices at its own school,

where boys are given 12 months' training in the shop under the supervision of competent tradesmen. This additional tuition results in a saving to employers in the long run and even country employers would benefit to the same extent as employers in the city if they provided adequate facilities for apprentices.

The member for Torrens referred to clause 18 and expressed amazement at the inclusion of the provision that the chairman shall advise the secretaries of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia, the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Inc., and the South Australian Employers Federation of the names of all apprentices in respect of whom indentures of apprenticeship are received after the commencement of the Act.

However, we know that those bodies will be represented on the commission and that the members will be there to express their views in regard to training. Everyone wants to see this carried out in the manner intended and I say without equivocation that, in order to do justice and arrive at proper decisions, the members of the commission would require a knowledge of industry and the different undertakings. The variations as between employer and employer are so great that it is only proper that the representatives should have a thorough knowledge of the situation in order to arrive at correct decisions and make recommendations for the benefit of the trade. Indeed, the members of the commission ought to be obliged to talk to the apprentices and employers periodically in order to obtain the best results. I think the provision is desirable, because without it the relevant information to enable the employer or the apprentice to be spoken to would not be obtained.

Mr. Ryan: There has been neglect.

Mr. HURST: There has been too much neglect, and insufficient interest has been taken. A fortnight could be wasted without a provision that assists these people to have discussions with the employer or the apprentice concerned. The measure is a good one and encourages the people responsible to make themselves conversant with the changes that are being made in industry from day to day. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What do you think of clause 9?

Mr. HURST: That is a sensible provision, and it is being followed in many instances now. It will keep boys up to a reasonable standard, as the commission will be able to inspect. Every effort should be made to bring apprentices up to the proper standard. If the Leader wishes to have any more comments from me, I shall be happy to make them in Committee. This is a good and progressive measure, and I think members opposite are jealous that they have not been able to introduce it themselves. I am glad to see the Leader nodding his agreement. I appreciate his co-operation, and look forward to his support when a vote is taken.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): In indicating my general support of this Bill, I will elaborate on one or two things that the member for Torrens did not deal with fully, particularly the two hours study at night. If this, combined with studying for eight hours in the employer's time, means that apprentices will be able to complete courses in a shorter period, it will be all to the good in the long run, but the initial costs to the employer will be greater.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Will it shorten the course?

Mr. McANANEY: If it does not, the Bill will have failed to achieve what it sets out to do. The member for Semaphore did not think much of the present situation, for which he blamed the employer, but surely both sides can contribute to an unsatisfactory situation. There should be mutual effort by employers and employees. If one wants to train to be an accountant one must study at night, and night study is necessary at adult education centres: in every other field, the individual must make some contribution. I do not think it helps the outlook or character of young people if it is made easy for them to become trained citizens in the community, from which training they have a higher qualification later in life. As a trained accountant I hold a Diploma in Commerce at the University of Adelaide, and I obtained my qualifications by studying at night after spending the day working. To do this is no real effort. During the period when I obtained my qualifications I saved enough money to take a trip to Ceylon. I was not spending my money, because 40 weeks of my year were spent working. Naturally this meant that I enjoyed my free time when it came around. It is good for young people to take a bit of initiative and assist in their own training. Although things should be easier for young people than they were when I was younger, if things are made too easy we will have a generation of drones who will make no contribution to the community as a whole.

I should like to see one or two aspects of the Bill improved in Committee. I cannot see why it is necessary that the indenture should be

sighted by the Chamber of Manufactures and the Trades and Labor Council. There are only three parties to the contract and they should be the only ones advised. The present chairman has not spent much time on this job but if he is appointed full-time he will spend much time improving the relationship between apprentices and employers. Therefore, benefit could be derived from having a full-time chairman. I favour the Bill because I favour anything that helps to train people so that they can be more productive and make a greater contribution to the community. However, everything that increases the cost of production must be guarded against. I am confident that, if all parties put their heart into these proposals, and if the apprentices are willing to learn and to make their contribution, more goods will be produced and the cost of production will be reduced. Much is said about social services but they can only be paid for according to the productivity of a State or country. The Opposition's main criticism of the Government is that the excessive control it is introducing will reduce production. Because of this, the Government might find it extremely difficult to carry out its rash promises on social services. I support the Bill and will have more to say in Committee.

Mr. CLARK (Gawler): I have been particularly struck with the friendly atmosphere in the debate. I thought that the member for Stirling was going to spoil it when he referred to "rash promises of the Government" at the end of this speech, but he sat down without adding anything more. This afternoon, members had the benefit of a lengthy speech by the member for Torrens, who, as an industrialist, knows much about the employment of apprentices. Then we heard from the member for Semaphore, who over the years has been closely in touch with this problem because of his association with the trade union movement. I think that those who bothered to listen carefully to those two speeches would have heard something interesting and therefore would have been fully informed on the issue that is being discussed.

Of course, I support the Bill. There is no doubt that there is today (and there has been for a long time) a continuing shortage of skilled tradesmen. We are given all sorts of reasons for this, but nobody seems to be sure of the real reason. I can remember, Mr. Speaker (as you will yourself), that on a number of occasions over the years when the present Government was in Opposition we referred to this matter. I particularly recall that in 1958 we introduced a Bill which we thought would reform the Apprentices Act. At that time Mr. O'Halloran (I think that if ever a man was entitled to the prefix "honourable" it was that gentleman, although he never earned it in the strict meaning of the word) introduced a Bill, and in his second reading explanation he said:

> The Apprentices Act deals with a subject that is becoming more and more important each year with the techniques that are being introduced into industry generally, and the fact that more and more skill is therefore required. Also, it appears that if an apprentice is not encouraged in every possible way to acquire skill in industry there can be social consequences . . . so any consideration of matters relating to apprenticeship are of great importance.

Although those words were spoken by Mr. O'Halloran in 1958, I think all honourable members will agree that they are just as applicable today. As I said, there is a real shortage of apprentices today, and we know that many more skilled tradesmen are required. This Bill has been introduced in an honest attempt to improve the situation, and I think is worthy of success. If honourable members will cast their minds back for a moment I think they will remember that following the introduction of our Bill in 1958 the then Premier, although he was not completely in sympathy with the Bill, told us that he would ask the Apprentices Board to report on the matters it contained. I understand that the board reported to the Minister of Education recommending many alterations to the Act, but unfortunately nothing further was heard of it in this place.

It must be obvious to all honourable members that the industrial scene has changed enormously since 1958. I have thought for many years that the present Apprentices Board is unable, because of its constitution, to take any positive action. Although the board can recommend certain action it cannot implement anything at all. Under the present amending legislation, the board will be replaced by a commission, and the member for Torrens had something to say this afternoon about the constitution of that commission. The important thing is that this commission is to be given power to act and attempt to improve the quality and supply of apprentices. I like the composition of the commission: it will have two Government nominees (including a permanent chairman); two members nominated by the employers' organizations, and two by the United Trades and Labor Council. This is in contrast to the present committee,

which has four Government members, two members nominated by the Trades and Labor Council, and two by the employers' organizations. With a large number of Government nominess, there is a chance that the other members can be overawed.

A vital amendment is clause 7 (4), which provides the apprentice to attend school for eight hours each week. I have been interested in this aspect for some time. I know that this cannot be implemented immediately because of problems of accommodation and equipment, but I hope that it will not be long before this can be done. I received a letter this week from a constituent of mine who is interested in the problems of apprentices. He lives at Elizabeth South, and his letter states:

Dear Sir, I am making an appeal to you on behalf of apprentices and parents of apprentices in the Elizabeth area to bring before Parliament during the current debate on apprentices the need to establish an apprentice training school or a branch of the Institute of Technology on a site located in Elizabeth Centre. In support of the establishment of an apprenticeship training school or a branch of the Institute of Technology in the Elizabeth area I point out the difficulties in transport and the long hours involved due to the scattered arrangement and remoteness of the existing apprentice training schools.

This person attaches a list which I shall not read, but those who realize the problems know that the apprentices' schools are scattered around the metropolitan area.

Mr. Freebairn: What classes are they taking at Gawler? Are they taking any there?

Mr. CLARK: The technical school is conducting many classes and classes are made available through the Elizabeth Adult Education Centre, which is virtually the same thing. The letter continues:

To take a case in point, my son is one of about 20 engineering apprentices at General Motors-Holden, Elizabeth, who must complete the first 12 months at Woodville. During this time, 12 of this number are to attend the trade school at Panorama, which is located south of the Daws Road Repatriation Hospital one night a week from 6 to 8 p.m. This means they cannot return home for an evening meal and must kill time between 4.15 and 6 p.m. before attending lectures. The lectures conclude at 8 o'clock and the programme is to catch a bus back to the city, then a train to Elizabeth which means that the boy has a long day, reaching home after 10 o'clock. To make this harder—

I have checked on this, and it is correct—

the authorities at the Panorama section of the trade school have refused to re-arrange the boys in class so that those from Elizabeth could attend on the same night, giving them the opportunity to get home much quicker, travelling together in private cars which are available. G.M.H. apprentice instructors have made representations to the school to have this made easier for the boys, but have met with no response. Notwithstanding the problems as stated above, the very real hazard of travelling to and from these scattered departments through peak hour city traffic and late at night is causing great concern to parents. In closing, whilst I wish you to support the claim for an apprentice training school at Elizabeth, I would very much appreciate it if you could use your influence to alter the hours of schooling of apprentices to cut out night classes altogether.

So I think that my constituent and the parents of the other children concerned would be happy about the early move proposed in this Bill to conduct the lessons at night. I hope it will not be long before that is done. I draw the attention of the Minister to the problems at Elizabeth, which is now a big city. Not only the motor engineering apprentices are concerned, as I have said here, but many other apprentices as well. I am pleased to see also in clause 11 another matter that has been concerning me for a long time:

. . . an apprentice during the first three years of his apprenticeship shall be required, either under the supervision of his employer or in a school or class of the Education Department, as may be approved by the Commission, to carry on the theoretical and practical work of or incidental to his course of instruction by correspondence for four hours each week during working hours and the employer shall permit him to carry on the same.

I have never been an apprentice myself—

Mr. Quirke: Yes, you were.

Mr. CLARK: I suppose we were all apprentices at some time or other. Most of us probably still are. We all have something to learn although sometimes some of us do not realize it. I am reminded of a course a few years ago when my eldest son was an apprenticed motor mechanic, especially in the first two years of apprenticeship. Certainly a motor mechanic apprentice (I do not know much about other apprentices) is kept busy all day, though he is not paid much money for that work. Then at night my son had to knuckle down to the correspondence lessons sent to him from the Technical Correspondence School. I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to that school for the lessons sent out: they are excellent. I remember going through them carefully.

Mr. Ryan: Who did the lessons—you or your son?

Mr. CLARK: At the time I was called upon to add my little assistance, such as it was. After a boy works hard during the day he finds

it difficult to work solidly at his correspondence lessons at night. The amendment in this Bill will be valuable. I do not mean that the boys will not have any work to do at night (that would not be advisable) but it will at least ease the burden on them. We must do all we can to attract apprentices. Over the years, and especially in the case of my own son, I have seen that it has been possible for young fellows to get jobs where their remuneration was much in excess of what the apprentice was getting, especially in his first year or two. There is a strong temptation to take up these more highly paid jobs. However, more moans were heard from apprentices who had to put up with poorer conditions. This did not encourage boys to become apprentices. As I wish to avoid being blamed for displaying any political rancour in this debate, I merely add that this is an important Bill, well meriting the attention that has already been paid it by certain honourable members. I am certain that, if we can obtain some intelligent amendments that will improve the measure, they will be acceptable, but I stress that they must be intelligent, as opposed to some amendments that have been moved to legislation previously introduced into the House. The Bill will raise the quality of apprentices; it will boost the quantity, and will assist employers with whom apprentices will train. I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports the general principles of the Bill, although I believe one or two amendments may be moved. I previously drew the attention of the member for Semaphore to new section 9 which, on the face of it, does not present much difficulty, and which states:

If any member of the commission—(*a*) is absent from three consecutive meetings of the commission except with leave granted by the commission; or (*b*) resigns his office by writing under his hand addressed to the Minister, his office shall thereby become vacant.

However, new section 8 provides:

A quorum for the transaction of business shall be constituted by the chairman and two members, one of whom shall be a member appointed pursuant to paragraph (*b*) of subsection (3) of this section and one of whom shall be a member appointed pursuant to either (*c*) or paragraph (*d*) of subsection (3) as aforesaid.

Honourable members will see that, by either side merely absenting itself (as it can do pursuant to new section 9), it can prevent any decision being made, because it is necessary for one of the two trade union representatives, and for one of the two employer representatives to be present before a quorum is constituted. If it is desired to avoid making an awkward decision, all one party has to do is merely to stay away, thereby delaying proceedings for up to three meetings. There can be no meeting if a quorum is not present, so either side could prevent an important decision from being reached merely by not attending the meeting. Members doing that would not jeopardize their seats, because there cannot be a meeting unless a quorum is present. The member for Semaphore appeared to be happy about the clause, but I consider some slight amendment is required. I am not suggesting that either the union or the employer representative would obstruct the work, but nevertheless it would be simple to prevent a decision from being reached. The Attorney-General might look at this and associated clauses, because it should not be possible to take advantage of the provision and prevent a decision from being reached.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I, too, support this measure. Adam Smith, the father of real economics, who wrote in English that people could understand, said that the wealth of a nation was the production of its people. The wealth of a nation is gauged by the value of that production. These are days of advanced scientific production and technological advances. Automation will come later, with all its complications. To enhance production, the worker must be educated.

In these days a boy must have a basic primary and secondary education. Gone are the days when it was necessary to teach apprentices only how to handle a few tools, masterly though their work was. The type of work that must be undertaken today and the fineness of it, dealing in one-ten thousandth of an inch and even smaller microscopic measurements, calls for special education. The boy must be trained in school to accommodate the additional education that will be given to him later in his training to become a skilled person. That is why I support this measure. I do not think that spending eight continuous hours, instead of the present number of hours, will hurt anyone. If this increases costs (and to some extent it could), they will become overhead costs. I will not go into that form of economics, as we know that the employer can recover his costs if he sells his product: if he cannot, he does not produce it. It is as simple as that.

We want fewer and fewer people listed every three months as unemployed and more and more

of the people called for in every Saturday's *Advertiser* in page after page of advertisements calling for skilled men. These are the people who are in demand. I will admit that apprentice training has been neglected, but it has not been a one-sided neglect. In many ways employers have contributed to the shortage of skilled craftsmen, as the realists among them will concede. We know perfectly well that some employers never undertook the training of an apprentice but immediately he was trained by someone else they entered into the market clamouring for him, and took him away from the people who trained him. That happened too often to too many people. That sort of attitude must go by the board, and we must have the maximum of highly trained people who will produce a type of wealth that will ultimately represent the wealth of the country, according to Adam Smith's theory, which has been proved over the years to be completely correct.

There are various forms of economy according to the type of labour. In eastern countries there is a type of labour supplied by millions of people and applied to lowly menial work. This work needs no direct skill, and the result accruing to the individual is a handful of rice. These countries must increase the value of their production, both in quantity and quality. They are beginning to realize that they have a massive job ahead to bring this about, and they are now being helped by the rest of the world. We do not begrudge them that help. As citizens of the world, we must help them out of the situations they are in as mendicant nations and see that the labour of their populations will have a real value and represent in great measure the wealth of the countries.

Mr. Jennings: Has this something to do with apprentice rice polishers?

Mr. QUIRKE: There may be apprentice rice polishers, but I do not think a long apprenticeship would be involved.

Mr. Jennings: How relevant to the Bill are your remarks?

Mr. QUIRKE: They may be completely irrelevant, but if the honourable member would remain awake instead of intermittently slumbering and then coming back to consciousness he would understand what was being said. He constantly misrepresents what people are saying: it must be an art he has.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That does not sound like you!

Mr. QUIRKE: I have repeatedly had this type of nonsense from the member for Enfield.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: You are out of character.

Mr. QUIRKE: His was an irrelevant interjection. Nobody would know better than he what I was saying. The honourable member is a constant source of interruption.

Mr. Hurst: What clause are you speaking on?

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not care what clause it is. I will speak irrespective of what people think about it. This country, although its items of production are of a greater value than the items of production of a country like India, must make its items of production more valuable. This can be done only when greater skill is applied, and it will be achieved by training apprentices now in large numbers. Everyone must undertake the responsibility: the Government and the employers are responsible. If the training of apprentices is carried out then the country will meet the demands of its people for a continual march of progress towards being a wealthy country with a highly trained, competent and happy work force. One day the demand in Saturday's *Advertiser* for people to fill occupations will not be so great. We shall have people able to fill the jobs, and every job that is filled will be such that it will create another job.

This Bill, I am glad to say, is the first move towards aiding the upward march of the population of this country to take its place among the most competent and highly skilled peoples in the world. We are not far away from that now, but there are not enough people in the highly skilled category. We want more and more of them because our population will expand. We do not want to be in the position that America is in today. That country has a highly skilled section, as well as a section that is unskilled. Because their production is of little value they remain in a lowly position. About 5,000,000 are completely unemployed and 30,000,000 on a low standard of living, notwithstanding the immensity of the wealth of that nation. This is primarily because they cannot sell something they have not got—and that is skill. We do not want that position in this country, but we could have it if we neglect the opportunities to provide for a population that is in the first rank in the matter of skill.

I now draw the attention of members to Western Germany. During the First World War, when we had prisoners of war, I noticed that it was the exception to find one of them

untrained in something. They were artisans and craftsmen. They have kept these skills right down through their history, and immediately after the devastation of the Second World War, when whole towns were obliterated, such was their skill that they rose from the ashes of their defeat to be probably the greatest country in Europe today. They have done this in a comparatively short time because they realize that if they are to retain that position everyone in the country must pull his weight in the most skilful way possible. We want that spirit in this country in full measure. The Bill is a contribution towards that, and that is why I give it my wholehearted support.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support the general principle of the Bill. How pleasing it has been to listen to the excellent speeches made by members on both sides of the House in support of the Bill. The speech we heard this afternoon from the member for Semaphore was a fine contribution. Undoubtedly he is an expert in this field. I also pay a compliment to the member for Torrens, who approached this matter as an industrialist, whereas the member for Semaphore obviously approached it as a trade union representative would approach it. I do not think any speaker has referred to the different rates of pay that apprentices receive over their four or five years of apprenticeship. I refer to it now because under this Bill—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why are you keeping this going?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Attorney-General can make his contribution presently if he wishes to do so.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have no intention of doing that; everything that can be said about this Bill has already been said.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am making a further contribution and I ask the Attorney-General to pay me the courtesy of listening. This Bill increases the responsibility of employers, for they are to provide for eight hours' tuition in their time compared with four hours under the present legislation. I think it is worth referring to the Metal Trades Award, which I find printed in the *Industrial Information Bulletin* of January, 1964, and which the Parliamentary Librarian tells me is the latest award. It states:

In an order dated November 25, 1963, the Commissioner varied the award by consent increasing the rates payable to apprentices covered by the award. The new rates, expressed as percentages of the adult male basic wage, with the previous percentages shown in brackets, are as follows:

Four and five year terms—

	Per cent.	Per cent.
First year	42	(41)
Second year	54	(52.5)
Third year	63.1	(61.5)
Fourth year	95	(92.5)
Fifth year	100 plus 44s. 6d.	(100 plus 36s.)

I think the Attorney-General would do well to pay attention to this. No doubt he moves in non-trade union circles, but many of his supporters are trade unionists, and it would not do at all if they thought he was rather too sophisticated to take note of their particular problems.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The matter has been well ventilated.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I support the second reading.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): Despite the Attorney-General's suggestion that the matter has been well ventilated, there are one or two matters that have not been mentioned. Any person who is not in favour of increasing the skills of our labour force is not looking squarely at the problem. Although the company in which I am interested does not deal with apprentices because, generally speaking, it is a manufacturing business, we are at present (as the Minister of Agriculture will know) using up one of the Government's Hawkesbury College scholarships for which the Minister did not get any applicants. He was kind enough to permit us to use that scholarship, thereby enabling us to send two men to Hawkesbury instead of one. I mention that to show that I am very sympathetic to people wishing to improve their skill. My company encourages all the young men who come into our office staff to improve their academic standards, too, at our expense, and it is money well spent. Therefore, I make no bones about saying that this Bill has my sincere support.

In the matter referred to by the Leader, I suggest that there is no need to state that a quorum shall be any more than three people, the chairman and two others. If the representatives of the employers or employees decide not to attend a meeting, that is their business. The structure is weakened if the quorum is specified. I agree with the member for Torrens, who has had wide experience in this field, is on the board of the Institute of Technology, and who knows something about the training programme for these young men, when he suggested that the appointment of a

full-time chairman may be premature. If the State's industrial growth demands it and the chairman's time is absorbed dealing with apprentice problems, a full-time appointment can then be made, but this legislation should not provide for it.

Under new section 14 (1), for the purposes of this legislation the Minister shall appoint an advisory trade committee. I have no complaint with that, but subsection (5) states that the Minister may remove any member of an advisory trade committee if he is satisfied that the member is for any reason unable to perform the duties of his office. The Minister will have already appointed the member and, whoever the Minister may be, it is putting an undesirable power in his hands if he is to have the opportunity to enforce his views and policies on a member of this committee. The success or failure of this legislation will depend on the assiduity of, and time devoted by, these people: these advisory committees are an important adjunct of this legislation dealing, as they do, with all aspects of the various trades. There should be no fear in the mind of a member appointed that he will be removed if he does or does not do something. This is sufficiently important legislation for all members to fully consider each clause. I agree with what some members on this side have said, that we have had a well informed discussion. The members for Semaphore and Gawler have made excellent contributions to the debate. When it comes to dealing with this matter in Committee, I hope we shall have the benefit of their advice and experience. If they can convince me that their ideas are right, I shall support them.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 3. Page 3797.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support this Bill, as I have supported all past Town Planning Bills. This legislation is an important step forward in planning and, in general, I strongly approve of it. We all have differences of opinion, however, and I shall criticize some aspects of the Bill; but generally it is timely and I am glad to see it.

On the other hand, I protest at the haste with which it has been introduced. It has been drafted over many months (I do not know how long) and, as far as Opposition members are concerned, it has been behind closed doors for five or six months. Then it is presented to us on one day, and within six days we are expected to discuss it. That is not a fair way of dealing with it, and I protest strongly. Generally, when a far-reaching Bill is introduced, members are given as much time as possible to consider it and people are given time to discuss it fairly fully. On the other hand, after this Bill has been proceeded with comparatively leisurely for five or six months, it comes here and within six days the debate has to be resumed.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Six days is as much as you ever gave us for anything.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I was expecting somebody to say something like that, but that is not correct. In fact, when we were in Government we gave as much time as possible for the perusal of Bills and, when only a short time was possible for this, the matter was the subject of negotiation, and the Leader, as Premier, would discuss the position with members opposite and perhaps explain the reason for any haste. But that did not occur this time. I can name plenty of Bills that have been on the Notice Paper for a long time, which has given members a chance to consider them. In fact, I know of one Bill that was introduced one session with the express purpose of being discussed next session. Although that is perhaps longer than is necessary, I point out that that can happen. However, this measure was introduced last week. I obtained copies of the Bill and of the Minister's second reading explanation as soon as they were available so that I could send them to people who I knew were interested.

I have discussed with some of those people the results of their perusing the Bill; obviously, some have not had time to examine it. Some district councils, which I suppose could be more directly concerned with the matter than anybody else, would not know anything about the measure yet. Any knowledge some of them may have about this Bill up to the present, as far as I know, will probably be through the Local Government Association, which is a far cry from a council's having the opportunity to discuss the matter at its own meeting. That is not fair. We hear much about Opposition members speaking to measures unnecessarily; on almost every occasion that the Premier has been asked a question about the sittings of the House he has prefaced his reply with the words "If the Opposition co-operates . . .". There are now about

127 Bills on members' files, whereas the usual number in any session would not exceed 75. Naturally, we have to express our opinions on measures before the House if we are to be an effective Opposition in the interests of the State. This session has seen some far-reaching legislation introduced; the Government itself claims that many of its Bills are of major importance, so naturally we are keen to discuss such legislation to the best of our ability. Although I have examined the Bill and discussed its implications with other people, I may not have comprehended it completely; I may make some mistakes in respect of certain provisions, and I may have overlooked some features of it that I should have liked to debate. The name "Town Planning" has been dropped and this measure is the Planning and Development Bill. I suppose that the name does not matter much, but my reaction is that, strictly speaking, this is not a development Bill. The development of the State is not the business of anyone other than our people.

This is undoubtedly a planning Bill and it will be the business of the authority to guide the activities of the people who will develop the State rather than to themselves develop it. This authority will regulate the activities of people. It will be vested with tremendous power and will be one of the largest instrumentalities in the State. There is no doubt it will lift town planning to greater eminence. The Director of Town Planning will be one of the most important servants of the public in South Australia, although I do not know whether he will be a public servant as such.

I respect the present Town Planner (Mr. S. B. Hart): every honourable member knows him well; nobody has found fault with him; and he is conscientious and able. The town planning report of a few years ago was largely his work and is a credit to him. I support the Minister in his commendation of Mr. Hart and of the Parliamentary Draftsman who drafted the Bill (Mr. Ludovici), who also has done extremely well. I do not want any criticism I have to be related to personalities. In fact, I am not criticizing the the authority as such, but I draw the attention of the House to the fact that this authority will have tremendous power, probably much more than people at present realize. It will be able to buy and sell land, and certainly will do that. It will become a big landowner in its own right. A multi-storey building will be provided for the authority in a pleasant setting somewhere in the metropolitan area within a few years.

The work of the authority will in many respects supersede the work of local government. Although the financial provision for the authority will be by way of appropriation from Parliament, the authority may proceed from there with little recourse to Parliamentary funds. In times of inflationary pressure we have seen how an authority that can buy and sell land can increase its capital holdings tremendously, and the more it does this the more important it becomes. In that way, the importance of the Attorney-General's portfolio will increase.

Clause 8 provides that this authority will be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. Many things formerly under other portfolios will come to the Attorney-General. For instance, last year a committee was appointed to investigate the use of land around the inland waterways of the State. That committee is sitting and taking evidence, and it will duly make a report to the appropriate Minister, but for all the good it will do it may as well go direct to the Attorney-General, because that is where it will finally go: it will go first to the Minister, be forwarded to the authority on planning and development, and then be sent to the Attorney-General.

The Bill provides that this authority will consist of nine members. Although I agree with the idea of setting up the authority, I do not agree with its constitution, and I intend to move amendments in Committee to alter it. I think nine members is too many. The Bill provides that the Director of Planning will be chairman of the authority and that the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Commissioner of Highways and the Surveyor-General will be appointed by right of office. The Governor will appoint five other members, of whom one will be nominated by the Minister of Housing on the recommendation of the Housing Trust, one will be nominated by the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, one will be selected from a panel of names submitted by the Municipal Association of S.A., one will be selected from a panel chosen by the Local Government Association of South Australia Incorporated, and one will be selected from a panel chosen jointly by the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures Incorporated and the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce Inc. The first four I have mentioned are public servants and the next is an officer of the Housing Trust, so five out of the nine will be public servants

or their equivalent. The next three I have mentioned are representatives of local government, so only one member will not be actively associated with the State Government or local government. I do not think this is a just or wise provision, and I believe this particular representation should be strengthened.

I will move to amend the Bill to provide for an authority of seven members, with the Director as chairman, one representative from the Highways and Local Government Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, one appointed on the recommendation of the Minister of Housing (not necessarily the Housing Trust), two representatives of local government (one from the Local Government Association and one from the Municipal Association), one from the Chambers of Commerce and Manufactures, and one from the Real Estate Institute. On my authority there would be two representatives out of seven as against one out of nine who would not be either local government or State Government representatives, and I believe it would work better. I will discuss this matter again in Committee.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Shouldn't the Surveyor-General be on it?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I realize that he is on the authority referred to in the Bill. I gave much thought to his being a member but finally decided that he should not be. The authority can refer to him for all the information it needs without his needing to be a representative. If an authority is selected on the principle of who would be useful it quickly gets too big to work effectively. I believe that smaller bodies are more effective than large ones, and I discussed this point recently on another matter.

Under the Bill the decisions of the authority can be appealed against to the Planning Appeal Board. The board is to have three members, all appointed by the Governor. The chairman shall be either a local court judge, a special magistrate or a legal practitioner (as defined in the Legal Practitioners Act) of not less than five years' standing; the second member is to be appointed from a panel chosen jointly by the governing bodies of the Municipal and Local Government Associations of South Australia; and the third member is to be selected from a panel of three names chosen by the governing body of the Adelaide Division of the Australian Planning Institute. In Committee I shall move amendments to alter this board in an effort to make it more realistic. I believe the chairman should be a man who can deal with legal problems. A local court judge or magistrate should be the chairman, for I see no reason to allow for the appointment of a legal practitioner. Undoubtedly many fine legal practitioners could be found but if the judge or magistrate is appointed as chairman it will give the board more standing in the eyes of the public, and this is important.

I fully agree with the appointment of a member from the Municipal and Local Government Associations, because this is necessary. However, I do not agree at all with the appointment of a representative from the planning institute. I believe it is quite unnecessary for a planner to be on the appeal board. When a decision was given by the authority I believe that the person representing the planning institute would almost instinctively tend to lean towards the authority's point of view. I feel sure he would do so, because I imagine he would be a professional planner. I would rather see a representative from the Institute of Valuers, a man in private practice, for I think it would be far more realistic to have such a nominee. If we have a representative from the Institute of Valuers who is in private practice (and I emphasize that) we shall have somebody who is fully capable of answering almost 50 per cent or more of the questions and views put up by an appellant.

Plenty of good precedents exist for the use of valuers in appeals of this sort. In fact, the Land Tax Act provides for an appeal committee, and the committee that sits on those appeals has a magistrate as its chairman. It also has a representative of the Real Estate Institute for metropolitan area appeals, and he is replaced for country appeals by various people who are appointed by Executive Council. I know that in the case of the southern districts that representative is a farmer. The third member of this committee is a valuer. That appeal committee has worked extremely well. I believe the appeal board under this Bill would be a much better tribunal if a valuer was appointed to it and if the representative of the planning institute was not there.

On looking at the definitions in the Bill I was rather amused to see that the Government had changed its idea of what constituted the metropolitan area within the last few days. In a measure discussed not very long ago the Government held that the metropolitan area consisted of the corporation areas that existed in 1954. However, the "metropolitan planning

area'' defined in this Bill is very much wider and goes for miles and miles outside that other boundary. I recommend the Government to have another look at the definition it applied in the case of the Constitution Act Amendmont Bill that was discussed earlier, and it might change its mind on that matter.

I point out that this authority is under the general control and direction of the Minister. Just exactly what type of directions it takes I do not know, and later I shall seek further information on this point. If it means that any decision of the authority can be reversed by the Minister I am not in favour of it. If it means that the Minister can give orders to that authority and have them enforced, it is going much too far. I hope we shall get a more precise definition shortly on this matter. Regarding the appeal board, I do not like clause 26 (3), which states:

The determination of the board shall be final and not subject to appeal.

That is obnoxious: it should not be final and should be subject to an appeal. This provision will cause the authority more public criticism than any other power it has been given, because however willingly it sets to work and however wise, restrained and moderate its activities, it must be affected by the knowledge that, if an appeal is not allowed, its decision is correct and the decision cannot be reversed. It is not good for anyone to have such wide powers. The present Town Planning Act provides for certain types of appeals, when disallowed, to be reported on in Parliament. This refers particularly to plans, so that Parliament can easily become the final court of appeal from decisions when an appeal is disallowed by the planning authority. Some use has been made of this provision, but I do not know how much.

It would be wrong to say that it has not been of considerable value. In the opinion of many, the fact that Parliament is there to discuss the matter if necessary, and possibly reverse the decision, has a restraining effect on any authority, and this is a good thing, particularly when such wide powers are being given to this planning authority. The present Act provides that a report be made to both Houses of Parliament, and that a joint committee be then appointed to examine the question. That is possibly the best method of dealing with appeals should a further decision be necessary. If there is no appeal justice will not be done. Although I say that the present legislation has been effective, it is not easy to prove it either way: the important thing is that the provision is there. The strength of a navy may lie in an idle battleship, as the safety of the nation would be in jeopardy if it were not there. An appeal provision has a restraining effect on an authority.

Clause 29 provides for an examination of the planning area by the authority, and several factors must be considered by the authority in drawing up the plans. One I do not like and hope will soon be removed is required by paragraph (*e*) (ii) which states:

the extent of land within the planning area already divided into allotments and the extent to which such land has not been used for the purposes for which the land has been so divided;

If the authority states that there is enough land subdivided in a particular area, this decision will automatically affect the blocks, and could be extremely deleterious to the public interest. Many blocks in apparently empty subdivisions are owned by people who may be raising the necessary finance to build on them. Some blocks are undoubtedly sold and resold. It was happening much more frequently a few years ago than it is today, but the blocks have been used for speculative purposes. In any case they are individually owned and no-one is to know the reason why they are not being built on now. I am afraid that the authority will perhaps refuse further subdivisions in an area because of subdivisions already made and, by doing so, will in effect be saying, ''We want to see more houses put up on existing blocks.'' But in doing that he will also be giving a licence to the owners of those blocks to increase prices, and nobody knows what the prices of them are without considerable investigation. It could force up the prices of the existing blocks falsely, which, to my mind, would give an unfair advantage to the owners of the blocks. In addition to that, of course, there are other reasons why people should not have to go and choose a particular area when there are willing vendors further along in areas in which they want to live. I do not like this provision.

Clause 36, one of the largest clauses in the Bill, deals with planning regulations. It has what I think is a rather unusual and extraordinary provision, which should be removed. Subclause (7) states:

No planning regulation shall be regarded as invalid on the ground (*c*) that any formality prescribed by this Act has not been observed.

If it is there to be done, it should be done. If it is not necessary to be done, there is no need to have it at all but, if it says that such

and such a thing should be done, there should be no escape from the authority if it fails to do it. That provision should not be there, and I hope that in Committee it will be removed.

Part V, dealing with interim development control within the metropolitan planning area, has caused me considerable difficulty, because obviously in many respects it is necessary. On the other hand, it can be one of the most difficult features to justify to the owners of property. It is necessary to have this interim development Part in more or less the form in which it is expressed. Certainly, it is far-reaching, particularly clause 41(5), which states:

Where any land is subject to this section, no person shall, so long as the land is so subject (*a*) change the existing use to which the land or any buildings or structures thereon is or are lawfully being put; or (*b*) construct, convert or alter any building or structure thereon, without the consent in writing of the authority. Penalty: Five hundred dollars.

That will cause much paper or counter work for someone with the authority. It will not be hard for people to simply get the authority to do things which the authority will grant; but there will be many things that the authority will of necessity refuse, and that will be harsh and could blight business areas. This is a matter of administration rather than law, but there are some areas of the city where it would clearly have been more desirable had they never been industrialized. No doubt other mistakes have been made in the course of Adelaide's growth, but if mistakes can be prevented under this Bill it will be all to the good. However, to my mind it is not necessarily sound policy to try to enact provisions that should have been in force many years ago. One provision may not affect one area, but in other areas it can prevent business from developing, and thereby harm employees and employers, and even the whole State. The authorities will have to consider carefully the effects that legislation of this type may have on the employment of the people involved. That is why I disagree with some of the interim provisions in the Bill, although, obviously, they are necessary in general. The *status quo* must have the bias in its favour.

The next part of the Bill deals with the control of land subdivisions, in respect of which I suggest an amendment that seeks to remove the prohibition of options. We could have a ridiculous situation. An option to buy land is often only a verbal option. Under clause 44, a person cannot legally obtain from a vendor an agreement to sell the latter's land to him, unless that person first obtains the written approval of the Director. Apparently, the prospective purchaser must go to the Director and say, "I am thinking of offering to buy a part of Jones's allotment; will you be prepared to approve his giving me an option?"

How realistic is that? The buying and selling of land is a delicate business, with the first approach by the purchaser to the vendor often being informal. With this provision about no option, almost anything other than saying "Good morning" or "Good-bye" will, strictly speaking, be against the law. I have no doubt that the law is being broken almost every day in some respects, because a similar provision exists at present. I hope it will be removed. Some of the provisions in this Bill are contained in the existing law and an amendment of them will effect an improvement.

Most of my amendments will make it easier for the public to deal with the authority and feel more secure against the far-reaching powers vested in the authority. Clause 51 (1) commences with a provision dealing with a further ground for refusal by a council of plans for subdivision. It provides:

Without limiting the powers contained in section 49 of this Act, a council may refuse approval to a plan of subdivision unless the council is satisfied—

(*a*) that—

(i) the roadway of every proposed road or street has, to a width of at least twenty-four feet, keep adequately formed, paved and sealed with bitumen, tar or asphalt, and all necessary bridges, culverts, underground drains and inlets thereto necessary in accordance with recognized engineering design practice have been constructed, in a manner satisfactory to the council and in conformity with detailed construction plans and specifications signed by a prescribed engineer and submitted to and approved by the council prior to the commencement of the work; and

The Bill goes on to provide that a "prescribed engineer" is a corporate member of the Institution of Engineers, Australia, or the holder of alternative qualifications. I see no reason why a corporate member of the Institution should be required in this case. We must remember that the plans must be submitted to and approved by the council before the commencement of the work. Why could not the council, with its own engineers, agree on the plans? Why should we have to insist upon the

Institution of Engineers being represented? Surveyors do much of this work. Provided the plans passed the council, it should not be necessary to insist upon an engineer.

Clause 52, dealing with further grounds of refusal by the Director of Planning, provides:

Without limiting the powers contained in section 49 of this Act, the Director may refuse approval to a plan of subdivision or plan of resubdivision if—

Clause 52 (i) (*d*) (iii) provides:

the amount of land in the vicinity of the land depicted thereon which is already divided into allotments and the extent to which such allotments have not been used for the purposes for which they were so divided;

Once again, the Director of Planning is involved in deciding the number of blocks. He could suppress development by forcing people to buy at higher prices blocks already subdivided instead of blocks in a new subdivision. This would have an unhealthy effect on the prices of land and could give an unfair advantage to the owners or blocks, many of whom are individuals and not substantial companies. Clause 61 provides that the Governor may on the application of an owner proclaim land as an open space. This type of provision is well known to Parliament. If land is so proclaimed, the owner will receive concessions from various types of rating and the public will have the advantage of the open space provided. If the owner subsequently wishes to have the proclamation revoked he can seek the approval of the Governor, who may proclaim that the land is no longer an open space. If that is done, the owner will be liable to pay the appropriate rating or taxing authority the total of the moneys conceded over the years since the land became proclaimed an open space. If it had been so proclaimed for a long time, this could be a harsh provision. In some cases it may be necessary in the intrests of the family or the beneficiaries, as well as in the interests of the planning authority, for the land to be no longer a proclaimed open space, and we can be sure that if the authority is not sympathetic towards the application it will not be granted. If it is granted, however, the total of the concession for the period, whether it be four years or 20 years, will have to be paid. I suggest that, as in the Land Tax Assessment Act, we should go back only five years. This would be a sensible and moderate provision and would safeguard the interests of both authorities and the owners.

Part VII deals with the acquisition of land and contains special provisions relating to compensation. I understand that the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act Amendment Bill is still before another place.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is here now.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There has been much argument about whether the valuation should be that 12 months before the notice to treat was given or that at the date of the notice, and that is very important in this Bill. I do not want to go into this in detail, as I do not know the outcome of that Bill, but whatever is done there will govern this aspect of the legislation. As values are changing rapidly for genuine reasons, this provision may be unjustly onerous.

Clause 64 provides for compensation for losses arising out of the reservation of land. Provision is made for a case where some improvements have been made to land and the owner has attempted to sell it. In such a case the owner can be compensated where a planning regulation impairs the value of his property. How far does this provision go in relation to unimproved land? Although I may be subject to correction, as I read the clause the owner of unimproved land gets no compensation whatever if the value of his land is impaired by a planning regulation. If I am correct, I think this provision is unfair. I hope that by the time this clause is dealt with in Committee I will have discovered that such a landowner can be helped or that provision will be made to see that he is helped. It could be that land would lose value by reason of a planning regulation to such an extent that its value would be less than the price the owner paid originally. This could easily happen by virtue of any one of dozens of planning regulations. This clause needs much more consideration.

Part VIII deals with financial provisions. As I said earlier, the authority will be in business in a big way. Whether it likes it or not it may become a dealer in land. In fairly stable times the authority might not accumulate large sums and it might be necessary for it to get large sums from Parliament to carry out its work. However, let us consider the other side of the picture. In the late 1940's and through the 1950's and 1960's the values of land increased sharply—in many cases by several hundred per cent. Any authority operating in those days, that bought land, used the part it liked and sold the part it did not want, could scarcely have helped making a profit from the transaction. Members know that the New South Wales soldier settlement authority bought large areas

in various places in New South Wales at 1941 land values. There was an artificial price on the land.

Mr. Quirke: It was compulsory acquisition.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. That authority frequently bought several thousand acres at 1941 values, divided the land for farming, and then sold the bits it did not want. It sometimes received more for those odds and ends than it paid for the whole property. That is what happened in those days and the same sort of thing could easily happen now if there were a period of inflation. Areas around the metropolitan area and in other parts of the State could be bought by the authority, and the same thing could happen as happened in New South Wales. Therefore, even though the authority itself had no intention of speculating (and I am sure it would not have such an intention), it could find itself the proud possesser of much more money than it ever dreamed about, and it would not need to have recourse to Parliament to carry out its work. That is a possibility.

Under the Bill, the authority will have a Planning and Development Fund, which will be built up through appropriations from Parliament, moneys derived from the sale, leasing and other disposal of land vested in the authority, and in other ways. This money can be spent with the approval of the Minister and without further appropriation under this Act. It can be spent on the acquisition and development of any land that may be required or developed by the authority, on the payment of moneys, whether by way of compensation or otherwise, which the authority becomes liable to pay under the Act, on rates and taxes, and so on. Members can see that once the authority is put in business by Parliamentary appropriations it could be that it need not come back to Parliament.

In the circumstances, what does Parliament see of this? Parliament will see a report as to how the authority is proceeding and carrying out its work. The Minister will represent Parliament in the oversight of the work of the authority. It is noted that any money spent by the authority is spent with the approval of the Minister, and I point out that that is the only supervision Parliament will have. We have had many discussions in this House on the work of the Auditor-General and the importance of his reports. Parliament has great respect for the Auditor-General, and to my mind this authority is exactly the type of instrumentality that could well be audited by him, or at least it should be scrutinized by him so that he could report to Parliament on it. We all know that hundreds of different things are investigated by the Auditor-General. For instance, he undertakes special investigations into the work of different boards such as the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board. I think the Egg Board is investigated under a special Act. The Auditor-General could very well be asked to investigate and report to Parliament on the work of the authority, in order that Parliament could see that the authority (which will be so large and powerful) is carrying out its work effectively and correctly.

The authority may accumulate large sums, and it feasible that it will embark on inner suburban redevelopment. I would not argue that that is not a good activity in which to engage, but I think we must remember that not everybody likes living in large multi-storey buildings. Often we have heard arguments for and against the type of living that people want: some like living in multi-storey buildings and some do not, but we should consider what social effects can result from inner suburban redevelopment, as they are not all good. The population density can be increased, costs can be reduced, and people may have a higher standard of living in some ways than they will have if they live in a house on their own block.

Inner suburban redevelopment is not necessarily a good thing for family life. Some like it and others do not, but I cannot imagine how families can send their children down in a lift to the communal playground. Most people want a sand pit for children in the backyard, and somewhere to tinker with an old motor car. Australians generally prefer a house to a multi-storey building. I know that redevelopment does not necessarily mean multi-storey buildings, but it tends to be that way. I was told that in a survey, migrants to this country were asked their views on high density living, and almost invariably the answer was that they wanted their own block of land, because that was why they were coming to Australia. Our community lives with and thinks about motor cars and transport, and every member of the family is generally interested in these things. They do not like the idea of living too far off the ground. I am sure that most people prefer living in their own house, so long as adequate communication is provided (and that is sometimes difficult), to living in a multi-storey building.

This aspect can be controlled administratively and has nothing directly to do with the Bill, but I am sure that many people agree

with me on this point. I have referred to amendments that I am trying to place on file but which have not yet been completed. One or two I should like further time to consider, particularly those dealing with compensation for owners of land subject to planning regulations. I hope that the Government does not insist on a quick passage for this Bill, as there is no need for that. It is a long, although worthy, Bill and I have generally supported it. It merits close consideration by people both within this House and outside it. No member should set himself up as an authority on any subject, and I am sure each member will want to obtain advice and the views of others outside this House. Little opportunity has been afforded members on this side of the House to do that, as six days ago we did not know what the Bill contained. In spite of that, it is a good Bill in general, and I support it.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I, too, support the Bill, but I want to offer what I hope is constructive criticism on some of its clauses. That this is a Bill of general interest was indicated when it was introduced into the House last Thursday, because in the gallery were the Town Planner himself and some distinguished senior members of the profession of surveying who have a keen interest in this matter. A tribute is due to Mr. Hart for the job he has done over the years he has been the Town Planner of South Australia. I am sure that many times his task has not been easy, and the tolerance and patience he has shown during those years are most commendable. A tribute is due also to Mr. Ludovici, the Parliamentary Draftsman who has obviously spent much time on this Bill and has considered closely the various clauses and similar Bills introduced in other States. I congratulate the member for Alexandra, who had the responsibility of taking the adjournment on this Bill for the Opposition. Although I do not intend to go into the detail into which he went in dealing with the different Parts and many clauses individually, I want to make some general comments.

It is interesting to me that in the Bill provision is made in several places, where the plan has to be submitted to the people, for representations to be made to the commission and appeals to be made to the Planning Appeal Board. One month is given as the time within which people can do these things. Yet here in an extension of the first session of this Parliament we have introduced into the House a Bill, and we know, from the time table that has been given to us as to when the Government hopes that Parliament will prorogue, there will be little time in which to deal with it in a fitting manner, because there is no doubt that this is an important Bill. It is of general interest to the whole State: it is important to town and country alike. The people charged with its administration are concerned with, and made responsible for, the development of South Australia for years to come. The Bill will have an impact upon almost every facet of life, in fact on every man, woman and child in our community. Yet this important Bill is expected to be debated and passed (as the Government no doubt hopes it will be) in the shortest possible time.

This is the sort of Bill that I feel (because I have an interest in town planning) should be talked about by the man and woman in the street. But how often do we hear people say (and I have heard it said even in this building) "Town planning is something about which I know nothing whatsoever"? This, to me, is a great pity because in a democracy public opinion is formed and represented by the man in the street, and this can be a force which for me, and I think for many other members here, brings about much needed reform. Town and country planning in South Australia stands in great need of being brought up to date. As the member for Alexandra implied, not only members of Parliament but all local government authorities and many groups within the community are interested in town planning. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that recommendations and reports had been welcomed by the people responsible for drafting the Bill and for considering the proposals to be embodied in it. However, I wonder how many of the organizations invited to make representations on the matter have actually seen the Bill in its present state.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They were all sent copies; they all received the second reading speech.

Mr. Nankivell: They got them before we did.

Mrs. STEELE: As soon as the Bill was introduced, and as soon as I obtained a pull of the Minister's second reading explanation, I sent copies of both documents to the two municipal councils that I have the honour to represent. That was on Friday, and the copies would have been received on Monday. If council meetings had been held last night or tonight, or if meetings of the various committees had been held, the Bill might then have been considered, but the time at their disposal would be short.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I am sorry; I may have misled the honourable member. Copies were sent to the association.

Mrs. STEELE: I sent copies to both the Burnside and Campbelltown councils, because I wanted to hear their reactions to the legislation which I believed would be important. I also spoke to a member of the Municipal Association, who told me that although he had not seen the Bill he hoped it would not be hurried through Parliament. All I could say was that it was the third item on the Notice Paper for Tuesday of this week and that if he wished to study the Bill he should obtain a copy and do so quickly. Local government bodies play an important part in the Bill, and their co-operation will be sought in its implementation. On reading the Bill, I was interested to see the definition of the metropolitan planning area, particularly in view of the narrow definition advanced by the Government in another debate in the House last week. This Bill specifically includes in the metropolitan planning area the very areas which were excluded in another Bill, and which the Opposition was trying to have the Government accept as really being part of the metropolitan area. I refer to the municipality of Elizabeth, the District Councils of Munno Para, Tea Tree Gully, Noarlunga, Meadows, Willunga, and others. Apparently, it suits the Government to accept such areas as being in the metropolitan area for the purposes of this Bill. Evidently it wants the best of both worlds.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course, this Bill is far more realistic.

Mrs. STEELE: The member for Alexandra spoke at some length about the composition of the planning authority. I think this part of the Bill has probably evoked much interest in many people outside the House as well as in members who have studied it for the purpose of speaking in the debate and taking an active part in the passing of the measure. The comment I shall make is made without casting any aspersions on the people I intend to mention, because I consider them to be most able and experienced and in positions where they can offer much assistance to the State, particularly with reference to this Bill.

The first person mentioned is the Director of Planning, who, we all consider is the proper and appropriate person to be the chairman of the planning authority. The next is the person for the time being holding the position of Engineer-in-Chief in the Engineering and Water Supply Department in the Public Service of the State. The next is the Commissioner of Highways appointed pursuant to the Highways Act, 1926-63, and the next member is the person for the time being holding the position of Surveyor-General.

I am interested in this clause, because provision is made in clause 17 (2) for the authority to have power to co-opt any heads of departments who can play a part in helping the authority to carry out its work. I consider that, because of this power of co-option, it would have been better and would have saved the authority from being top-heavy with Government representation if those three people had been omitted from the authority itself and had been brought in under the powers in clause 17. I consider that, as far as the nominee of the South Australian Housing Trust is concerned, the trust is deserving of and entitled to a representative on the authority, because the trust is the largest developer in the State and has had much experience of planning and development. No-one would deny that.

I also consider that the Council of the City of Adelaide should have representation, for we have to remember that that council is extremely interested because of the changing concept of the inner part and fringes of the city. We find that residential areas in and on the fringe of the city are run down to a certain extent. One only has to drive out of the city in almost any direction to see many old houses that are in need of repair. The maintenance of these houses must be a problem to the elder citizens who live in many of them. Because these people are not in a position to do this maintenance, the houses fall into disrepair.

In spite of this, the value of properties on the fringe of the city is almost fictitiously inflated, because it is pushed up for a variety of reasons. First, newer houses and buildings are going up in the vicinity of the older buildings and there is the trend of commercial and professional interests to find accommodation on the fringes of the city, not only because of the higher rentals in the city itself but also because it is easier for clients to find parking places. The other reason is the present trend towards blocks of home units that are being erected and financed by building promoters as a speculation. For these reasons, I consider that the city council has a real interest in the planning and development of the city area and that it is appropriate for the council to be represented.

If the Municipal Association of South Australia and the Local Government Association of

South Australia jointly nominated one member to the authority, this would be in keeping with the provision that the Chamber of Commerce and the Chamber of Manufactures will jointly nominate one member. I say this because in the metropolitan area there are several district councils (Tea Tree Gully, Noarlunga and East Torrens, to mention a few) and there are several municipalities (such as Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln and Port Augusta) in country areas. The Municipal Association and Local Government Association could speak with one voice because they more or less represent the same types of local government authority, and I think they should be on the same basis as the Chamber of Manufactures and the Chamber of Commerce. On my reckoning, this would reduce the number on the authority to five. In studying similar legislation in Western Australia I found that the relevant body there had only three members, and I was interested in this because the Minister said in his second reading explanation that the Western Australian Act had been of very great value to the Government in drawing up this Bill.

On the whole, I agree with what the member for Alexandra has said about the general provisions of the Bill, but I have some misgivings about the unlimited powers given to the authority, which is subject to the Minister's final approval. The Western Australian Act provides that recommendations regarding planning areas, appeals and so forth are to be brought back to Parliament, whose job it is to decide whether areas so defined should in fact be declared planning areas; it also decides on appeals. I think that is a wise provision, as Parliament should have the final review of the matter, and that is one of the things I should like to bring to the Minister's attention.

I do not want to repeat what the member for Alexandra has said, as I think he has dealt fully with almost every clause. However, I wish to make one or two comments about clause 36. I am glad to see some of the things that the authority will have power to regulate. In particular, I am glad that it will have power to preserve certain things that add to the beauty of the scene around us (if one can put it that way), to preserve historical buildings, and to prevent trees being taken down without approval. This last matter, which has come up in this House several times, is, to the general public, almost like a red rag to a bull: as soon as people in the community learn that trees are to be cut down they get very hot under the collar. Therefore, I am glad to see that there will be an authority to which this matter can be referred. If, at any time, it is intended by some local government authority or subdivider to remove trees the matter must go, first of all, to an authority that has the power to decide whether they will, in fact, be removed. We know that in South Australia fewer and fewer of our native trees remain and anything that can be done to retain those we still have is in the best interests of the community.

I was interested to see that the authority has power to conserve, preserve and enhance river foreshores, sea beaches, and so on. One only regrets that this step was not taken many years ago by our forefathers so that the banks of rivers could have been preserved. Scenic drives could have been placed around them. However, now the owners of properties own the land on the foreshore of rivers (I believe the boundary is taken as being at the centre of the stream). When one travels around the upper reaches of the Torrens River one realizes what a great pity it was that this land was not preserved, in the early days, for the people of the State. The same position applies with regard to sea frontages. Again it is a pity that we cannot have a scenic ocean drive along the whole of the foreshore of the gulf instead of its being broken into every now and again by privately owned land. Local government authorities are improving some of their reserves and park lands. This has been particularly evident in the parklands that serve the city of Adelaide. The Burnside council is doing much to improve and preserve the natural beauty of Hazelwood Park.

I notice provision is included in the Bill to deal with the controversial subject of the development of hills slopes. Opinions on this matter differ widely. Some people believe that the hill slope should not be built upon at all, and that it should not be available for subdivision, or that houses should not be built beyond a certain height. We know that for practical purposes it is desirable that building should not take place above a certain point because of the difficulty of providing water, sewerage and so on. It is interesting to see those areas where people have built in the hills and made provision for their own water supply. Those hills have, in fact, been beautified by this building as can be seen in the development of the lower slopes at Glen Osmond and Beaumont. The hills are now clad with trees whereas before they were bare and bald (although, of course, such hills have their own particular beauty). It is not always a tenable argument to say that house

buildings spoils the hills slopes, because some hills areas have been improved. Another example of this is the area adjacent to Shepherds Hill Road in the district of the Premier.

I mentioned at the beginning of my speech that the Bill provided one month for people to be informed of the declaration of a planning area and for the presentation of appeals. However, in reading the Western Australian Act I find that three months is allowed in that State. I put this forward because we all know that quite often things appear in the press which people do not see, and it takes some time for people to become aware of them. It may be a case of somebody seeing a notice and telling somebody else. By the time they have realized that they have the right to make representations on this matter, they are left very little time to prepare such representations. I consider that a longer period than one month is desirable in each of the instances provided in the Act. I think, too, that in addition to publication in the *Government Gazette* and in the newspaper circulating generally throughout the State (as provided in the Act) other advertisements should be inserted in the newspaper or newspapers of the district or districts involved in a development plan. I hope that perhaps this matter might be given some attention.

Subdivision has greatly increased in recent years, and much of this is due to the inability of families to work the land which for a number of generations they have held close to the city. They have found in recent years that it is particularly difficult and that they are put to great financial strain to pay land tax, council rates, water and sewerage rates, and other charges. In addition to this, of course, there has grown (amongst the younger generation and particularly the present generation) a lack of interest in primary production, particularly in market gardening, because of the hard work and the long hours this kind of work involves, although it never seems to have done our Leader very much harm. However, with the better education facilities, the provision of Commonwealth scholarships, and all the other kinds of assistance with fees that young people are provided with these days, many of them who have been brought up on the land do not want to continue their association with it. On the other hand, increasing age and lack of health lead to the older landowners feeling that the only thing left for them to do is to put their properties on the market.

Therefore, in recent years we have seen a great spate of land subdivision. Much of this has taken place in my own district and in districts further north and to the west of Adelaide; in fact, in many of the so-called fringe areas. I think that lack of sufficient power to check subdivision in the past has led to some undesirable development. Often disposal of land has meant that there are areas of development, in between which is sandwiched some undeveloped land. I do not know whether this is what is known as ribbon development, but we get areas where there is a housing estate, then an area of undeveloped land or land still under primary production, and then another piece of built-up land. We can see that this has been happening mile after mile out of the city into the country. Each new belt of development as it takes place pushes up the cost of houses built in these areas. In addition, the distance adds to the cost of transport and the provision of essential services, and it also leads to the necessity for new schools, new community amenities, supermarkets, and other things.

Here I put in a word for the elderly people who are incapable of going into supermarkets, the most recent medium of shopping, and who need the convenience and service of stores that will deliver to them. All these things I have mentioned add to the financial burden that is being carried by young families who, because of the high cost of land adjacent to the city, have had to go farther and farther out. I feel sorry for them, and, to use a colloquialism, they seem to be well and truly getting it in the neck. I turn now to roads to be provided in subdivisions. Every member is familiar with the problem where a subdivider, conforming with the Act, has had to put down roads before the area becomes available for sale. This is happening and has happened particularly in the Athelstone area. I know of one subdivision that has been opened up for many years where the roads that were put down are now covered with weeds, and even artichokes are growing through them. This has also happened in other areas, as in parts of Tea Tree Gully and at Christies Beach. We are all conversant with what happens. It causes another problem, because, even though roads are put down to a depth of four inches no drains or kerbs are provided and the camber of the road acts as a water shed. The water runs off on to the unmade drains and contributes largely to the erosion occurring in the areas where there is a fall in the land.

This particular aspect is giving concern to councils and I have spoken with them to see whether something cannot be done to obviate this waste of money in many parts of the State. One council I represent would like to see the specifications for the roads required in subdivisions prepared by qualified engineers, who are, in addition, the district engineers. District council engineers need professional qualifications before being appointed to their jobs, and they should be best able to prepare the specifications for roads in subdivisions in their districts because they know the contour of the land, the type of soil and its movement. Once the specifications are prepared it should be possible to assess the cost of putting roads through a subdivision. To save spending money until the subdivision begins to develop and blocks are bought, and people start building houses once an assessment of costs has been made, a sum to cover the provision of roads should be paid to the council and held in trust, the interest on the money being paid to the people responsible for putting in the roads, the subdividers. It has been suggested by someone here today that to overcome this problem only sufficient roads should be built to enable development to go ahead. However, in some areas no development has taken place in subdivisions for four or five years. If the Bill were amended on these lines it would cover the point I am making and would save a great waste of public money. As the member for Alexandra covered other and different aspects of the Bill, I shall not prolong my remarks, but having made the points of particular interest to me, I support the Bill.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT secured the adjournment of the debate.

EXCESSIVE RENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 17 to 18 (clause 3)—Leave out subclause (*b*).

No. 2. Pages 1 and 2 (clause 4)—Leave out the clause.

No. 3. Page 3, line 12 (clause 7)—After the word "house" insert "which at the date of such agreement or within six months thereafter is".

No. 4. Page 3, line 15 (clause 7)—After "1961" insert "and".

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That the amendments of the Legislative Council be disagreed to.

The effect of the suggested amendments to clauses 3 and 4 is entirely to negative Government policy in this part of the Bill. It is the Government's intention in these clauses to provide that tenancies for three years or more will be excluded from the operation of the Act. Before this amendment was proposed, only tenancies of one year or more were excluded. The practical effect of the Government's amendment is that all tenancies for less than three years shall be subject to rent control. This is considered necessary and desirable by the Government. Clauses 3 and 4, as they originally appeared before the House of Assembly, closely followed provisions that appeared in a Bill introduced by the Attorney-General when he was a private member. That Bill did not pass. The amendments made by the Legislative Council to clauses 3 and 4 should, in my opinion, be opposed. I recommend that the Legislative Council's amendments to clause 7 also be disagreed to.

Amendments disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments would destroy important objects of the Bill.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1—After clause 3 insert new clause 3a as follows:—

"3a. *Amendment of principal Act, s.* 12—*Basis of compensation.*—Section 12 of the principal Act is amended by striking out paragraph (2) of the rules set out therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:—

(2) The value of the land—

(*a*) in any case where the land is taken—shall be taken to be its value on the day on which the relevant notice to treat was given by the promoters pursuant to section 23 or section 44a of this Act; or

(*b*) in any case where the land is not taken—shall be taken to be its value on the day when the execution of the works was commenced,

together, in either case, with the actual value of any improvements *bona fide* made thereon prior to such day: But the court or arbitrator shall be entitled to consider all returns and assessments of capital value for taxation made in respect of the land or acquiesced in by the claimant."

No. 2. Page 2, line 18 (clause 5)—Leave out "diligent" and insert "due".

No. 3. Page 2, line 18 (clause 5)—After "inquiry" insert "and search".

No. 4. Page 2, line 34 (clause 5)—Leave out "diligent" and insert "due".
No. 5. Page 2, line 35 (clause 5)—After "inquiry" insert "and search".
No. 6. Page 6, line 20 (clause 5)—Leave out "three" and insert "four".
No. 7. Page 7, line 29 (clause 5)—After "entitled" insert "and the claimant has taken proceedings for compensation before a court or an arbitrator in respect of the acquisition of the land".
No. 8. Page 7, lines 37 to 43 (clause 5)—Leave out subclause (7).

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I recommend that amendment No. 1 of the Legislative Council be disagreed to. This amendment seeks to insert in the Bill a new clause 3a, which amends section 12 of the principal Act. Section 12 sets out the rules in accordance with which the basis of compensation is to be assessed. Rule (2) provides that the value of the land is to be its value as at the beginning of the period of 12 months prior to the giving by the promoters of the notice to treat, or prior to the commencement of the execution of the public work. This principle has been written into this legislation since 1918, and has been an effective means of inhibiting speculation in land and collusive sales designed to obtain greater compensation based on fictitious sales figures. The member for Burra may recollect the difficulties that would have faced any compulsory acquisition if we had had to treat on the basis of the value at the time of the giving of the notice to treat, because of the obvious devices with which a fictitious value could be obtained.

Whenever practicable, promoters have in the past attempted to negotiate with the owners of land for the purchase of the land by agreement, and only when negotiations to purchase fail do they resort to giving notice to treat to acquire the land compulsorily. Thus, owners receive notice that their land is required for a public work months before it actually becomes necessary to give the notice to treat. For this reason alone it is entirely fair that the value of the land should be ascertained as at a date prior to the giving of the notice to treat, and there is no valid reason for changing the existing rule which fixes the value of the land as its value at the beginning of the period of 12 months prior to the giving of the notice to treat. The proposed amendment, if agreed to, will provide that the value of the land is to be its value at the time of the giving of the notice to treat.

This would render possible and encourage a number of undesirable practices by persons who get advance information that their land is to be acquired. In particular, owners will be encouraged to attempt to boost the value of their land by resorting to improper and perhaps dishonest devices which, under the proposed amendment, the promoters will have no power to prevent. The amendment could even have the undesirable effect of forcing promoters to give notice to treat, even without commencing negotiations for the purchase of the land by agreement. The proposed amendment is also too sweeping in its effect. It applies equally to cases where the notice to treat is given before and after the Bill becomes law. Thus, if notice to treat has already been given and proceedings for compensation or negotiations between the parties have commenced on the basis of the value of the land as at the beginning of the period of 12 months prior to the giving of the notice to treat, the parties would be forced to incur the expense, and suffer the consequences of the unnecessary delay, in obtaining fresh valuations of the land as at the date of the notice to treat, before the proceedings or the negotiations could be completed. This amendment applies to the existing provisions of the Act in addition to the new provisions. In consequence, I recommend that the amendment be disagreed to.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I agree in many respects with the view of the Attorney-General. If the value of land is not normally changing rapidly, then a provision such as the one at present in the Act is sound, because rumours can circulate which can present a problem to the authorities, thereby harming a situation. On the other hand, where the value of land is changing through perfectly legitimate causes the owner concerned can suffer a hardship. Can the Attorney-General say how this problem is dealt with in other States and whether any compromise would be advisable in relation to the period of 12 months as against the date of the notice to treat? Simply objecting straight out to the opinion of the other place would not be as good as arriving at some compromise, if that is feasible. I am not completely happy about the date of the notice to treat, because on occasions that presents difficulty to certain authorities and does not help the owners of land.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot say offhand what the practice is in the other States. I had understood that it was a general practice, not only here but also overseas, that where there were compulsory acquisition powers the value back dated before

the giving of the notice to treat, for the reasons that I gave in explaining the reason for rejection of the Legislative Council's amendment. Any other system would give rise to collusive arrangements to improperly jack up the price of land.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: There may be rumours, but suppose that an authority, such as the proposed town planning authority, wants to deviate a road. If the owners of the land knew beforehand, they would be able to jack up the price whereas, if the authority knew the price on the day, it could pay that price. That could be an advantage to the authority.

Mr. QUIRKE: A period of six months may be fairer to the individual in some cases, because in a period of 12 months there can be developments of which the owner had no knowledge and he may not have knowledge of the intention to treat or acquire. If he wished to sell, he would be forced back behind that period. That does not happen always, but it can happen, and I would like to hear the Attorney-General's comments on it. I know the advantages of dating it back for the common good, but sometimes a fixed period of 12 months can inflict almost an injustice, because the individual may not take advantage of something that can accrue when he has no knowledge of what is likely to happen.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member knows, in many cases negotiating for the purchase of a property goes on for 12 months or more before notice to treat is given. This provision has been in the principal Act since its inception and has been acted upon by every Government since that time. The acquiring authority would be placed in an extraordinary position if this were removed. A shorter period can give rise to the very evils I have mentioned. Because negotiations often have to be protracted, there is no way out if we are to keep the existing Act, quite apart from the Bill.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendments Nos. 2 to 6.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask that these amendments be agreed to. Amendments Nos. 2 to 5 make no alteration to the substance of the Bill. The Government agreed to them in the Legislative Council, so I see no reason for this Chamber to reject them. Amendment No. 6 provides that under new section 21b all claimants for compensation are required to deliver their claims to the promoters within three weeks of the publication of the proclamation acquiring the land if they want to receive an amount, on account of compensation, equal to the promoters' valuation of the land. The amendment proposes to increase the period from three weeks to four weeks. The Government has no serious objection to the proposal, so I consider that it should be agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 7.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I ask that this amendment be disagreed to. The promoters' valuation referred to in new section 23b (2) (that is, the valuation that has to be paid as an interim payment) is intended to be not a final valuation but a summary valuation, the amount of which has to be paid to the claimant on account of compensation to enable the promoters to take possession of the land. Subsection (4) makes it clear that because of the summary nature of the valuation the payment of the amount of the valuation is not to be referred to in any proceedings for compensation before a court or an arbitrator and therefore contemplates that either party could take proceedings to have the claim for compensation finally determined, and upon such determination an adjustment of the compensation will be made. Thus, if the promoters' valuation were less than the amount finally awarded by a court or an arbitrator the promoters would be obliged to make up the difference, or if the promoters' valuation exceeded the amount finally awarded the promoters would be entitled to recover the excess from the claimant. The effect of the amendment, however, will be that the promoters will have the right to recover the excess only where the claimant has taken proceedings for compensation but not where the promoters seek to have the compensation decided by a court. On summary valuation we could have overpaid, and if the claimant chose not to take proceedings for final determination we would have paid out too much on summary valuation and would have no way to recover the excess. This is completely unfair. There is not the slightest reason why the amount of compensation should not be properly determined upon a final valuation, the subject of proceedings, and the excess made up. Under the amendment the claimant is to be put in an extremely privileged position. If he is overpaid that is just hard luck as far as the public purse is concerned. I do not think this is a proper amendment, and I ask the Committee to disagree to the Legislative Council's amendment.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendment No. 8.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This amendment strikes out subsection (7) of new section 23b which defines "promoters' valuation" as a valuation made, on behalf of the promoters, by the Land Board. Honourable members will recall that this provision was inserted after considerable debate in this Chamber. However, the amendment was moved by Sir Norman Jude in another place. He pointed out that it was impracticable to require that these valuations be made by the Land Board, and the amendment was accepted by the Government. I therefore ask the Committee to agree to the Legislative Council's amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

The following reason for disagreement with amendment No. 1 was adopted:

Because the amendment would render possible and encourage undesirable practices by which the Government could be forced to pay improperly high prices for land, and would destroy the basis of the principal Act.

The following reason for disagreement with amendment No. 7 was adopted:

Because the effect of this amendment would be that the promoters could recover the excess paid by them only where the claimant had taken proceedings for compensation but not where the promoters sought to have compensation decided by a court.

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message.

(For wording of message see page 3568.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) moved:

That disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 5 and 7 and 8 be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference, at which the House of Assembly would be represented by Mrs. Byrne, the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Mr. McKee, Mrs. Steele, and the Hon. B. H. Teusner.

ACTS REPUBLICATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3191.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I support the Bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 11.1 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 10, at 2 p.m.