HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, February 17, 1966.

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

QUESTIONS

MEMBERS' RIGHTS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yesterday an incident took place when the Committee of the Whole was discussing the Road Traffic Act Amendment Bill. A member of my Party, when speaking on that Bill, was continually subjected to interruption by interjections from members of the Government Party. On a number of occasions he appealed to the Chairman of Committees, but was finally ordered by the Chairman to resume his seat and was not given the right to speak further in the debate. Can you say, Mr. Speaker, whether any Standing Order gives the Chairman of Committees the right to prevent a member from speaking merely because that member has asked for the protection of the Chair against interruption?

The SPEAKER: I think that the Leader will appreciate that the Standing Orders provide that any point of order or disagreement with the Chairman's ruling or decision should be taken at the time. No point was taken at the time of the incident to which the Leader referred, and I do not think it is competent for me to express an opinion on that incident or to conduct a post-mortem today. The Standing Orders are clear as to the rights of members both in this House and in Committee. I refer particularly to that Standing Order which gives a member the right to speak as often as he likes in Committee as long as he acknowledges the authority of the Chair. I assure the Leader that everything will be done in this Parliament, as it has always been done, to preserve the freedom of private members. I believe we even go to extremes to see that this is done. In fact, I feel that I am doing that by permitting this question.

Mr. HEASLIP: I was the person concerned last night in the incident about which the Leader asked the question. I appealed to the Chair—

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member desire the concurrence of the House to make a statement?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, Sir. Yesterday I was ordered by the Chairman to resume my seat, which I did, although, as far as I know, I had not transgressed any Standing Order: I had simply appealed to the Chairman to be permitted to continue without interruption. When I had resumed my seat the Chairman made a short explanation, the details of which I cannot exactly repeat, as the *Hansard* pull is not yet available. Normally, once a member has the floor he has the right to continue, but I did not receive that right. The Chairman having called for any other speakers, I could not rise on a point of order, because I had been ordered to resume my seat, and another speaker immediately rose. In those circumstances, I believe I was gagged and denied the right to continue. I expect that the *Hansard* pull will reveal that, having to resume my seat, I was denied the opportunity to complete my remarks. True, in Committee a member may rise to speak again, but I do not think any Standing Order gives anybody the authority to interrupt a member before he has completed his remarks. I should like your ruling on this matter, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Having already informed the House that Standing Orders Nos. 161 and 164 clearly set out the procedure to be adopted if disagreement with a ruling or decision of the Chair arises, as well as specifically stating that such a matter cannot be subsequently raised, I do not think I can be expected at this stage to conduct a post-mortem on something that happened yesterday.

GRAPES.

Mr. CURREN: On Tuesday the Minister of Agriculture, in reply to a question about negotiations to fix prices for wine grapes from the current vintage, said that a further meeting between representatives of the grape-growers and of the wine and brandy producers would be held yesterday. A report in today's *Advertiser* indicates that the negotiations broke down, with no price being agreed upon. The Minister of Agriculture is quoted as saying that he would confer with the Premier and would probably refer the matter to Cabinet. Can he say whether this matter was discussed by Cabinet this morning and, if it was, what action is proposed by the Government?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This matter was discussed by Cabinet this morning, and action will be taken. Knowing the interest of many members on this subject, I thought that perhaps if members would bear with me I would give some background to the situation before setting out what is intended to be done. Members will recall that a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into various aspects of

the wine grapegrowing industry, and that Commission brought down an interim report, followed a little later by a final report. The Commission stated:

We are of the opinion that the minimum prices of each variety of grape to be paid to the grapegrowers by the winemakers for the 1966 vintage should be the subject of negotiations between the two parties. We consider that action should be taken immediately to appoint a committee to conduct these negotiations. It is recommended that the committee should consist of the following persons:

(*a*) A person to be appointed by Your Excellency, who shall be chairman;

(*b*) Two persons appointed by Your Excellency who should be nominated by the Wine Grapegrowers Council of South Australia;

(*c*) Two persons appointed by Your Excellency who should be nominated by the Wine and Brandy Producers Association of South Australia Incorporated.

Cabinet and Executive Council appointed two members from each organization with an independent chairman, who was the Prices Commissioner. This meeting was convened, and all members attended. As a result of that meeting, certain prices were recommended by both the Grapegrowers Council and the Wine and Brandy Producers Association. The Grapegrowers Council's figures were, on a weighted average basis, an increase of £6 9s. ($12.90) a ton for the dry areas and £8 18s. 6d. ($17.85) for the irrigated areas. The increases suggested by the Wine and Brandy Producers Association were 1s. 1d. (11c) a ton for dry areas and 3s. 8d. (37c) a ton for irrigated areas. Members will realize that this is a very wide disparity and, because of this, after they had reported back to their various organizations a subsequent meeting was held. At that meeting a letter, signed by Mr. Kilgariff (Secretary of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association), was presented. That letter, addressed to the Chairman, Grapegrowing Industry Committee, care of the Prices Department, Adelaide, states:

Our nominees have reported to our executive the discussion at your committee meeting held on January 25, 1966. In view of the fact that there is such a wide divergence of opinion on grape values between grapegrowers and winemakers, our executive has decided that it will be in the best interests of both growers and makers for grapes to be sold privately by individual negotiations. Winemakers use the same varieties of grapes for various purposes, such as making either brandy or dry wine or fortified wine or grape fortifying spirit. The variety may therefore be more valuable to a winemaker who wishes to make dry wine than to another winemaker who wishes to use it to make grape spirit. In addition to this, some varieties have differing values according to the areas in which they are grown. Under the above proposal grapegrowers will have their opportunity to obtain the highest in market value for their grapes, and it is felt that the industry may be able to adequately resolve the problems associated with the coming vintage.

This did not suit the Grapegrowers Council, and the Prices Commissioner was rather astounded at the attitude of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association in presenting this letter. The Royal Commission's suggestions were not observed. Consequently, I was asked by the Premier to chair a meeting to include the five members and this was held at Parliament House about two weeks ago. A long discussion of about 2½ hours took place, and I pointed out to the association's representatives that I considered they had disregarded the Royal Commission's report and they should have a further conference. Eventually, they agreed. While I was in Sydney, it was arranged that representatives of the Wine and Brandy Producers Association would meet me. They did so and there was a profitable discussion. Representatives of the association agreed to meet again yesterday, but they wanted to meet a larger group of the grapegrowers concerned. It was suggested that eight grapegrowers meet eight representatives of the association, and, as reported in this morning's newspaper, these people met but no decision was reached. It was apparent from the outset that the association's representatives were not going to increase the prices beyond those they had suggested at the first conference.

It appears that they have agreed among themselves to ignore the Government and the Royal Commission's report. In fact, they have shown a total disregard for the report, and I considered that something further should be done. I have done everything possible including having a profitable conference with the Leader of the Opposition, whose suggestions were sound. However, nothing has eventuated, and I recommended to Cabinet this morning that legislation be introduced providing for the Prices Commissioner to fix wine-grape prices, and that a heavy penalty be imposed on those disregarding this legislation, whether growers or winemakers. This afternoon the Premier will give notice of his intention to introduce such a Bill on Tuesday week. This action has been taken only after much consideration and I am sorry that I have to recommend this move, because after conversations with the Leader and representatives of the

association I considered that negotiations would result in a compromise. However, this was not to be. I am informed that the grapegrowers were prepared to compromise all the way, but it was evident that the wine and brandy producers were not prepared to depart from their original suggestions, although they told me in conference that they would consider an increase. This is the action Cabinet discussed this morning when it decided to introduce this legislation.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: As the 1966 grape harvesting commenced some time ago, does the Government intend to introduce legislation the effect of which will be retrospective to the beginning of this year's vintage?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Retrospectivity is among the matters being examined in an effort to make the legislation as effective and as watertight as possible. I believe it has been said that such legislation would not be valid, but I assure members that the Bill will be as watertight as possible, and I believe it will be most effective.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The report of the Royal Commission into the Grape Growing Industry states:

The Commission recommends, for the reasons outlined earlier in this report, the appointment of an economic extension officer for the grapegrowing industry in South Australia, such officer to be attached to the Department of Agriculture. This officer could assist the Grapegrowing Industry Advisory Committee with information on costs, the economics of size and types of holdings and such other matters on which the committee requires advice from time to time. Because the industry makes an important contribution to the revenue of the Commonwealth Government, it is considered that a grant from that source could be sought to assist with this work.

In view of the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture earlier, has he taken to Cabinet the question of this appointment, and does the Government intend to appoint such an officer to assist the industry?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Cabinet has not yet considered the full details of the Royal Commission's report. Although Ministers have read it with interest, we thought it desirable to dispose of this year's vintage before implementing all the recommendations of the Commission. I pointed out to the committee when we met that, if it could reach agreement this year in respect of prices, we would then look at the position for another year with the assistance of such an extension officer and possibly a permanent committee as suggested by the Commission, which would help the industry generally. I went out of my way and did everything possible to try to arrange prices for this year. We were thinking about this year's vintage and the help as suggested by the report. It would be my recommendation to Cabinet that such an extension officer should be appointed. We have extension grants from the Commonwealth Government, and I understand that an officer will visit this and other States soon to examine the requirements for such grants. At present we have an excellent case for one, particularly as a result of the Royal Commission's report, and I am sure the Commonwealth Government would assist in providing funds in this instance. I had great hopes that the Royal Commission's report would produce stability in the industry, and no-one is more disappointed than I at what has happened. We shall now have to consider other aspects, and what can be done for the industry depends entirely on the outcome of the present situation. I told the representatives that I did not wish to adopt stand-over tactics: I wanted co-operation. Obviously, if we cannot get co-operation we will have to do something else.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I think the Minister of Agriculture is well aware of the problem of sultanas being delivered to distilleries, thereby creating a surplus, and necessitating the creation of a surplus grape pool. Last weekend I heard that, as growers were delivering so many sultanas to distilleries, a problem similar to the one experienced last year might arise. Further, the Minister may also be aware that recent rains may have damaged many sultanas, which may mean that a greater quantity of sultanas than is desirable will go to the distillery. Will the Minister consider making a public appeal to growers not to deliver so many sultanas, thereby encouraging wine and brandy makers to process grapes specifically grown for the purpose, and thereby also encouraging more drying of sultanas? Further, will the Minister take up with the Prices Commissioner the question of fixing a price for sultanas that will discourage the wine and brandy makers from accepting them?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I assure the honourable member that the grapegrowers are not the only people concerned about this matter: as a result of this problem, I have suffered from loss of sleep, indigestion, and many of the other complaints that go with worry. The Royal Commission reported against the representations made by the two grower organizations to the effect that a sultana crush pool should be established and legislation introduced

for that purpose. I am sure that the Prices Commissioner has a wide and valuable knowledge of this matter, but I will, of course, refer to him the questions asked today. However, I think I shall have to consider further the question of making a public announcement on sultanas.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In reply to a question about the failure to reach agreement on grape prices, the Minister of Agriculture said he had sought advice from the Leader of the Opposition. Will the Leader say what advice he gave the Minister?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not object to answering the question, and I presume the Minister does not object to my stating my views. The Minister approached me and said that there was great difficulty attached to the fixing of grape prices this year. From memory, I think he said that winemakers had offered an increase of 20c or 30c but that the growers were seeking an increase of between $12 and $16 a ton. He asked me my opinion about legislation to fix a minimum price at which grapes could be purchased, and I said I thought that unless there was some outlet for the surplus such legislation could be fraught with great difficulty but that if winemakers did not co-operate or if they bought only limited quantities of the varieties they particularly required they could leave the growers with many thousands of tons of grapes on their hands. I said that unless some Treasury finance was available to process the surplus I thought the legislation could present much difficulty. I also said that it would be advantageous to continue to negotiate for an amicable settlement as in previous years we had often not been able to get an agreement until many conferences had been held, but that we had always been able ultimately to get an advantageous agreement. The winemakers have always honoured the agreement that has been reached. I said also that I would agree to speak to winemakers and ask them to agree to a further conference. In accordance with that agreement, I met the winemakers and, as a consequence of a discussion held in my room, they said that they were prepared to confer again and that they would write to the Minister of Agriculture seeking a conference. I understand that such a conference has been held. I considered that every avenue for reaching an amicable agreement should be explored before legislation was introduced. As the Minister of Agriculture was in Sydney, I subsequently reported to the Premier on my discussions with the winemakers. That is the position as I know it to be.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: I appreciated the Leader's advice.

BETTING ODDS.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that yesterday's race meeting at Kadina was the first to be held since the introduction of decimal currency, and the first meeting at which betting odds operated in the new currency. As I know that the Premier is keenly interested in the matter, can he report on the success or otherwise of the new system at the Kadina meeting yesterday?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I received a report this morning from the Betting Control Board which indicated that, although a large crowd was not present at the beginning of the race meeting, the numbers gradually increased later in the afternoon. The report also stated that a complete understanding existed in respect of the odds which had been approved by the board and the bookmakers concerned, and which are now before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. The system has been well received by the public and the people operating it, as well as by the racing fraternity. It is pleasing to know that the system has been successful so early in the piece, and I hope it will continue.

WHEAT BOARD ADVANCES.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question regarding Wheat Board advances?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Mr. Cliff Semmler (State Superintendent of the Australian Wheat Board) reports:

In reply to your letter of February 11, our head office has advised as follows:

"Second advance for No. 28 pool not yet considered by board pending receipt of sufficient proceeds to establish a credit bank balance. It would not be unreasonable to expect that a further payment could be made before the end of June. The total net realization for the pool should be not less than, say, $1.32 for f.a.q. wheat on a bulk f.o.r. terminal basis."

To clarify the position, it is desired to point out that finance for the first advance is made available to the board through an overdraft provided by the Reserve Bank of Australia and, until adequate proceeds from sales have been credited to clear the amount advanced and sufficient funds are accumulated for another advance to be paid, further payments cannot be made.

PARKSIDE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning drainage and paving at the Parkside Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Director, Public Buildings Department states that design work is being undertaken for improvements to drainage, paving, etc., at the Parkside Primary School. He expects that tenders will be called in two to three weeks' time.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister of Education, in reply to questions, has made several statements in this House on a new policy that has been applied in allocating subsidies for schools. I have been provided with figures for various schools that show a considerable variation in the allocations to schools of a similar size, some small schools having received almost as much as have much larger schools. For instance, the allocation for the Keith school, a large school of 600 students, is $480 (most of which has been used), and for two schools with a total of 800 students at Millicent it is $320. There must be a reason for these discrepancies. Can the Minister say what formula was used in arriving at these figures or, if no formula was used, why there are apparent anomalies in decisions reached in arriving at the figures?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: When I explained Government policy in relation to the equitable distribution of the money available for subsidies, I pointed out that several considerations had to be taken into account in allocating the subsidy to a school. If the honourable member casts his mind back he will remember that the member for Flinders said that he hoped we would take into account, for example, schools that had already started projects that had to be finished, and I said that we would. I cannot give what may be termed a mathematical formula. However, although I do not know the actual cases referred to, I think the differences in allocations would have been the result of the different circumstances of the schools. If the honourable member cares to submit the cases to me I shall have them investigated to see whether they conform to the policy laid down. Departmental officers consider several facets in regard to different schools, and allocations are made having regard to those facets with a view to achieving an equitable basis of distribution.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: On several occasions I have asked the Minister of Marine whether the Harbors Board will consider permanently closing the Jervois bridge to ships pending the building of the new bridge, which is expected to be started later this year. Can the Minister say whether this matter has been considered by the Harbors Board and, if it has, what decision has been arrived at?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, the honourable member has raised this matter often, and this morning I had a long discussion with the General Manager of the Harbors Board. I regret that I must inform the honourable member that I am compelled to agree with the General Manager that it would be inadvisable and improper to stipulate that the bridge should not be opened in future. It is agreed by certain people concerned that the bridge will have to be closed when the construction of the new bridge commences, but in the meantime many factors must be considered. The Harbors Board must take its dredge through to do the dredging for the new bridge. Further, we have received many petitions from people on the West Coast about a vessel that trades between Port Adelaide and that part of the State. The members for Eyre and Flinders would know something about this. The petitions have asked that we do everything possible to enable the vessel to continue to provide a service to the people there. When the vessel is not trading with the West Coast it carries gypsum to the plaster works and, therefore, must sail through the bridge. The shipping company and the plaster works are reconciled to the fact that when work on the new bridge commences they will have to dump gypsum because the bridge will be closed. However, they have asked (with every justification) that in the meantime the bridge be opened for the ship to pass through so that they will not be forced to dump the gypsum on the other side of the bridge, as this would increase the cost to the plaster works by about $1 a ton and would prejudice the industry and undoubtedly cause the shipping company to cease operating where it is necessary for it to operate. Although I must report these facts to the honourable member, I appreciate the difficulties caused when the bridge is opened.

STATE AID TO SCHOOLS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I refer to the answer given yesterday afternoon by the Premier to the Leader of the Opposition, to the effect that the Cabinet of the South Australian Government had made a positive decision not to challenge the validity of arrangements for State aid that are now in being, as was desired by the Federal executive of the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What evidence have you of that? You are making statements that are quite untrue.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Subsequently I asked the Attorney-General whether he had advised—

The SPEAKER: To make a statement explaining a question requires the permission of the Chair and the concurrence of the House, which the House gives by maintaining silence. Since there has been an objection I must ask the honourable member to ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir, if I can frame my question, having been interrupted by the Attorney-General. Can the Premier explain the apparent misunderstanding that occurred between him and another Cabinet Minister who said that no such decision had been made on this matter? Also, can the Premier say when Cabinet came to this decision?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This question concerns the business of Cabinet. On this occasion that business is the business of Cabinet, and that is what it will remain.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say that the Government's policy on this matter was officially discussed by Cabinet?

The SPEAKER: Is not that question on notice?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No; I asked whether it was officially discussed by Cabinet—not what it is.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have already said that Cabinet has its own business to attend to and is master of its own destiny. If I consider it appropriate to make known to the House any particular matter considered by Cabinet, I shall do so. The honourable member has asked questions on State aid to independent schools, but Cabinet has reached no finality as yet. Consequently, I cannot give the honourable member a reply to many of his persistent queries. I point out, however, that in my view he has used and usurped all of his privileges in this matter, and I suggest that any impatience on his part is not my responsibility.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yesterday, in answer to a question I asked, the Attorney-General said he had not advised Cabinet at all on questions of law involved. Can he say whether he was present at any discussions in Cabinet on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not intend to discuss Cabinet business in the House. If the honourable member is so anxious to have a relatorship action brought in the High Court (and he seems to be frightfully keen that that should be done) let him bring an application to the Attorney-General, and I shall consider any application he makes.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A few moments ago, in reply to a question, the Attorney-General did not merely imply but said straight out that I was apparently anxious that proceedings should be taken to challenge the validity of arrangements for State aid to independent schools. He said that I had implied this in my question. I say here and now categorically that there was no such implication in my question: indeed, it is absolutely contrary to my belief. I do not desire that any proceedings be taken and, unlike members opposite, I am able and anxious to make clear my position on this matter: I support the present arrangements for State aid to independent schools.

MODBURY PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of February 15 about any plans the Education Department might have to improve accommodation at the Modbury Primary School because of the high enrolment increase?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As soon as the unexpectedly high enrolment increase at the Modbury Primary School was known, the Public Buildings Department was asked to have a quadruple timber classroom unit erected in the grounds. It is expected that these classrooms will be ready for occupation in a month's time. This will obviate the need to transport children to Modbury South, but it will still be necessary to have a number of infants classes at the Golden Grove road school until the new infants building is occupied. Tenders were called on February 14 for the erection of an infants school building of eight classrooms, an activity room and ancillary accommodation, and will close on March 15. It is expected that the work on the project will commence about the end of April.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mrs. STEELE: In Western Australia later this year a technical education and training week is to be held, the organization of which has been proceeding for time time. Emphasis is to be placed on the value of technical education and training both to the individual and to the community. The object of the week is to highlight the opportunities available to young men and women and to stimulate their interest in the many branches of technology

open to them. As I know that the Superintendent of Technical Education has expressed great interest in the Western Australian project, can the Minister of Education say whether consideration has been given to holding a similar technical training week in South Australia and, if it has not, can the matter be investigated?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated. However, it could be that the question has already been considered by my officers but that no recommendation on the subject has yet arrived. I will have an answer for the honourable member as soon as possible.

SUBDIVISIONS.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The conditions under which subdivisions are carried out are well known. Near Morphett Vale, in my district, subdividers are asked to pay a certain sum to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for the cost of extending water to the area. However, in the case I have in mind a subdivision was carried out some time before this rule was introduced. A firm of builders has approached me, on behalf of its individual clients, complaining that, although it has bought already subdivided blocks and is building for individual people, none of those blocks will be watered unless a sum is paid to the department for water. If these blocks were individually owned and each was being built on by an individual, as I understand it, such individuals would not have to pay this charge. The firm is complaining that its clients are expected to meet a cost of about $90 on each allotment for this service. I know the Minister of Works is aware of this case, although he and I may not agree on all the facts. If I give him all the information that has been given me in the last few days, will he consider the case submitted?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The question raised by the honourable member was considered at some length by the department. In fact, a deputation waited on me, and I replied to that deputation on December 6 last year. The deputation established that the firm was engaged on a group building scheme; therefore, in the opinion of my departmental officers the scheme is subject to the requirements regarding subdivision and must meet the contribution. As recently as January of this year the Director and Engineer-in-Chief wrote to the people concerned and told them that if they paid the contribution they would be supplied with the water. I am prepared to let the honourable member have a look at the files on this matter. I think I have the facts of the deputation here and, if I have not, I will get them for the honourable member. We were convinced beyond doubt that the company concerned was engaged in a group building scheme. As the department and I understand it, this firm builds houses on the subdivided land and then appears to sell the houses when the walls are topped. In fact, that is the firm's own statement, yet it claims it is building for private individuals. Of course, if the firm is building on a group building scheme (I think the honourable member acknowledges that that is the case, and, in fact, the firm admitted it) it is subject to the requirements of the Act and must pay the contribution.

KIMBA AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Last week I asked the Minister of Works a question regarding amenities at the Kimba Area School, and in doing so I made a slight error: I said that the tender had been accepted from Arthur Hall, Ackson and Company, whereas I should have said that a tender had been received from that firm. Has the Minister a reply for me on this question?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: True, a tender was received, but on examination of the tender by the department it was found that the tenderer was under some misapprehension as to what he was tendering for and consequently the tender fell through. Therefore, a tender has not been let. Subsequently, tenders were called but no tender was received. However, with a view to making the job more attractive and thereby getting more tenderers, we have now called for tenders for similar work on the Streaky Bay Area School. These close on March 1, and we hope we shall be more successful and that we shall be able to do the work requested by the honourable member.

KANGAROO CREEK RESERVOIR.

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the faults that were discovered in the original design and location of the retaining wall for the Kangaroo Creek reservoir in the Torrens Gorge and the intention to locate this wall farther downstream, can the Minister of Works say what delay has been caused? Is the work now progressing satisfactorily, and can the Minister give an assurance that no further delay will be caused in this work which is so vital to the water supply of the metropolitan area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I appreciate the question, because this is a matter of great public interest. I am assured that work is now proceeding and that there will be no further delay. However, rather than make a statement without having an assurance from the department, I shall ask for a detailed reply to the honourable member's question and shall endeavour to let him have it when the House resumes.

TOWN PLANNING.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on December 1 about the delay concerning the transfer of property?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A report from the Town Planner states:

The application referred to is filed in T.P. docket 1440/65 and was received on August 9, 1965. The application was docketed and perused by this Office before sending out to the various authorities on August 11, 1965. Approval was received from the city of West Torrens on August 18, 1965. On August 19 approval was received from the Commissioner of Highways, also advising that a 7-ft. widening strip adjacent to Henley Beach Road would be required later. The Engineering and Water Supply Department advised that the application was satisfactory as regards water and sewerage on August 23. The original tracing was returned from examination in the Survey Section of the Lands Titles Office on October 8, 1965. The application was subsequently approved by the Town Planner on October 22, 1965, and the decision conveyed by post to the applicant on October 26, 1965. The principal delay in dealing with this application occurred in the Survey Section of the Lands Titles Office.

I inquired of the Registrar-General of Deeds about the delay, and the Chief Draftsman reported:

The computing section which handles the examination of resubdivisions has been working understaffed for several months due to recreation leave, sick leave, and to a large back-log of new titles to issue. Two juniors (who do the closures) have been almost continuously helping the tracers. One of the officers handling the examination of resubdivision was for four weeks relieving another officer who was sick for that period.

The Registrar-General of Deeds further reported:

Further to the minute of my Chief Draftsman dated February 10, 1966, I can only add that the delay in this office was caused by a shortage of staff. Over the period in question, only one officer was employed on the examination of resubdivisional plans when normally two, and more often three, are employed. This was caused by the resignation of one and another relieving an officer on sick leave. The delay in this section of my draftsman's branch is regretted as we pride ourselves in this State in the expeditious handling of our work. By way of comparison, I add that in Victoria where the Titles Officer handles twice the work with three times the staff of our department, a resubdivisional plan takes a minimum of six months from initiation to final approval.

GRID MAPS.

Mr. RODDA: The Naracoorte Emergency Fire Service has planned to obtain grid maps covering six hundreds, involving 50 maps at a cost of about $10 each. These maps are available from the Lands Department, and their use is important for fire-fighting purposes. Can the Minister of Lands say whether he has considered the need for these maps, and whether, to encourage fire-fighting services in the South-East to make full use of them, the maps can be made available more cheaply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether this is an original thought by the Naracoorte E.F.S. but, if it is, I commend it for a sound idea. These maps should help the E.F.S. to control fires in the district. I believe that the photographs can be obtained from local councils or police stations for $7 each, but I shall have the matter examined, and will inform the honourable member whether anything can be done to assist the Naracoorte E.F.S.

STRATA TITLES.

Mr. LANGLEY: For several years, many old houses have been demolished and two-storey home units erected on many blocks in the metropolitan area. As a legal provision of a strata title is required for people to have security, will the Attorney-General say whether any action is to be taken in this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A Strata Titles Bill has been in preparation by the Registrar-General of Deeds for about 18 months, and we expect to introduce it next session. The Registrar-General has examined strata titles provisions in other States, and we expect our provisions to be the most up-to-date in the Commonwealth. In the meantime, in most of these cases shares in limited proprietary or private companies have been sold, entitling the holders of certain shares to a 99-year lease of certain portions of the company's premises. It was thought that this was a reasonably legal means of providing security prior to the introduction of strata titles legislation. However, a recent Full Court decision in New Zealand decided that such an arrangement is, in the terms of the New Zealand Companies Act, a return of capital to the shareholders. Under

our Act it is a reduction of capital, which is unauthorized and therefore illegal. The matter was discussed at the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General, but we have received only within the last two days copies of the emergency legislation passed in New Zealand to hold the situation and to protect those who have shares in such companies of this kind. I gave notice today of a Bill to be introduced on Tuesday week, and that Bill is intended to cover this situation prior to the introduction of the Strata Titles Bill.

NAILSWORTH SCHOOL.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Education investigate the situation existing at the Nailsworth school where congestion exists because, on about three acres of land there are an infants school, a large primary school and a girls technical high school? In fact, the area is so congested that no playing area exists, so the Prospect Oval has to be used. Although I asked the Minister a similar question last year, following which the matter was investigated, will he have a further investigation carried out to ascertain whether the problem can be alleviated, either by acquiring neighbouring properties and consolidating the playing area, or by replacing temporary structures with solid construction buildings?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to investigate the matter, but I point out that when I became Minister and looked at some schools, I was rather dismayed to see the confined space in which so many of our important schools were being conducted. I instance the Adelaide Girls High School and the two teachers colleges. When the Government has more finance, it will be pleased to acquire land and to see that these deficiencies are remedied.

TEENAGE DRIVERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier a reply to my question of February 10 about teenage drivers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes. The Education Department fully recognizes the importance of youth driver training and would like to extend the facilities among the older students. At the same time, however, there are many difficulties. Under the law, no student can be instructed until reaching the age of 16 years and obtaining a learner's licence. The Director of Education has kept closely in touch with the Commissioner of Police and his officers on this matter. We have had in this State since 1959 a first-rate working arrangement with the Commissioner under which groups of 25 students at a time are taken for an extensive driver training course at the Police Advanced Driving Wing near the city. Instruction is both practical and theoretical, and it is given by expert police instructors. There is no doubt that students who take the course derive great benefit and are most appreciative of what is done. Each year ten or 12 courses are held, and these cater for 250 to 300 students. The department is greatly indebted to the Commissioner of Police and his officers for this work, as in so many other ways, but it is not possible at present to extend the arrangements, because more trained instructors cannot be provided. Consideration was given several years ago to the possibility of setting up a full driving instruction centre in conjunction with, or at least adjacent to, several large metropolitan high schools and perhaps in country centres. However, apart from the interference with normal school work, funds are not available in the Education Department either for the construction of a centre or for the annual outlay that would be involved.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received a request from a constituent who has a fairly large family for information about the Government's plan in relation to free school books. I have seen many references to the plan, but as far as I know its actual working has not been officially reported on, at least in this place. Will the Minister of Education prepare a report stating when it will operate, how it will work, and what children will be covered by it, so that members will be able to reply to the questions they are asked on this subject from time to time?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have already issued a public statement on this which contained all the details and which received wide publicity. In several speeches at school speech nights before Christmas I gave full details, but I shall be happy to produce the document, make it public again, and give a copy to the Leader.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: No statement was made in this House.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am not sure of that from memory.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I am not asking for it now, but will the Minister make a statement on Tuesday week?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS (SUPPLEMENTARY) DRAINAGE BILL.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT.

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the South-Western Suburbs (Supplementary) Drainage Bill, 1966, has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its inquiry, your committee met on two occasions, and took evidence from the following witnesses: Mr. F. D. Jackman, Commissioner of Highways and Chairman of the Construction Authority Committee, South-Western Suburbs Drainage Scheme; Mr. J. Chaston, Town Clerk, City of Brighton; Mr. A. D. McClure, Town Clerk, City of Marion; and Mr. A. E. Daniel, Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman.

2. Advertisements were inserted in the daily press inviting persons desirous of submitting evidence on the Bill to appear before the committee. There was no response to these advertisements.

3. In evidence before the committee the representatives of the Brighton and Marion councils indicated that the Bill was acceptable to their respective councils in its present form, and that the councils would like to see the work envisaged in the Bill proceed as soon as possible.

4. Your committee is of the opinion that there is no objection to the Bill, and recommends that it be passed without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 16. Page 4102.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): This appears to be largely a machinery measure consequential upon the Commonwealth legislation. Under those circumstances, as far as I can see, it is unlikely that the Bill would contain provisions to which either objection or criticism could be made. The purpose of the Bill is obviously to protect the public and to see that people get fair weight and measurement of anything they purchase. However, new subsection (6) of section 26 requires an explanation. Under that provision the Minister, if he is of the opinion that the use of a weight, measure, weighing instrument, measuring instrument, etc., might facilitate fraud, may order a person to discontinue using it, or to comply with any other direction. The penalty prescribed for not obeying any direction is $200.

I cannot see the purpose of this. An instrument or a weighing machine is either lawful or unlawful and, if it is an unlawful machine, it should not be approved in the first place. The Minister is not a technical person, yet all he has to do is form an opinion that such an instrument or machine could lead to fraud, and he may then order that it be not used. A machine could comply with the Commonwealth law in every respect, yet a person may be ordered to cease to use it or to dispose of it; in other words, to comply with any direction the Minister may give. I do not know whether this clause has been suggested by the Attorney-General because of some desire to introduce uniform legislation. No real explanation has been given of it, and it is certainly a most peculiar set-up.

The Minister can give notice, and without further ado the person concerned, having bought what was a perfectly legal machine, suddenly finds himself with a machine that he is no longer able to use; and if he does not comply with the direction of the Minister (which can be anything) he is up for a fine of $200. We have seen some dictatorial legislation in this House this session, but I do not know of anything as bad as this. I do not know of any type of weight or measure that could not be used by a person somewhat fraudulently at some time or another; in fact, most machines can be adjusted in a certain way. Apparently this is a new provision altogether, for there is no marginal reference to its having been used anywhere else in this form. I take the strongest objection to it. If a person purchases something that is of a legal standard, I believe he has every right to use it. The Standards Association of Australia prescribes what shall be proper equipment. I am not advocating the use of machines that are fraudulent, but I maintain that we should have some order as to what people know they can do and what they cannot do: it should not be at the whim of the Minister, because one day the Minister may say a thing is all right and another day he may say that it is not all right. I want an explanation before I accept this clause. The Minister, in his second reading explanation, said:

New subsection (6) provides that, notwithstanding any prior approval given by the commission or the Warden of Standards, the Minister may restrict the use of weights, measures, weighing instruments and measuring instruments if he is of opinion that their use in certain circumstances would facilitate fraud.

New subsection (7) provides for a penalty not exceeding $200 for a person acting in contravention of any direction given by the Minister.

Machines or sets of scales may be perfectly legal and in use in every State of the Commonwealth, yet suddenly the Minister may come to the opinion that their use be discontinued. I consider that if a person is using any machine fraudulently he is committing an offence anyway and he is then very rightly punishable by law. Under this Bill the Minister may merely assume that somebody could do something illegally. I take the strongest objection to the provision.

There is one other thing about the Bill to which I object violently. This Bill was introduced and the second reading given only yesterday, and copies of the Bill, which we are asked to debate today, have been on the file for only a few minutes. As I have said, this is a complicated Bill, yet the Government expects us to debate it when it has been available to members for only a matter of minutes.

Mr. Millhouse: It is another example of the Government's dictatorial attitude.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. It was introduced yesterday and put at the top of the Notice Paper for debate today. No-one could have examined the Bill properly in that short time. Members opposite, when in Opposition, would have refused to handle the Bill in these circumstances. I ask the Premier to allow reasonable time in which to examine legislation, as Bills should be on the file for at least two or three days before being debated. With those protests, I support the Bill, although I shall require a further explanation of clause 12 before I accept it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): The Minister in charge of this Bill has experienced some difficulties, which were not his fault. Had certain information been given to him from outside Parliament, the Bill would have been introduced last year, so that it would have operated from January 1 of this year. If there is still something in the mind of the Leader concerning the Government, he can have all next week to consider this Bill. I hope that members are prepared to sit all of the following week so that the Legislative Council, when it returns from another State, will be able to deal with this and other legislation. I shall not interfere with the responsibilities of the Minister. If he desires that the Bill shall be debated now, or that it be adjourned without prejudicing the operations of his department, the decision is his.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This Act has been amended several times in order to close loopholes and prevent fraud, and to provide a fair deal for all consumers. If this Bill achieves uniformity throughout the Commonwealth (and I understand that is one of its objectives), it has my support. However, I should like an assurance that the rights of councils employing inspectors are maintained at their present level and not in any way reduced. Also, I should like the Minister to say whether the provisions of clause 12 are peculiar to this Bill or whether they are in the legislation of the Commonwealth and of the other States. If a new type of measuring device is placed on the market, does the Minister have the right to approve of it? I support the Bill in principle, but should like my queries answered.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): Perhaps the Bill has been introduced and dealt with with undue haste, but this was unavoidable, and I remind the members that the previous Government did this sort of thing often. This is not a complicated measure as the amendments are mainly consequential, so that I do not consider it necessary to adjourn the debate for further consideration of the Bill. In reply to the Leader's question relating to new subsection (6) of section 26, I point out that a certain type of machine can be issued and used, in accordance with the standards laid down, for two or three purposes. However, because of its nature, it should not be used on the counter of a retail store. I refer to a certain weighing instrument used in a factory, which can be adjusted merely by flicking a finger, whereas other machines may require the use of a screwdriver or spanner. I think the instrument is called a quick-taring machine, and weighs packages prior to their being filled.

If such a machine were placed in a retail store, a person serving a customer could be accused of a fraudulent practice, bearing in mind the way in which the machine is so simply and readily adjustable. That is why the Minister must have power to declare a machine unfit for a certain use. It is extremely difficult to cater for every different circumstance that may arise in matters relating to weights and measures, but it is not envisaged that this power will have to be used often. Another example of the desirability of this power relates to petrol pumps used for wholesale purposes, which have a continuous figure on the dial. Although that is approved for wholesale purposes, I point out that dials have

to be zeroed on pumps used for commercial purposes. These are the only two examples that the Warden could readily call to mind. It may be said that if only two cases exist, it is unlikely that anything else will happen that will justify a provision of this kind, but I contend that undesirable ways may be found to use an approved machine.

The Commonwealth Act provides for the various State Ministers to have this power. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) asked whether this particular provision was included in the Acts of other States. Although I cannot answer that question categorically in relation to all States, I point out that it exists in some States, particularly in Tasmania where the power given to the Minister in this Bill is left in the hands of the secretary who is equivalent to a Warden in this State. It was considered in this case, however, that the power should be given to the Minister; because, otherwise, if left with the Warden, it might invite accusations of bureaucratic control, etc. This provision will ensure that less likelihood of personalities entering into the matter will arise. It will also make for better control of the situation.

The member for Torrens also asked whether councils would be interfered with in any way as a result of measures contained in the Bill, but I can answer that with a categorical "No". The department is conscious of the work undertaken by councils and appreciates the assistance it receives in this field. On the other hand, it intends to increase the assistance given to councils in relation to the functions they perform on the department's behalf.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Stamping and verification of weights, etc."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

In new subsection (6) to strike out "is of opinion" and insert "has reasonable grounds for believing".

Obviously, if the Bill does not provide for the restriction of a measure for certain purposes it may be defective. The ridiculous position could arise of somebody weighing a pound of tea on a weighbridge. If there is no approval associated with the function for which the instrument is to be used, then the Bill has been conceived in haste and should be further examined. My amendment will give the opportunity to question a direction given by the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): The Government will accept the amendment. Tremendous difficulties are associated with specifying exactly where items of this nature can be used. A machine could be used for several purposes in different places if it were adjusted. I do not think it would be feasible or practicable to try to specify in every case where a machine should be used.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: New subsection (7) is too wide. I do not agree that the Minister should be able to give any direction, as this provision would enable him to do. He should be able to give only a direction restricting the use of a machine. I suggest that the new subsection be amended to provide that "any person who contravenes or fails to comply with any direction restricting its use in any such notice which is applicable to him shall be guilty of an offence". If the Minister is prepared to accept an amendment along those lines I shall have it prepared.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not disagree with the Leader on this. Perhaps the wording could be improved by using the word "specification" instead of "direction". I think this is just a matter of term, and if it meets the Leader's wish I shall be happy to substitute that word.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the Minister moves such an amendment, I think it will at least show that it has to be related technically to the use of a particular weighing instrument. If the Minister will move that amendment, it will meet the position.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

In new subsection (7) to strike out "direction" and insert "specification".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 13 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Certain standards not to be used."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

In new section 38(3) to strike out "purporting to be".

A peculiar set of words is used here. New section 38(3) states:

Any certificate or indorsement, if purporting to be signed by the Warden of Standards, shall be *prima facie* evidence of the verification or reverification of the weights and measures therein referred to.

If it is to be *prima facie* evidence, it should at least be real. Anybody could sign this in the Warden's name.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is only *prima facie* evidence.

Mr. Millhouse: It ought to be taken out.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the Attorney has remarked, this is *prima facie* evidence only. The Commonwealth Government approves of the person in each State who will do the verification and reverification of the weights and measures, and in this State it is the Warden of Standards. I do not readily grasp the intention of the Leader's amendment. If these words were struck out, it would mean that every time the Warden's signature appeared he would have to be formally produced to say that that was his signature, but if it purports to be his signature this would be accepted as *prima facie* evidence. Therefore, I cannot accept the amendment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On many occasions we provide that a signature on a certificate shall be *prima facie* evidence. However, this goes much further, because it may not be signed by him at all. As the clause stands, it will place upon a person the obligation of proving that the certificate was not signed by the Warden of Standards, and how could a person prove that?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Under your amendment, the Warden would have to be formally produced to prove that the certificate was signed by him.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Everyone else has to prove things; why should the Warden of Standards not prove it?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You don't produce the Government Printer to prove his signature on the *Government Gazette*.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Attorney is going to absurdities.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As I said, under Commonwealth legislation the person appointed to be responsible for the verification and reverification of standards in this State is the Warden of Standards. I point out again that if these words are removed, every time a certificate is signed by the Warden of Standards he would have to be produced to prove his signature. I think the Leader knows that that is not practicable, and therefore I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It seems that the only justification the Minister can advance against the amendment is that it would mean that the Warden of Standards would have to be called to prove his signature. Why should he not be called to prove his signature?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why should he?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Evidence is given orally in a court of law. The Warden is not so overworked that he cannot go along and give evidence. If this is the only reason, it is a poor one.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (18 to 22) and title passed.

Clause 21—"Consequential amendments to various sections of principal Act"—reconsidered.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In this clause many consequential amendments are made to the principal Act, and in it section 47 of the principal Act is further amended. These amendments should be separate. This is not good drafting, and may cause confusion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Clause 21 (2) deals specifically with one item, and I cannot see where it can be confusing.

Clause passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES AND BUILDING SOCIETIES) BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Friendly Societies Act, 1919-1961, and the Building Societies Act, 1881-1938, and has a two-fold object: (*a*) to increase the amount by which a member may be indebted to the small loan fund from $400 to $1,000; and (*b*) to permit friendly societies to establish and operate building societies. I have consulted the Parliamentary Draftsman, who has assured me that the Decimal Currency Bill, which has been assented to, covers all amendments that would be necessary where the old currency figures are used. Power to form a small loan fund is conferred by section 9a of the Friendly Societies Act, and the South Australian United Ancient Order of Druids Friendly Society and, it may be, other friendly societies have registered rules for the establishment of such a fund. This amendment increases the amount by which a member can be indebted to the fund from $400 to $1,000. It may be of interest to members if I explain the general principles on which this fund operates in the abovementioned society.

When a member's savings amount to $10 (based upon members' contributions to the

fund at the rate of 10c a week or multiples thereof) they are allotted a loan unit and receive interest at the rate of 5 per cent on each loan unit. After 12 months' membership a member is entitled to borrow $100 for each loan unit up to a maximum loan, at present, of $400, so that if, for example, a member has $20 in his savings account he can borrow $200, but if he has $40 in his savings account he can borrow up to $400. Members may also deposit lump sums in the savings fund for which they receive interest at the rate of 5 per cent but such a deposit does not entitle a member to a loan, as loans are available only to members who make regular savings contributions to the fund. Savings and deposits can be withdrawn at any time. Loans are made to members, on application, and repayments to the society may be made over a period of six, 12, 15, 24 or 30 months, and interest is charged at the rate of 4 per cent flat.

Since this fund was established three years ago the society in question has granted 943 loans with a capital value of $299,876; 340 loans with a capital value of $95,696 have been repaid in full and at the present time 603 loans with a capital value of $204,180 are current. Loans have been granted for such purposes as purchase of property, house improvements, motor vehicles, household goods and for medical expenses, holidays and so on. At the present time the savings and deposits received from members of this society amount to $208,296 and because of the limit of $400 imposed under section 9a of the Act it is not possible to utilize all the moneys made available by way of savings and deposits. Over the past 12 months the amount available but not used varies from $64,000 to $88,000 and as at October 31, 1965, the society held $89,832 available for small loans.

It has been suggested by the South Australian United Ancient Order of Druids Friendly Society, and accepted by the Government, that by increasing the amount by which a member can be indebted to the fund to $1,000 members would be materially assisted, particularly with regard to home purchase. Where large amounts are being lent, some type of a security is obviously required and this society, and no doubt other friendly societies, can materially assist some of its members by making a personal loan up to $1,000 available as a second mortgage; and as the existing interest rate on personal loans is only 4 per cent a considerable reduction in interest would be saved by members who purchase homes. Clause 4, which amends section 9a of the principal Act, accordingly provides.

The principal amendment proposed by this Bill is to enable friendly societies to establish and operate building societies. This proposed amendment has also been suggested by the South Australian United Ancient Order of Druids Friendly Society. Honourable members will be interested to learn that friendly societies are playing an important part in mortgage financing in this State and it is worth noting that over the last few years their rate of lending has been slightly in excess of $2,000,000 per annum. Most friendly societies have a waiting list for mortgage finance. It is anticipated that if the Friendly Societies Act was amended, as proposed, then friendly societies would have no difficulty in obtaining savings and deposits from their members, which in turn would permit an increase in the amount of money available for mortgage finance. There is, it is considered, a definite demand in this State for the establishment of building societies to permit money being made available for home purchase at reasonable rates of interest. If the proposed amendment is passed it is considered that it would assist the abovementioned society and its members, as well as other friendly societies. By clause 3, therefore, section 7 of the principal Act is amended by conferring upon friendly societies power to establish permanent societies registered under the Building Societies Act and for joining and co-operating with any other society for that purpose.

By clause 5, section 12 of the principal Act is amended and confers a power upon friendly societies to invest moneys in or make deposits with building societies owned wholly by friendly societies subject to the consent of the committee of management of the friendly society and the approval of the Public Actuary. Clauses 7 and 8 are consequential amendments to the Building Societies Act to give effect to Government policy enabling friendly societies to operate as building societies. Clause 7 amends section 4 of the principal Act and provides that a permanent building society, the shares of which are owned wholly by a friendly society, may, subject to the amendment made by clause 5 of this Bill, be established by one or more friendly societies, and any permanent building society so established shall transmit to the Registrar two copies of the proposed rules of that society for purposes of its registration. Clause 8 amends section 13 of the principal Act and provides that the rules of building societies

established by friendly societies must contain certain unalterable rules. I commend this Bill for consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from February 16. Page 4136.)

Clause 3—''Annual subscriptions''—which Mr. Hall had moved to amend by striking out "six guineas" in paragraph (*a*) and inserting "twelve dollars''.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This Bill was obviously prepared a long time ago, before the change-over to decimal currency. Little, if any, explanation has been given as to why an increased fee is required. This clause increases the annual fee payable by physiotherapists to the board from £3 3s. ($6.30) to £6 6s ($12.60). The Registrar or Secretary of the board is an accountant and I suppose that his fees have risen and he believes that he is justified in charging more. I believe some explanation should be given for the increase. The Premier said:

Clause 3 (*a*) will raise the maximum annual subscription of practising physiotherapists which can be fixed by regulation from £3 3s. to £6 6s. It is understood that it would be the intention of the board to increase the annual fee only if it found it necessary to do so.

I wager that it will not be long before the increase is made if this clause is passed. I do not believe there is any justification for passing this measure on the explanation given. The member for Gouger is right in saying that the fee in the Bill should be converted to dollars but this is a superficial amendment. I believe that the Committee should further examine the matter and query the need for any increase at all. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is voted on will I be precluded from speaking on clause 3 (*b*)?

The CHAIRMAN: An amendment does not preclude any discussion on a later subclause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My only amendment will be to strike out paragraph (*b*). Will I be in order in moving that?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: To sum up, I believe the Committee will be doing less than its duty if it agrees to almost doubling the annual subscription of physiotherapists.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I intended to move to strike out "six guineas" and insert "six pounds five shillings". I explained earlier that the Decimal Currency Act will cover the necessary alterations even after this Bill is passed. This Bill provides that the annual subscription of practising physiotherapists may be increased by legislation from $6.30 to a sum not exceeding $12.60, and that non-practising physiotherapists shall pay an annual fee of $3.15 to remain on the register of physiotherapists. At present there is no charge for them. I understand that physiotherapists are in a similar position to others who practise and are not afraid to charge more than $2.10. The reason for the proposed increase in fees is that the administrative costs of the Physiotherapists Board have risen substantially since 1946 when the fees were last raised. These administrative costs include legal fees, stationery, postal expenses and the annual remuneration of the Registrar. Non-practising physiotherapists share with practising physiotherapists the protection of the board and other benefits, and it is considered fair and equitable that they should pay to remain on the register and equally bear the burden with practising physiotherapists. For non-practising physiotherapists the registration fee will be increased by regulation only to what the board thinks is necessary. I seek the leave of the Committee to permit me to move an amendment that would strike out ''six guineas" and insert "six pounds five shillings".

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is it in order that this amendment be considered before the Committee considers the amendment of which I have given notice and which you have read to the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Did the honourable member actually move the amendment?

Mr. HALL: I passed up a written copy to you, Sir, and you read it to the Committee. You would have put it to the vote had there not been a debate.

The CHAIRMAN: But my understanding is that the amendment has not yet been moved.

Mr. HALL: I understand that I did move it. Why would I have handed it up otherwise?

The CHAIRMAN: It could have been handed up as a proposed amendment. Did the honourable member move the amendment last night?

Mr. HALL: Yes, Sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. I intend to put the first part of the member for Gouger's amendment, which seems agreeable to both the member for Gouger and the Premier. I will subsequently put the second part of the honourable member's amendment.

Mr. HALL: I should like to say a few words before the amendment is put to the

Committee. I appreciate the fact that the Premier has spoken on the matter, but he has not given a satisfactory explanation. The Premier said that the reason for the increase is that costs have risen substantially. "Substantially" is the key word—the word "doubled" was not used. That is important because the fee is doubled. In the face of no explanation of why we need double the fee, and in the face of the fact that the Premier said the fee may be (not "will be") increased up to this figure, I believe that the figure is a most untidy one, and that it should come out of this Committee in round dollars. The explanation that has been given is most inadequate.

Mrs. STEELE: I think the increase is outrageous. Many young girls each year enter the profession, having graduated after a three-year course of study, and many have had to pay entirely for this. They have expensive fees to meet, and for a considerable time after they are registered and able to practice the profession for which they have studied they receive a salary that is not really adequate. It seems to me that to suggest to young girls just embarking on a career that they have to pay double the fees paid in the past is unfair. To what extent has the remuneration of the Registrar been increased? By how much have the legal fees payable by the Registrar in connection with his duties been increased?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In view of what has been said, surely it behoves the Premier to give some figures on the remuneration of the Registrar and on the other costs incurred by the board.

Mr. Shannon: In other words, what becomes of the money collected?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The Premier should justify this increase.

Amendment carried.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

To strike out paragraph (*b*).

I am extremely disappointed that the Premier has not had the courtesy to get up and justify the figures.

Mr. Quirke: He can't, if he doesn't know.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The only conclusion I can come to is that he does not know. The Premier is in charge of the Bill. Whatever the justification may be for paragraph (*a*), there is no justification at all for paragraph (*b*), which provides, for the first time, an annual fee of one and a half guineas. I do not know whether the Premier plans to amend that to a decimal amount. I have some personal interest in this matter, because I happen to be married to a "slap and tickle" girl; I make sure now she does more tickling than slapping. Nevertheless, she is a physiotherapist, and her name has been for many years (since we were married) on the list of non-practising physiotherapists. She has received no communication from the board, and she has had nothing from the board at all. The advantage of that list is not to the non-practising physiotherapist but to the members of the board, who will know what physiotherapy assistance is available in the community. The board will know, by virtue of the list, what assistance may be available in an emergency. The names on that list do not have to be renewed annually: they remain on the list indefinitely, and no fee (until the present time) has been charged. No real reasons were given for this. The explanation again was as weak as water: that in some way the physiotherapists who have their names (most of them are women) on the list of non-practising physiotherapists can get some protection from something. That is just nonsense and piffle. There is no protection and no advantage at all to the physiotherapist through being on the list.

Mr. Hall: But they do not have to register, do they?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, they do not. What will happen if this goes through is that the name will simply be removed, so far as I am concerned. Why should I pay out two or three dollars?

Mr. Hall: What disadvantage would there be in not being on the list?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: None at all. Under section 39 of the principal Act, the name can be replaced on the list at any time, simply by a person proving certain things to the satisfaction of the board. A person is entitled to be registered at any time. Those who realize their rights and their position under this will have their names taken off the list of non-practising physiotherapists. The list will then get into disarray, and the board will be no better off; in fact, it will be worse off because it will not know which physiotherapists will be available in an emergency. Of course, some will think there is some obligation to pay this fee: some will not know that pursuant to section 39 they are entitled to have their name restored to the register at any time. That is where the unfairness of this lies. This is just something to get a bit more money for the board, for it gives no advantage or protection to anyone whose name is on the

list. I ask the Committee to strike out this paragraph.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: This is another instance in which I have no personal interest in fees. As the board has not had sufficient funds to meet the obligations imposed on it, I cannot accept the amendment of the member for Mitcham.

Amendment negatived; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment.

Bill recommitted.

Clause 3—"Annual subscriptions"—reconsidered.

Mr. HALL moved:

To strike out "one pound eleven shillings and six pence" and insert "three dollars".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill reported with a further amendment. Committee's reports adopted.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I voice my strong protest on two counts. First, until the member for Gouger drew the attention of the House to the points about decimal currency no-one, including me, had taken the trouble to check what the Bill meant, and we should all do that at all times. Secondly, the Bill is completely unjustified. The previous Government was wise enough not to introduce it. One physiotherapist's name will be taken off the list: this will be no disadvantage to her, but it will be to the board. This is a thoroughly bad and unjustified Bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

GLENELG BY-LAW: FORESHORE CONTROL.

Order of the Day, Other Business, No. 8: Mr. McKee to move:

That by-law No. 1 of the Corporation of the Town of Glenelg, in respect of regulating bathing and controlling the foreshore, made on June 8, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on November 23, 1965, be disallowed.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie) moved:

That this Order of the Day be read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, March 1, 1966, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

At 5.6 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 1, at 2 p.m.