

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, August 24, 1967

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

QUESTIONS

HOUSING TRUST STANDARDS

Mr. HALL: On July 18 the Premier, when replying to a question concerning low-cost rental-purchase houses to be built by the Housing Trust and whether the Government intended to reduce the overall standard of trust dwellings, said, "We certainly do not intend to reduce the standard of Housing Trust construction." The member for Burra then asked whether the proposed policy would mean a lowering of the existing minimum Housing Trust standards, to which the Premier replied, "I have already pointed out to the Leader of the Opposition that it does not mean any such thing." I have received information that variations to previous specifications for rental-purchase houses have been made, as follows:

Bathroom and W.C. floors—previously terrazzo, now coloured cement.

Asbestos gable ends—previously moulded asbestos, now flat asbestos.

Shower screens—deleted and curtain rail substituted.

Laundry cabinet—deleted.

Water softener loop for future connection—deleted.

Insulation to walls and ceilings—deleted.

Ceramic tiles to kitchen—deleted with the exception of two rows behind sink, which is the requirement of the E. & W.S. Department.

Ceramic tiles to bathroom—tiles over bath and basin reduced to one course in accordance with the E. & W.S. requirement; tiles to shower area—unchanged.

Cupboards to kitchen—one bench and one overhead cupboard deleted.

It has been estimated that these variations will save about \$250 to \$300 in construction costs. I have been told that insulation is essential in walls and ceilings of brick-veneer houses, as one important criticism of this type of construction is that there is a high noise level without insulation. Can the Premier say whether the foregoing variations and reductions in construction standards have been made and, if they have been, why they have been made in the face of his recent statement that standards would not be reduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I have certainly not been informed of any of the matters to which the Leader refers, I will obtain a report.

HORROR BOOKS

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have read a press statement about the circulation of horror books at a Findon school in which the Minister of Education is reported as saying that he will make further inquiries. Has the Minister a statement on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have had the opportunity now to examine these books thoroughly, and they are certainly books that can be described faithfully as political propaganda. However, I do not intend to take any further action in the matter because, concerning the horror aspect, I am satisfied that some magazines in wide circulation contain photographs and other presentations of atrocities similar to those that have appeared on television. We are encouraging schools to apply to the embassies for material they require, rather than have individual students making approaches, because I believe the embassies have been somewhat embarrassed by the number of applications for material from individual students. I believe that in the circumstances, if this is undertaken, headmasters can adequately handle any matter that may arise from the receipt of publications of this sort. It was brought to my notice only a few minutes ago that the South Vietnamese embassy, through its First Secretary, had apologized for the embassy's action in sending to schoolchildren pamphlets on Viet Cong terrorism. I think it is true that to some children these pamphlets may be shocking but I do not think that we should hide the horrors of war from students or allow the old idea that there is some glory in war to be entertained any longer. I am happy to leave the matter to headmasters.

TORRENS RIVER OUTLET

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about any responsibility that his department might have concerning the development of the lower reaches of the Torrens River?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Except for some small odd parcels of land along the Torrens River the only land under the control of the Minister of Works is the land required for the construction of the outlet channel from the river. This land in the past few years has been reduced to the minimum requirements for maintenance purposes by the sale of surplus land to the Housing Trust. As the whole purpose of the outlet works is a functional one, to prevent flooding in the West Torrens, Henley Beach and Grange areas, the

requirements of sufficient flood opening and effective maintenance must be the prime consideration and, for this reason, the plans for beautification must fit in with the operational requirements. The present plan can envisage only limited tree planting on the reverse slopes of the embankments and, as the funds under the Metropolitan Drainage Act supplied by the various councils are insufficient for normal maintenance requirements, it has been necessary in the care of the young trees that have been planted to enlist the aid of local progress associations and local residents in the project.

PORT LINCOLN SCHOOL

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have inquired of the Minister of Education on several occasions about progress being made on the proposed third new primary school at Port Lincoln. The Minister has told me that one of the main problems in the matter concerns the acquisition of land, and that there are other associated problems. As the lack of accommodation for children attending primary schools is becoming more acute each year, I ask the Minister whether he has any further information on the matter. If he has not, will he please obtain a report for me at the earliest opportunity?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As I do not have the information with me, I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

PORT PIRIE HOUSING

Mr. McKEE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the Housing Trust's building programme at Port Pirie?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The trust is building to the known and expected housing demand in Port Pirie. At July 1, 1967, 29 houses were under construction and, as mentioned in the Loan Estimates for the current year, it is expected that a further 25 will be commenced (actually three of these are at present under construction), and approval for the erection of a further 10 has been given. In addition to the new constructions, many applicants are accommodated in the vacancies which occur from time to time in the existing groups. The estimate of an average of 15 houses a year was used by the trust's Principal Engineer when discussing with the district council the extent of stormwater drainage needed for the existing site at Port Pirie. There is no information to indicate a continuing demand at the present level after the 1967-68 programme is completed, but should

the need arise for additional houses consideration would certainly be given to meeting such demand at the appropriate time.

BUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I guess that in common with all other members I was delighted at the news of the up-turn in approvals for new buildings in South Australia announced early this week. We hope that this is the first glimmer of a return to prosperity (or activity anyway) in the building industry in South Australia. I was therefore deeply disappointed to read in this morning's paper the comments of the secretaries of some unions engaged in the building industry that, in fact, they have not yet noticed any improvement. The Builders' Labourers Federation Secretary (Mr. L. J. Robinson) could see nothing much to show for the rise yet (if anything); the Bricklayers Society Secretary (Mr. K. H. Lutz) could see no improvement yet; and the Secretary of the Operative Plasterers and Plaster Workers Federation (Mr. A. J. Byars) reported no improvement yet. In view of this disappointing report, can the Premier say what plans the Government has to stimulate the building industry in South Australia (a matter on which he said early in his period of office that he intended to take action), and when they will be announced and put into operation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I notice that the honourable member did not refer to the remarks of the Secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners.

Mr. Millhouse: You referred to that yesterday.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. The honourable member obviously wants to quote only from people who have not yet felt the up-turn in the building industry, but I point out to him that, where there is an up-turn in the building industry, one must expect that the initial results will be shown in the planning stages (that is to say, in increased activity of architects and in increased activity in applications for approvals of buildings), and that these will take place before the actual building work takes place. This is a natural thing that one must expect. Although I realize the honourable member is impatient about most things, I should have thought that he would give due appreciation to the normal facts involved in any change in employment in the building industry, for which we have present indicators. As to the Government's plans for stimulation of the building industry, apparently the honourable member has not been taking

terribly much notice of public announcements. I draw his attention to the fact that the Government has announced many things—

Mr. Millhouse: What are they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall detail them for the honourable member, since he does not seem to have taken notice as have members of the public of things that have taken place in the past two months. First, the South Australian Government provided a higher proportion of funds than had been provided previously for housing activity. What is more, I have agreed with the Commonwealth Housing Minister that a higher proportion of funds than was available previously will go to the co-operative building societies to which I have given Treasurer's guarantees and which have been able to obtain support from the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, so that an additional sum can be made available in certain areas of house building in South Australia without Government funds in addition to the Government funds that are committed to those areas.

Secondly, I have introduced in this House the strata titles legislation, which I am glad to say has now been passed. All sections of the housing industry in South Australia, despite the honourable member's derision, have suggested that that measure will, in fact, call into effect in South Australia considerable housing loan moneys that are available provided that there is adequate security for the loan. I am grateful that the other evening the honourable member was prepared to facilitate the passage of this measure, about which I was prepared to be perfectly co-operative with him. However, the honourable member apparently thinks it is unimportant in the housing area—

Mr. Millhouse: Well, I doubt whether it will make the difference you say it will.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the Chair should have to rise every day to remind the House that interjections made during answers to questions are entirely out of order. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not in my hands to name the honourable member on this score. In addition to the matters I have mentioned, I have undertaken to re-orient the Housing Trust programme in the way requested by the Housing Industry Association and by some master builders so that, in fact, the investment of low-interest moneys in South Australia will be in an area where previously money has not been expended, and other areas in which finance is available in the State will be left free to private investors.

As well as carrying out those measures, the Government will next week introduce a Bill for the registration of builders in South Australia. That legislation will control the building industry to ensure that those engaged in it are properly qualified and soundly based financially, so that those who have caused harm to others in the building industry under the previous lax provisions of legislation in South Australia will not be able to do so in future. In addition to this, I have negotiated with the Commonwealth Government and private investors for some considerable projects for South Australia. I have told the honourable member that, when these negotiations have been completed, I shall make announcements about them, and those announcements will be made.

I am well aware that from time to time members opposite, after being told that announcements will be made by the Government, have made various derisory remarks in the hope that nothing will occur, because they do not want anything to occur in South Australia. They are knockers who believe in having a go at the economy of this State and saying that it is wretched. They do that not to assist the people of this State but for their own petty political advantage. The people of this State, however, are well aware of the course that Opposition members are following. Unlike the previous Government, this Government will not announce projects until they are definite. When they are, an announcement will be made. I am sorry that members opposite will be as disappointed as they will be, and as they have shown themselves to be, about the announcements that have already been made by this Government. I assure them, however, that announcements will be made and that the people of this State will benefit, however disappointed members opposite may be about it.

IRRIGATION

Mr. CURREN: In past years when an increase in irrigation water rates has been contemplated, it has been the practice for the Minister to invite representatives of grower organizations to meet him and discuss the proposed increases. Can the Minister of Irrigation say whether any such increase is contemplated for the districts under his control?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, in the past it has been the Government's practice to notify interested organizations of a contemplated increase in water rates. This question is being examined at the moment. The department has set out to bring the situation back to

the level that existed in 1956 so that the Government subsidy towards the provision of water will remain at a certain level. Members will be aware that, in the past two years, increases in water rates have taken place in order to regain this level. The examination of the situation has not yet been completed, but I expect that, because of the increase last year, it will not be necessary this year to increase water rates. I hope that the examination will be completed shortly and that I shall be able to notify interested organizations that the Government does not intend to increase water rates this year.

CAMPBELLTOWN-PARADISE SEWERAGE

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister of Works say when work on the extension of sewerage to areas east of the Lower North-East Road will commence?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am not sure of the dates, so I shall call for a report and inform the honourable member when it is ready.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Mr. McANANEY: Yesterday, in an announcement concerning increased sums to be spent on public and other buildings in South Australia, it was stated that approvals for education buildings totalled nearly \$6,000,000 during the July quarter, which was almost double the amount spent during the previous three months and almost double the amount spent during the corresponding period last year. Can the Minister of Education say whether this means that the education programme is to be speeded up, or whether it will be continued at the normal steady flow or at a slightly reduced rate because of the reduced amount available in the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Loan Estimates which were dealt with recently indicate that the expenditure for school buildings in the forthcoming year is expected to be about the same as it was during the previous year. I do not know what the honourable member means by "speeding up". After all, schools must be built and plans submitted to the Public Works Committee, and the department then proceeds with construction as promptly as possible. True, the amount spent on particular buildings may be greater in a certain period of the year than in another period. However, we have to view this over a 12-month period, and I see no point in comparing a few months of one year with another period of a few months.

KEITH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked him during the Loan Estimates debate about the allocation of \$448,000 to the Tailern Bend to Keith water scheme, and how much of that money, if any, was allocated to the water scheme for the township of Keith? Also, will he ascertain from the Minister of Mines what progress, if any, has been made in finding a source of water to supply the township of Keith?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I arranged with officers of my department to write to all members who asked questions during the Loan Estimates debate, and I am disappointed to learn that the honourable member has not received a reply. I shall inquire to see what has happened. With regard to the water supply for Keith, I was told unofficially yesterday that the Mines Department had removed the plant from Keith. This information surprised me, because I discussed this matter only yesterday morning with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, who was adamant that investigations would continue. I will inquire immediately and inform the honourable member.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY

Mr. RODDA: The Minister of Works will recall that he recently received correspondence from the Penola District Council about extending the electricity supply to the fast-growing area of Coonawarra. Can he say what plans have been made to extend power to Coonawarra and to survey the other four hundreds that were included in the Penola franchise area? Will they be tied in with the hundred of Short represented by the Minister of Lands? Also, can he say what plans are envisaged to reticulate power to the area of the Naracoorte District Council and to erect a transmission line into the Lucindale area?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: These questions cover a wide area and I do not have these facts at my finger tips. I know that the Electricity Trust is planning extensions to the Frances area and to Keppoch, from Naracoorte. However, I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

FRUIT CASES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This morning I was informed that many people had been retrenched from work in the case-making industry at Mount Gambier, and that instructions had been given that employees previously put off should not be re-employed.

Pine forest timber is completely suitable for use in the fruit industry. It provides a cheap container, and there is no earthly reason why it should not be universally used by the industry, thereby not only conserving our forest industry but also providing substantial employment. Can the Minister of Forests say how many people have been retrenched and how many more will be? Also, what active steps are being taken by the department to have this timber, which is so eminently suitable for use in the fruit industry, used instead of imported timbers, which are being used more and more?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The situation concerning retrenchments at the Mount Gambier case mill is not quite as the honourable member suggests. Some females, mostly married women, have been retrenched, but male employees have been given other work in the department. Some weeks ago I recommended that no male employees should be retrenched, but a few females, mostly married women—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What constitutes a few?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I shall obtain the exact number for the honourable member.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I was told that it was a substantial number.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This is different from what I know. As I said earlier, whether the fruit industry uses pine boxes or imported boxes, as suggested by the honourable member, is in the hands of the industry. Some time ago the Agriculture Department, after much trouble, proved that a pine box was suitable for the apple industry but, despite this, the industry decided to use the carton. I cannot comprehend why it should do this but, of course, the decision rests with the industry.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: But you said—

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order when a Minister is answering a question.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The industry could demand a pine box, and, if it did, such a box would be supplied. I emphasize that this is not the first time that an industry, for some reason, has changed from a pine box to carton: it happened in the dried fruit industry a few years ago. I spoke to officers of the Woods and Forests Department about the imported veneer that is used for the construction of the wire-framed box, and these officers consulted the firm concerned. It was pointed out to them that this firm had

a reciprocal arrangement to export doors to the Philippines. If it were possible, I should hope that pine logs would be made into veneer, but constant representations along these lines have been unsuccessful. I have no doubt that the Woods and Forests Department would make every effort to have this done if it were possible to do so. Any industry, whether orange, apple or dried fruit, can demand to use pine boxes.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It has been reported to me by two people who were present that a combined deputation comprising two members of the Forestry Board, as well as representatives of the fruitgrowing industry, waited on the Minister of Forests some time ago, with a view to obtaining assurances from the Minister that timber would be available. These people were told that no assurance could be given that timber would be available and, in fact, they have offered to give me a letter from the Minister (and I have not yet seen this document) in which it is stated that the Minister instructed the people concerned to approach a private miller.

Mr. Jennings: Question!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister say whether that deputation, seeking assurances concerning timber cases, did, in fact, take place and whether the people present received the assurances they desired; or whether the deputation was unable to secure any assurance that adequate cases would be made available?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I am not sure to which deputation the honourable member is referring, although I suspect that it was a deputation which I received about two years ago and which comprised the present Leader of the Opposition, members of another place, the member for Chaffey, and several other members. That deputation was mainly concerned with tomato cases for growers, particularly in the Virginia area. I understand that representatives of Murray citrus growers were also present, including the Secretary or Manager of the organization concerned (I think his name was Mr. Medley). It was pointed out to the deputation that it was not and never had been within the province of the Woods and Forests Department to supply cases to private individuals; that cases were supplied to co-operatives; and that private casemakers should be approached. On that occasion I referred the matter to Mr. Josephs who, I believe, is the President of an organization which I think is known as the Casemakers Association. He assured me (and I think this relates to

the letter to which the honourable member referred) that an abundance of cases was available for these people. On that occasion, one person was seeking second-grade timber for cases. I do not know how we could go about growing sufficient second-grade timber: we want to grow first-grade timber. I was told that the person concerned used the timber from second-hand car cases to reduce the cost of those cases. Of course, he is entitled to do this; his idea is to have cheaper cases. As far as I can gather, private casemakers have given every assurance that they have ample material available to supply the people involved; in fact, they have second-grade timber that is mainly required by these people for cases. From memory (and I believe my memory is fairly reliable on this matter), at this deputation, in front of all those concerned, Mr. Medley was asked whether, in fact, there was a shortage of cases for co-operatives along the Murray River. I think he disappointed the deputation when he said there was not a shortage. A casemaker, whose name I cannot remember for the moment but who was also present, assured people with private packing sheds along the Murray River that ample timber was available for their needs. Those who had dealt with this casemaker in the past said that they were quite satisfied with the arrangements. Since then, I have been informed that the two or three casemakers at Williamstown have been able to supply the needs of people in private packing sheds in the fruit-growing area of the Murray River. I repeat that, if the industry decides that it wants wooden boxes, it is up to the industry to apply to have them.

ROAD MARKINGS

Mr. LANGLEY: The many road markings in suburban areas act as a safeguard to motorists and pedestrians alike. As these markings have resulted in much more careful driving than previously, will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ask his colleague to inquire whether the Road Traffic Board will consider providing more of these markings adjacent to schools (especially some of the smaller schools such as the one conducted at the Goodwood Orphanage)?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to confer with my colleague and obtain a report on the matter.

CLARE RESERVE

Mr. QUIRKE: In the western ranges near Clare there is a red cored stringy bark reserve that is unprotected on the northern side

although adequately protected on the western side by 600 acres of land that has been purchased as a reserve. As I understand some action has been taken with a view to protecting the northern side, where a beautiful stand of this rare timber is at present menaced, can the Minister of Lands say precisely what has been done to remedy the position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the honourable member's interest not only in this reserve but in conservation throughout the State generally. The honourable member will be pleased to know that only last Tuesday Cabinet approved the purchase of 84 acres of a Mr. Freebairn's property to add to the northern side of the reserve to which he has referred. Negotiations have been completed, and I hope that the result will be to provide the protection which, as the honourable member has suggested, is necessary.

EYRE PENINSULA WORKS

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Can the Minister of Works reply to the questions I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates about expenditure in various areas on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am sure that the honourable member and all other members concerned realize that many questions were asked during the Loan Estimates debate, concerning the department under my jurisdiction. I point out that my department spends about 75 per cent of the total sum allocated under the Loan Estimates and that, although it is not possible to obtain all the replies immediately, we are doing our best to obtain them as early as possible. I assure the honourable member that he will receive a reply.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. SHANNON: I have some sympathy for the Minister of Works concerning the metropolitan water supply; indeed, if worthwhile rains are not received soon, we shall be in difficulties. It has been the department's practice, when we have experienced dry periods in the past similar to the one we are now experiencing, to use underground sources for supplying water to the metropolitan area. In fact, I think a number of bores have been sunk but have not been used for some years. Can the Minister of Works say whether the department intends to use underground water in order to avoid restrictions that will obviously have to be imposed if we do not receive a good downfall soon? I have noted with some pleasure that the Minister was taking steps to have underground water used for maintaining

school ovals and surroundings, and I point out that that policy could be extended to the advantage of the State generally.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The metropolitan water supply is a matter of great concern to both the department and me. I discussed this matter with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief only yesterday and the Director intends to discuss with his officers ways and means of reducing to a minimum any restrictions that may be necessary. The watering of school ovals has been referred to the Director who, I understand, intends to take up the matter with the Director-General of Education and eventually with the Minister of Education. I agree with the honourable member that the use of bores for watering all ovals would considerably reduce the present rate of consumption; it is a splendid idea, and the matter is being thoroughly investigated.

BAROSSA VALLEY ROAD

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: The main bitumen road (certainly the most picturesque road) leading into the Barossa Valley via Gawler and Lyndoch is badly eroded in some places owing to wear and tear over many years. Each month the road is used by thousands of tourists who visit the Barossa Valley; this applies particularly during the vintage time. In view of the present condition of the road, I believe urgent major repairs are necessary, particularly the resheeting of large sections of the road. Will the Minister of Lands ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether the department intends to carry out these repairs, including the resheeting of the road, during the present financial year, or at an early date?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Of course, the honourable member is aware of my interest in tourist activities in the Barossa Valley, which is one of the major attractions of the State because of its beauty and because of its relative proximity to the metropolitan area. I shall be happy to see whether something cannot be done to repair the road, as it is important not only to the Barossa Valley but to the tourist industry in South Australia.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. McKEE: Yesterday, the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Freeth) said in Canberra that agreement still had to be reached with the South Australian Government on some aspects of the standardization of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line. Mr. Jessop (Commonwealth member for Grey) said later that he interpreted this as indicating that the South Australian

Government was not as ready as the Commonwealth Government to finish negotiations and open the way for other projects to begin. Can the Premier comment on those statements?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I find it extraordinary that the Commonwealth should suggest that South Australia has in any way been laggard in attempting to achieve finality in negotiations for standardization, because the boot is entirely on the other foot. I can tell the honourable member that South Australia has not been prepared to complete negotiations under conditions which would get rid of this State's interest. We are not going to be rail-roaded in this area and lose business that is essential to the State. The report that appeared in the *Advertiser* of a statement of the Commonwealth Minister did not give a true indication of South Australia's position. There are some points on which agreement is still to be reached between this Government and the Commonwealth Government on some aspects of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie undertaking. These are matters of some financial importance to South Australia which are apparently not being fully appreciated in other quarters. This Government would not be capable serving the State if it entered into arrangements which finally reacted to the State's disadvantage. Over 12 months ago, this State strongly suggested to the Commonwealth that a conference at Ministerial level was essential to deal with this problem. It took nine months for this conference to be held! Mr. Jessop, who asked the question in the Commonwealth Parliament, stated that, after he had received the answer that was quoted in the *Advertiser*, he understood this to mean that South Australia was not as ready as the Commonwealth Government to finish negotiations and open the way for other projects to begin. It should be clearly understood that South Australia is quite ready to complete negotiations on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie line, but not under terms that are radically disadvantageous to this State. It is also in a position for immediate negotiations on other projects, such as the Peterborough Division and including a Port Pirie to Adelaide connection and the provision of a standard gauge line between Port Augusta and Whyalla. We have made approaches to the Commonwealth about this to which we have had no reply. The Commonwealth has, since April, 1966, been in possession of detailed proposals from the South Australian Railways Department as to the way in which the State considers the Peterborough Division should be standardized. Mr. Jessop, with some

other Commonwealth members, would be doing his own State a greater service if he was prepared to get the facts for himself before he asked questions.

Mr. HEASLIP: When I last asked about this matter, the reply given to me was as follows:

The Minister of Transport states that the rail standardization agreement provides for the conversion to standard gauge of the whole of the Peterborough Division.

Mr. Lawn: Do you want leave to explain your question?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. Who is speaking?

Mr. Lawn: You have to get the approval of the House to do that.

Mr. HEASLIP: Are you the Speaker? Keep quiet!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must get leave of the House if he wants to make a statement explaining his question.

Mr. HEASLIP: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to explain my question after you, not another member, have requested me to do so. It is your prerogative.

The SPEAKER: Leave to make a statement in explanation of a question is given by the House, with the concurrence of the Chair. It is competent for any member of the House to refuse that leave.

Mr. Jennings: I think I shall, the way he's going.

Mr. HEASLIP: Have I leave to make a statement?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. HEASLIP: For some time I have been asking questions about standardization of the railways in South Australia and the last answer I received from the Premier was that the standardization proposal included all the railways in the Peterborough Division. However, in the report in this morning's *Advertiser* there is no mention or recognition of standardization of the Gladstone-Wilmington line, which is part of the Peterborough Division. Will the Premier again ask the Commonwealth Government to ensure that that line is included in the Peterborough Division for the purposes of standardization?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have pressed the Commonwealth on the matter of the standardization of the whole of the Peterborough Division, and we shall continue to press the Commonwealth on this matter. The immediate point at issue between the Commonwealth and this State relates to the conversion of that part of the line on which the Silverton Tramway Company at present operates. The proposals made to us by the Commonwealth would be singularly disadvantageous to the State. We are not prepared to agree to proposals that deprive this State of valuable business that it has now. Recently I again wrote to the Commonwealth about standardization of the Port Augusta to Whyalla and the Adelaide to Port Pirie sections. We are assured of considerable industrial expansion in South Australia immediately the Adelaide to Port Pirie section is standardized, because that will place South Australia in the extremely advantageous position of having a central location of manufacture on the standard gauge line and industry will be in a better position there in relation to transport costs and developing areas than almost anywhere else in Australia. I assure the honourable member that we shall continue to press this matter and all other matters about which we have given undertakings to the House.

CO-OPERATIVE WINERY

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In the press a few days ago it was announced that the seven major co-operative winemaking companies in the State had combined to form one joint enterprise known as Co-operative Wines (Australia) Limited. I understand that the new joint enterprise has leased the Emu Winery at Morphett Vale and that the Emu organization will export and market the co-operative's wines in Canada and the United Kingdom. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the co-operative will market this wine under its own name or whether the familiar Emu name will be used?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I have heard about the matter but, as I am not able to answer the specific question, I shall obtain further information.

ROAD TAX

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week about the percentage of money received from road tax that is allocated to the various councils?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I have not received a reply from my colleague, but I will inquire further about the position.

SCHOOL HEATING

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that matriculation classes are held at high schools in the evenings and I have been reliably informed that at the Vermont Girls Technical High School and the Norwood Girls Technical High School those classes are conducted without the students having the advantage of heating arrangements for their comfort. During the cold weather, this has been most unpleasant and has deterred the students from concentrating on the lectures and lessons given. When this matter was referred to a headmaster, the answer given was that, in the interests of economy, heating was not being provided. Can the Minister of Education comment on this matter and will he obtain a report about whether the reason given is the actual reason why heating facilities are not made available?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Headmasters have been asked to try to economize in the use of electrical power, because that is one item in an Education Department budget that is extremely hard to control. Obviously, some people put on lights in classrooms but do not turn them off. I have no doubt that headmasters have been carrying out the request made on this matter. However, I will ascertain whether we can meet the situation referred to.

MORTGAGES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been approached by a member of the legal profession about a problem concerning second mortgages, and perhaps I can best explain the question by reading this portion of the letter he has written me:

A number of clients for whom we act grant second mortgages to people buying homes on temporary finance. When a long-term loan is eventually approved, it is necessary to discharge the existing second mortgage and prepare a new second mortgage in the same terms to be lodged after the registration of the mortgage to the long-term lending body.

I think the Premier will understand the reason for this. The letter continues:

This procedure involves the home owner in considerable unnecessary expense. It should be possible to lodge at the Lands Titles Office a simple document whereby the second mortgagee agrees to the lodgement of the new first mortgage and agrees that the first mortgage has priority. I understand that such a provision exists in the Acts of some of the other States

and believe it should be introduced here, as it would save the owner considerable expense and reduce unproductive work at the Stamp Duties and Lands Titles Offices.

I suggest, with respect, that this suggestion has obvious merit from the points of view both of the person who must obtain finance and of the reduction of the administrative burden on the Government officers mentioned. Therefore, will the Premier say whether he has thought of this and, if he has, whether he has made a decision on it? If he has not thought about it, will he do so with a view to adopting the suggestion contained in the letter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have considered this and other matters relating to refinement of the Torrens titles system that have been introduced elsewhere but not yet brought into effect in South Australia. There are many ways, particularly in relation to mortgage documents, in which the procedure in South Australia ought to be modified and made simpler and more effective. It ought to be possible in South Australia to register a variation of a mortgage instead of having to discharge the existing mortgage and register a new one. This can be done in certain other countries under the Torrens titles system, but it cannot be done here. I have asked the Registrar-General to examine a number of these matters, and I will draw to his attention the matter the honourable member has raised.

RIVER MURRAY COMMISSION

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In this morning's *Advertiser* appears an article referring to the reply of the Minister of Works to a question by Mr. Curren regarding Murray water restrictions. Part of it states:

The River Murray Commission had tentatively agreed that restrictive action was likely this summer. This would again be discussed by the commissioners next week when a declaration on restrictive action was likely to be made. The July assessment indicated a distribution to South Australia of 318,000 acre feet for the September-April period, in addition to 376,000 acre feet of dilution water. This was an allocation about 278,000 acre feet below the full allocation for these months.

Under the River Murray Agreement, during a period of non-restriction, South Australia would be entitled to 972,000 acre feet, which water would have to be of good quality, because there is no mention in the agreement of dilution water. The Act provides that South Australia is entitled to a certain quantity

a month, of which 67,000 acre feet is for irrigation purposes, and an additional quantity of about 300,000 acre feet a year to overcome evaporation. Can the Minister of Works say whether the River Murray Commission is now using some of the water that should be coming into South Australia which is of bad quality, and using some of our water to dilute water that should not be coming here? The commission is responsible for supplying us with first-class water, and if we are to use a large quantity of water that is coming into South Australia to dilute inferior saline water—

Mr. McKee: Question!

The SPEAKER: "Question" having been called, the honourable member must ask his question.

MURRAY RIVER STORAGE

Mr. McANANEY: At present, when apparently the upper storages are not full, water is going over the spillway into the sea. As, to the best of my knowledge, this water is of reasonably good quality, will the Minister of Works ascertain why it is necessary for this water to be let out of storage and go to waste at this time of the year when the high level of the lake is reducing the area of grazing land available to nearby landholders, particularly when it could be of great value to them in this dry year?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This is a complicated question, and the honourable member will appreciate that water must be discharged down the river in order to keep the water lower down fresh and clean. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member and let him have it when it comes to hand.

KYBYBOLITE LABORATORY

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Agriculture say what research will be conducted in the laboratory that is to be constructed at Kybybolite?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The research, which will deal mainly with the products of that area, will have a bearing on pasture. I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

OVERLAND BUFFET CAR

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the debate on the Loan Estimates I asked the Treasurer questions about the possibility of having a buffet

car on the Overland and about blinds being fitted on the "red hens". Has he a reply on those matters?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to the buffet car on the Overland, a dining car would weigh approximately 55 tons, which would mean that at those times when the train operated to capacity one passenger car—representing anything from 20 sleeping car passengers to 64 sitting passengers—would have to be omitted. The Railways Commissioner states that the patronage on the Overland continues to grow and, in view of the fact that the existing capacity is taxed on many occasions, the rejection of up to 64 bookings could not be contemplated. It is pointed out that this train is owned jointly with the Victorian Railways, and that system's views regarding a dining car coincide with those of the South Australian Railways.

Mr. Millhouse: What about service to passengers?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have to answer that, but in order to provide service to passengers, the really important thing is to provide them with seats or berths and, although it would be delightful to provide them with additional facilities, it would be cutting one's nose off to spite one's face if one were to deprive them of the means of obtaining any facilities at all.

As far as the fitting of blinds in the "red hen" trains is concerned, the South Australian Railways has been testing for some time a type of window with a built-in anti-glare louvre for use in suburban railcars. As the reaction has been favourable, the 20 cars now under construction or contemplated will be fitted with this type of window. If these prove effective under full working conditions, consideration will then be given to their progressive installation in the existing cars.

GRAIN CHARGES

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the rebate of 83c on the freight charged to carry grain from silos to be used for starving stock?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I have only an interim report on this matter, I shall let the honourable member have the information later.

SUPERPHOSPHATE

Mr. McANANEY: In the newspaper this week it was reported that a leading superphosphate company had made a profit of 20 per cent for the last financial year, this being slightly over the 16 per cent for the previous year. Recently, the Premier claimed that, because of price control, many hundreds of thousands of dollars had been saved for users of superphosphate in this State over the past year or two. Can he reconcile these figures?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The price of superphosphate in South Australia has been restricted under price control so that South Australian companies, to some extent, have been at a disadvantage compared with other Australian fertilizer companies. This control has been exercised in order to protect South Australian users of superphosphate. Despite the reported returns to these companies, they have not been able to provide from their returns the same reserves for expansion that would have been available to other superphosphate companies in Australia, and this has placed them at some disadvantage compared with those other companies, which make larger profits without price control and which have been able to conserve a considerable sum for capital expansion. I can point to significant differences in sums reserved for this purpose. In South Australia we have tried to maintain a reasonable balance. The superphosphate companies have been somewhat bitter about the maintenance of control at the levels that have been extant in South Australia, but I should have thought that the farming community in this State would be grateful for the control we have maintained.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Will the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Social Welfare, ask the Minister of Transport for a report on the advisability of the South Australian Railways, in co-operation with the superphosphate companies, establishing bulk depots for superphosphate at various railway sidings? This would certainly reduce costs and provide an incentive for people who are engaged in the transport of bulk superphosphate to use the railways.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report.

EGGS

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the use of compulsory containers for eggs is being introduced as an administrative act or as a regulation, or is the instruction merely subject to the approval of the Minister?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It will be an administrative act.

PRICE CONTROL

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier's attention been drawn to a statement in this morning's press by the Premier of New South Wales concerning the failure of price control in South Australia and, if it has, has he any comment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Mr. Askin's statement is a broad one that pays no heed to any time span. The consumer price index measures only price changes in capital cities and does not compare prices between States. The general price structure in South Australia is considerably lower than that in other States, and I have previously given honourable members specific examples of the advantages in the cost structure in South Australia, under price control, compared with New South Wales. Through price control we have preserved the differential. Costs have risen in South Australia at the same rate as in other States, but we have maintained lower prices. New South Wales has a Prices Commissioner, but control exists only on two major commodities, bread and petrol, and in both cases the prices are lower in South Australia. The consumer price index increased from the 1952-53 June quarter to the 1967 June quarter by 37.8 in New South Wales, by 38.9 in Adelaide, by 40.1 in Perth, by 42.9 in Melbourne, by 43.3 in Hobart and by 45.5 in Brisbane.

The index measures only increases on certain items in each State and not price levels. In 1952, the cost of living was lowest in Adelaide and Brisbane (the price control States), and highest in Sydney with a basic wage 12s. a week above Adelaide's. These States started on a different basis from ours. Queensland decontrolled all but a few items in 1959. Several controlled items on which this State has a price advantage are not in the index. For example, many building materials and services, cartage, petroleum products, and superphosphate are not included in the price index that Mr. Askin quoted. Prices of a

wide range of goods and services are lower in Adelaide than in Sydney, including bread, footwear, some clothing, petroleum products, cartage, and many building materials and services. Through price control lower prices in this State are being, and will continue to be, maintained. People in this State should be grateful that New South Wales is not maintaining price control, because it enables us, under price control, to obtain a cost advantage for industry and business that does not exist in other States, and it enables us to maintain a competitive position, which is essential to the expansion of business and industry in this State.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. MILLHOUSE: At his invitation, last Thursday I asked the Premier for a reply to a question I had asked during the Loan Estimates debate concerning drainage in the Garden Suburb of Colonel Light Gardens. As he could not give me the answer then and as I understand he has it now, will he be kind enough to give it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Roads reports that no relief is possible for Colonel Light Gardens until Drain 4 is extended eastward to the junction of Goodwood Road and Daws Road. Tenders have been received for this drain to be constructed from Sturt Creek to the Willunga railway. It will probably be at least two years before funds are available to extend this drain to Goodwood Road.

GOOLWA FERRY

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Lands obtain from the Minister of Roads a progress report on installing a ferry at Goolwa?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

WINDY POINT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A little over three weeks ago I asked the Minister of Lands a question about Windy Point and the possibility of further development there. The Minister told me privately to ask him for a reply three weeks later. As a little over three weeks has elapsed, I ask the Minister whether he will give the House any information as to his plans for the further development of Windy Point as a tourist resort.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is incorrect: it is only two weeks

since he asked this question. I have nothing to report to him at present, unfortunately, but when I have the information I will notify him.

NAIRNE PYRITES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Premier say whether, in fact, the Government has called up certain funds that were lent by the previous Government to Nairne Pyrites Proprietary Limited for the development of the pyrites industry and, if that is so, to what extent funds have been called up?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Having given no direction for the calling up of Nairne Pyrites funds, I will inquire about the honourable member's question.

SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand the Premier now has a reply to the question which I think I asked him last week about fencing private swimming pools. Will he now give me that reply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Mines reports that inquiries that have been made from other Government departments, a local city council, and the Home Safety Division of the Industrial Accident Prevention Society, indicate that there is no legislation in this or other States covering the fencing of private swimming pools for safety purposes. Fencing for safety would appear to be a matter of individual choice, and the details of the fencing required would depend on the surroundings of the pool.

FRUIT PROCESSING

Mr. McANANEY: As I understand that the organization that has taken over Rosella Foods Proprietary Limited, which used to manufacture much jam in South Australia, is transferring its activities to Melbourne, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether any efforts have been made to retain that industry for South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The first indication I had of this matter was when I received this morning a letter from a constituent of mine, who is a grower and who supplied produce to the organization concerned. I immediately conveyed the information contained in the letter to the Premier for his officers to ascertain the true position and the

reason for the transfer. I do not think I could have done anything more quickly than that.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr. McANANEY: Some months ago I was one who supported legislation to establish the Totalizator Agency Board in South Australia, because I believed that, to a certain degree, people should be entitled to do what they wished. However, I was amazed the other day to hear the Chairman of the board claim that the system was a great boost to the South Australian economy. I could not follow that statement because, if some poor unfortunate person decides to spend his money in this way rather than on other activities, how can that boost the economy? Does the Premier consider that T.A.B. has been a help to South Australia as a whole?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has certainly channelled the return from off-course betting into rather more socially advantageous channels.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: MR. RYAN

Mr. BROOMHILL moved:

That three months' leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Port Adelaide (Mr. J. R. Ryan) on account of absence overseas.

Motion carried.

INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Institute of Technology Act, 1892-1959. Read a first time.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to increase the membership of the Council of the Institute of Technology from 15 to 19. Of the four additional members, one is to be the Director of the institute who is to be a member *ex officio*, two are to be appointed on the nomination of the academic staff of the institute and one will be an officer of the Education Department nominated by the Minister. The Bill is introduced following discussions which have been held with the Director and the staff association. Clause 4

of the Bill defines "academic staff of the institute" as including heads of divisions, heads of schools, heads of departments, senior lecturers and lecturers.

Clause 5 provides for the enlargement of the council by the addition of the Director and the three new members to whom I have referred. The Director will not be subject to retirement. Existing members will continue in office for the balance of their terms, while, of the new members first appointed under the Bill, one of the nominees of the academic staff will be appointed for one year and the other for two years; the Education Department representative will be appointed for three years. This will mean that six members in all of the council will retire every three years. In the case of the nominees of the academic staff, re-appointment can be made for only one successive term; this will make for a certain flexibility.

I refer here to the excellent service given by the members of the Council of the Institute of Technology and, before that, the members of the governing body of the School of Mines. They have, indeed, rendered excellent service. Important and far-reaching developments are taking place in technological education and this Bill is to some extent a natural consequence of these developments. The staff association emphasizes that representation of staff members on the council of the institute would enable them to play a more active part in the development of the institute, an aim which is common to both staff and council. I believe there is a wealth of experience and expert knowledge among the academic staff that will make a valuable contribution to the formulation of policy and its implementation.

When considering how tertiary academic institutions should be governed, it is important to remember that strong academic representation from within is an integral feature of all universities and most other tertiary institutions in Australia and overseas. The growing importance of advanced colleges of education has been frequently emphasized since the publication of the Martin Report, which dealt so extensively with the subject. It has been said on numerous occasions that our advanced colleges of education in this new phase of development have achieved a status similar to that of our universities. In fact, those diploma

courses which will replace some degree courses at present conducted at the South Australian Institute of Technology will be of identical high standard.

It is intended that the staff representatives will be elected by all members of the academic staff: the election will not be restricted to members of the staff association. It will be conducted by the Administrative Registrar. The council of the institute has considered this question and has agreed to the proposal that the Director and two members of the academic staff should be appointed to the council. It took into account the comments of the Commonwealth Committee on Advanced Education regarding staff participation of the government of such tertiary institutions as the Institute of Technology. Clause 2.26 is as follows:

Whatever the form of government of such a college it should provide adequate procedures for the voice of the community and the voice of the staff to be heard on major policy matters. In our view it is essential to a balanced policy that it should take into account the needs and views of those responsible for its implementation in teaching and administering the departments of the institution, as well as those who are concerned with the graduates of the college.

The appointments of the Director and an officer of the Education Department as members of the council are also desirable because of the new developments of the institute. It is expected that some of the lower-certificate work at present being carried out by the institute will eventually be handed over to the Education Department. Also, there will need to be an even closer liaison between the institute and the Education Department in the future. The preparation of our secondary students who will be going to the institute will be a matter of increasing importance.

Mr. CUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ORIENTAL FRUIT MOTH CONTROL, RED SCALE CONTROL AND SAN JOSE SCALE CONTROL) BILL

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act, 1962-64, the Red Scale Control Act, 1962-1964 and the San José Scale Control Act, 1962-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends three Acts which are in almost identical terms and which deal with the control of oriental fruit moth, red scale and San José scale respectively. Two major problems have arisen in relation to the administration of these Acts. Firstly, the provisions relating to the conduct of a poll by which the orchardists within a district decide whether to establish or dissolve a committee, empowered under the respective Acts to take steps towards the eradication of those pests, are somewhat ambiguous. It is not clear whether the owner of two or more orchards is entitled to two or more votes or only to one. Secondly, under the Act the chairman of the committee is the person in whose name legal proceedings are taken. This has in a number of cases aroused some antipathy towards the chairman personally. This is, of course, most undesirable and it has therefore been decided to incorporate the committees and provide simply that proceedings are to be taken by the committee in its own name.

The Bill provides as follows: Part I containing clause 1 is merely formal. Part II amends the Oriental Fruit Moth Control Act as follows. Clause 2 is merely formal. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act by striking out the provision that an orchard is to be registered and substituting a provision that either the owner or keeper of an orchard is to be registered in respect of an orchard. A new subsection is inserted which requires the applicant for registration to furnish information as to where his orchard or orchards is or are situated and the number of host trees therein.

Clause 4 amends section 6 of the principal Act. Subsection (3) of this section has given rise to a certain amount of ambiguity and it is therefore struck out and two new subsections inserted in lieu of it. These new subsections contain substantially the contents of the previous subsection (3), but the ambiguity raised whether a person who has registered two or more orchards is entitled to two or more votes is removed by amending subsection (4) which, so far as is relevant, will read "each voter shall have one vote only whether registered as the owner or keeper of one or a number of orchards".

Clause 5 inserts new section 7a in the principal Act which incorporates every committee appointed pursuant to section 7 of the Act.

Clause 6 amends section 9 of the principal Act by striking out the reference to the chairman in relation to the recovery of fees and charges by action in a local court. Clauses 8 and 9 make similar amendments to sections 10 and 15 of the principal Act. Part III, which contains clauses 10 to 17, makes identical amendments to the Red Scale Control Act, 1962-1964, and Part IV, which contains clauses 18 to 25, makes identical amendments to the San José Scale Control Act, 1962-1964.

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

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Order of the Day (Government Business)
No. 1: Public Accounts Committee Bill—
Third Reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands) moved:

That this Order of the Day be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was introduced by a private member and, as far as I know, the member concerned has not instructed the Minister to take it over. Therefore, how does the Bill become a Government Bill? This is contrary to the normal Sessional Order whereby Government business takes precedence over private members' business except on Wednesdays.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, I moved:

That this Order of the Day be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER: I accept the point of order raised by the member for Gumeracha and desire to make the following statement for the information of the House. The procedure of a Minister of the Crown in moving money clauses and obtaining a Governor's message to recommend appropriations contained in such new clauses is in order in relation to a private member's Bill. In my opinion, such a procedure does not automatically change the character of such a Bill from a private member's Bill to a Government Bill. The report from the Committee of the Whole was adopted by the Houses in the matter of the Public Accounts Committee Bill and, when the question for the third reading was put, the member for Albert did not rise in his place. I saw the Minister of Lands as the only member rising and I called on him to take the next procedural step.

A somewhat similar situation, but one without money clause implications, arose during last session in connection with the Long Service Leave Bill. Speaking generally, I shall always give priority at appropriate times to the member in charge of any Bill, but it is well to remember that a Bill, after its introductory stages, is in the possession of the House and that rights in connection therewith are not the exclusive property of the member who introduced the Bill. Such a practice safeguards the rights of individual members but allows the ultimate will of the House to prevail.

Last evening I did not see the member for Albert rise in his place. I did see the Minister of Lands rise to move the next procedural step, and he received the call from the Chair. I thought it possible that there had been some arrangement between the member for Albert and the Minister of Lands. I understood this morning that that had been so, that the member for Albert had indicated that he himself did not intend to go any further with the Bill. That information was passed to me this morning but it had not been in my possession last evening. The ruling I give is that the Bill is in order, that it is the property of the House once it has been introduced and that, when only one member rose in his place, there was no alternative but for me to see that member.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, if this is still a private member's Bill, why is it being dealt with today, out of order and as Government Order of the Day No. 1?

The SPEAKER: The Minister, when moving that the third reading be made an Order of the Day for today, announced to the House that the Government was taking the Bill over and on that announcement the Clerks (and I consider quite justifiably) placed the Bill on the Notice Paper as a Government measure. The decision of the House last evening made the Bill an Order of the Day for today.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Still on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, although the Bill may be an Order of the Day for today, it is still private members' business and ought not to be at the top of the Notice Paper, because the Sessional Order provides that Government business is to take precedence over private members' business on Thursday afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The Government has shown indulgence in this matter, and, if it is prepared to allow the Bill to take precedence

over Government business, that is entirely in the hands of the Government, not in my hands.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a further point of order, this is a private member's Bill: the Government had no right to take it over. There was no authority for the Minister to take it over and say that it became a Government Bill, nor was there authority to put it in this position on the Notice Paper. We are dealing with Bill No. 29, but there is no Bill on file bearing that number. I object to the procedure, which is not in accordance with the Sessional Order or with the Standing Orders. No Standing Order supports what what the Government intends to do.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yesterday, during the course of this debate—

The SPEAKER: Is the Minister speaking to the point of order?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I wish to speak to the point of order raised by the member for Gumeracha, if I am permitted to do so, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, during the course of this debate, when I moved amendments that involved finance, I said that a Minister of the Crown was the only person who could move amendments of that nature and that, therefore, it would be necessary for the Government to take over the Bill. As you have said, Mr. Speaker, the member for Albert did not rise in his place in connection with the third reading. I did rise and moved that the third reading be made an Order of the Day for today. That motion was seconded and carried. Therefore, I cannot see that there is any point of order in the matter.

The SPEAKER: The only matter that concerns me at present is the point raised by the member for Gumeracha about whether the Bill should have been placed at the top of the list of Government business. Last evening the House decided that the third reading of the Bill should be made an Order of the Day for today. The matter of the order of Bills on the Notice Paper is the business not of the Chamber but of the Government. I rule that the motion is in order.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker, the member for Albert was the member in charge of the Bill. He introduced it and, although it was amended substantially, I consider that yesterday he was still in charge of it. I refer to this passage in Sir Erskine May's *Parliamentary Practice*, 16th edition, at page 568,

in the section dealing with proceedings on report, because I understand that, as nothing in our Standing Orders deals with the point, we have to resort to the practice of the House of Commons:

If amendments have been made to the Bill in Committee, the member in charge—

I submit that the member in charge in this case was the member for Albert—

. . . in response to the Speaker's request, names a day on which the Bill, as amended, is to be taken into consideration. This is the normal practice, but in cases of urgency the Bill may be considered immediately after it has been reported.

I submit that what is before the House today is not the result of something done directly yesterday, because Sir Erskine May says that the Speaker is obliged to call on the person who is in charge of the Bill. That person was not called on yesterday. If he had been, he could have asked that the next stage be brought before the House in two weeks, three weeks or four weeks.

The SPEAKER: Our Standing Orders provide for the immediate adoption of the report whether or not the Bill is amended, and I did look to see the member for Albert when I put the question relating to the third reading. However, the honourable member did not rise in his seat. The only member who rose was the Minister of Lands and it was obligatory on me to see him. He moved that the third reading be made an Order of the Day for today, the motion was seconded, and the House decided the issue. I say that the matter is entirely out of my hands and that the procedure adopted is in accordance with Standing Orders and previous practice.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I did not give any authority to the Minister to move on my behalf. What you say, Sir, is correct: I did not rise as speedily as he did. However, I was under the impression that, when he indicated that this Bill had become a Government Bill, the matter was out of my hands. I was informed that this was so, although I did not check it, and in that regard the fault was mine. I had not confirmed it with the Clerk, but I understood it to be so. I raised no objection when it happened as I believed the Bill was taken out of my hands when the Minister indicated it was now a Government Bill.

The SPEAKER: In view of that statement, I will continue with the statement handed to

me which I did not include in my first statement: that there was an understanding about the Public Accounts Committee Bill, and that the member for Albert proposed not to proceed further with the Bill after it emerged from the Committee of the Whole if representation of the Legislative Council on the committee were eliminated from the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL: That is pure presumption. I did not give anyone authority to say that in my name.

The SPEAKER: I will discuss that with the honourable member later, but it does not alter the procedure of this House, and the information that was handed to me. The Minister of Lands has moved that the third reading be made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Minister could not move that because this year's Sessional Orders provide that Government business shall have priority over private members' business, except on Wednesday afternoons.

The SPEAKER: I have answered the honourable member on that. The arrangement of the business of the House is in the hands of the Government and if the Government sees fit to make way for private members' business, that is its business.

Motion carried.

ELECTRICAL ARTICLES AND MATERIALS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Third reading.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I rise not to oppose the Bill but to strenuously oppose the procedure. At present only three of the Bills on the Notice Paper are on the file; all the other Bills are conspicuous by their absence. The House is being asked to carry the third reading of this Bill without it being on the file. I object most emphatically to that procedure. Why cannot a Bill be on the file at least for the third reading? Indeed, it is ordinary procedure that it should be on the file.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The Bill, as laid on the table, read a first time, and referred to a Committee of the Whole, is Bill No. 22 on members' files.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Then why is it No. 34 on the Notice Paper?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Because that would be the number of the print at the third reading stage after it left Committee. The honourable member must know that for years the Government Printer has been under such pressure that it is difficult to get the amended Bill on to members' files in time for the third reading next day. All the information that members need is already on the files. The Bill which was considered in Committee and which I presumed the honourable member would have read, plus one small amendment that was carried in Committee, can be found as Bill No. 22 on the file. As it is indexed for the honourable member, I do not know what is his difficulty.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): Members are being asked to proceed with the third reading of Bill No. 34, but no such Bill is on the files. I see that it is being handed around now: this is the first time we have had an opportunity to see it. It should have been on the files so that we could know what it contained. This session the Government seems to have adopted the procedure whereby very little is put on the Notice Paper, which has meant that members have not had time to look at the Bills before the second reading stage. Bills are then rushed through the third reading before they are printed, even though they have been amended. That procedure is wrong. There is no need to rush Bills through the third reading without members having a chance to see them.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

Read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 17. Page 1434.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I do not oppose the Bill. Any reasonable request received by this House from responsible local government should, if possible, be approved. Unless there is a substantive objection to legislation requested by local government it should be seriously considered and approved because,

generally, the legislation is in the interests of councils and ratepayers. Conditions have arisen in the Tea Tree Gully area that are similar to conditions that obtained in the Salisbury area some time ago. The Act was amended in 1961 to allow the Salisbury area to be given city status, so that if this amendment was necessary then it should be extended now. It provides that, where the rapid growth of housing occurs in what would otherwise be a broad-acre open area in a district council area, the council can assume city status. In this respect it enjoys an advantage over a corporation that is surrounded by district councils.

The area of the corporation of Port Lincoln, in which I have considerable political interest, is bounded by the sea on one side and by the District Council of Port Lincoln on the other. The town of Port Lincoln has been steadily growing for several years, and the population is now over 9,000. It is close to achieving the population qualification of city status. Considerable building activity has taken place within the corporation boundary and similar activity has taken place within the area of the District Council of Port Lincoln, adjacent to the corporation boundary. If it were possible to consider this adjacent area, Port Lincoln would have exceeded the 10,000 population required for city status. Salisbury was able to become a city because it had within its boundaries a considerable area that had been closely developed. Similarly, the same position arises at Tea Tree Gully. The Corporation of Port Lincoln has to develop within itself in order to justify a city status. From 1948 to 1958 it doubled its population, which continues to grow rapidly and consistently each year. Mount Gambier has achieved city status, but the geographical circumstances are analogous to Port Lincoln. Good luck to Tea Tree Gully and I do not object to these provisions being extended to cover that area or similar areas where circumstances justify it.

Variations have been made in the minimum rate provision. It was originally placed in the Act in order to allow councils to impose a minimum rate on small and less valuable pieces of land in the area so that the rate would be sufficient to cover the cost of its collection. Frequently the cost of collecting the rates was greater than the sum recovered. About seven or eight years ago the limitation on the minimum rate was removed, and now councils can fix the rate. However, this procedure has created problems.

The owner, with adjoining ownerships separated by a corporation or council boundary, is levied a minimum rate on a small piece of land in one area that does not compare with the rate that he has to pay on the larger piece of land in the adjoining district council area. This has created an anomaly. I believe that there are cases in which land has been acquired from the owner of a property for road-making purposes, and when the road has been made across the corner of the property (the road being the boundary of the district council area) the owner has found that the small area that is severed from his larger holding is in another council area.

That owner is then subjected in certain cases to the application of this inequity in minimum rates. It has apparently been considered advisable by councils that some flexibility should be written into the legislation, but it seems to me that in resolving one problem other problems are probably created. For example, let us assume that an owner has properties, one small area of land being in council area A and a large block of land lying in council area B; those areas are separated only by a road or the council boundary, and the owner is probably levied a minimum rate on the small area that he holds in council area A. Considering that that is inequitable, he may apply to the council for the provisions of the proposed legislation to apply. If he were granted an exemption from the minimum rate concerning that small piece of land that he holds in area A, that would benefit him.

However, I think that the owners of land adjoining that property in area A may well object. For instance, a widow with, say, four children, might well say, "I live in council area A on the adjoining block, and I cannot get the advantage of a minimum rate on my block; but, because my neighbour happens to be a substantial landholder (having land in two council areas) he is able to obtain a benefit." This sort of problem will undoubtedly arise and we may well create anomalies that the Bill seeks to remove. It is suggested in the Minister's explanation that councils might agree to a slight alteration in their boundaries in order to overcome the problem, but I wonder which council will give up land, particularly if it is a small piece of land that carries a fairly high rate! But again, this is a matter largely for councils to iron out and, if councils desire this amendment to the legislation, I am not in the mood to deny it to them.

The next amendment has important consequences: contained in clause 7, it deals with the limitation that is at present placed on district councils in regard to sums spent on purposes other than those specifically listed in the Local Government Act. A number of amendments have previously been made to the section in the Act that lists the items on which councils may spend money, and the legislation has been amended always with the object of widening the scope of those approved provisions. That indicates that it is the will of Parliament that councils be given more autonomy in such matters and in cases in which they are endeavouring to decide on which items they shall spend ratepayers' money. The provision as it at present stands limits the ability of councils to spend any more than \$400 or 1 per cent of the previous rate revenue, whichever is the lesser.

It is now intended, as this revenue is considered to be insufficient for many councils (to cover purposes such as naturalization ceremonies, public relations, and so on), that there should be more freedom. The amendment proposes that a council may spend not the lesser of \$400 or 1 per cent (as at present applies) but the greater of \$400 or 1 per cent. Although that seems to be some sort of relaxation, it is a relaxation only in certain cases; small councils are still limited to \$400 if their rate revenue at 1 per cent does not exceed that sum, whereas the larger councils with the greater rate revenue are given freedom to spread expenditure by being able to spend 1 per cent of their rate revenue. However, there are probably increasing requirements on the part of the councils to have funds available for public relations purposes, particularly when so many councils are endeavouring to extend tourist facilities in their towns, print literature, advertise their district and entertain important visitors at public functions.

Generally, the calls made on councils in this respect amount to more than the \$400, or the 1 per cent that the small councils can provide. I see no reason why this amendment should not be made to the Act. We often see, particularly concerning municipalities and to some extent district councils, the mayor or chairman of a district council (as the case may be) having to dip into his personal pocket in order to provide entertainment, etc., for people visiting his area. While that is clearly an act of unselfish citizenship, it is inequitable and creates a situation in which possibly only a person of some means can afford to hold

this office. However, this is apparently something for which councils have asked, and I believe that it is a matter between councils and their ratepayers concerning how the money shall be spent.

Councils and corporations are elected by the ratepayers, who have their remedy if they believe that the body is using its rights for undesirable purposes. I believe that it is the privilege of councils to spend ratepayers' money in a way that they themselves decide, bearing in mind, of course, the limitations provided under the Local Government Act. However, it is also the responsibility of councils not to sit behind the provisions of the Act or to seek the protection of Parliament: they must assume responsibility for the way the ratepayers' money is spent. I believe it is the prerogative of ratepayers to deal with councillors in the same way as they deal with members of Parliament: if they are not pleased with them they can change them. Therefore, I can see no reason why we should object at this time if councillors want greater freedom to spend funds. However, I believe the councils in my area would recognize the priority of road construction and would be reluctant to divert much of their funds for other purposes. This applies to other country councils as well.

The Bill also provides that councils can spend revenue in insuring council members against personal injury. It is intended to widen the section in the present Act so that councils may insure also the wife of the chairman or mayor of the council. This is probably desirable, although I point out that the wives of other people in public office (or the husbands of women in public office) are not insured at public expense by virtue of provisions in any Act. For example, the wives of the Premier, Ministers of the Crown and other members of Parliament are not insured at public expense. Members of Parliament are insured, if they so desire, under special arrangements for which, incidentally, they pay. However, if councils believe this provision is necessary then I have no serious objection. In each case, the provisions of the Bill are applied to both councils and corporations. As the Bill as a whole does not make any serious departure from the Act, and as I am informed from an official source that the amendments have been desired by councils, which have asked that they be introduced, I am prepared to support the second reading.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I am pleased to hear that the member for Flinders supports the Bill, which is uncontroversial and which contains five unconnected amendments to the Local Government Act. Clause 3 interests me particularly. It will enable any proclaimed district council to apply for city status, and this amendment interests the District Council of Tea Tree Gully, which is in the Barossa District. This council, in the area of which a great deal of development has taken place and in which area the population is now about 26,000, meets the population requirement for a change of status to that of a city but, because of the extensive broad acres (this area covers 31,182 acres), it does not meet the requirement of being occupied mainly for residential and business purposes.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister of Lands referred to the similarity between this case and that of the former District Council of Salisbury, for which special provision was inserted in the Act in 1961. It is interesting to note that at the time the Salisbury council petitioned for the area to be declared a city, the population of the area was 23,240 and the rates receivable were \$404,000. As I said, the population in the area of the Tea Tree Gully council is now about 26,000 and the rate revenue for this year is set down for \$584,701.

This Act contains many remedial sections which differ in their application to districts and municipalities. It is desirable, in the rapidly developing area of the Tea Tree Gully council, that the wider legislative control of the Act, as applied to municipalities, be available, instead of the limited control now applicable to townships only. The same position applies regarding the model by-laws that have been adopted by this council: 25 apply to municipal councils as against 18 to district councils. Also, where polls are demanded, it is necessary for at least 100 ratepayers to sign the petition in a municipality as against 21 ratepayers in a district council area.

Another important change would be to the present method of the council's committee system. I have received many complaints about this matter. At the moment, because some wards have one councillor only, all the members of the council comprise the group committee, which deals with the various committee matters, and the council holds its committee meetings on the same evening and before the council meetings. Of course, this means that at times council meetings do not commence until

11 p.m., and sometimes later. With this system, council meetings are merely a formality to adopt and ratify the decisions of the group committee. With two councillors for each ward (some adjustment to ward boundaries would have to be made in order that two councillors would represent a ward), it would be possible to adopt the alternative procedure of holding two group committees, namely a works group and a finance group. One councillor for each ward would be represented on each group of committees, and normally they would alternate annually. A chairman is appointed for each group committee and, at council meetings, reports of committees are submitted by the chairman who, for the benefit of the other councillors who were not present, elaborates on the matters brought forward, thus enabling them to cast an intelligent vote when the committee minutes are put forward for adoption. Of course, this means that, even though the committees have already made a decision, there is a great deal more discussion in council on the various matters brought forward. This is an advantage, for it gives ratepayers interested enough to attend council meetings the opportunity (which they do not have under the present system) to hear some debate. Another advantage is that the time spent on committee work is halved.

It is considered that the group committee system is desirable, for not only does it reduce the time of committee business but it also creates more interest at council meetings. This matter has often been criticized by the ratepayers, who have commented both to the council and to me.

On the other hand, points that the ratepayers may disapprove of could include the financial sections of the Act, as these give power to municipal councils as against district councils to fix the maximum rates at 25c in the dollar in lieu of 20c. In relation to the amount of money a council may borrow, the Act provides that, in the case of a municipal council, it shall not exceed 80c in the dollar, as against 95c for district councils. The amount borrowed is naturally governed by the amount that is allowable to be repaid annually, and the Act provides for a greater repayment amount in the case of municipalities as against districts. The Act also specifically provides that only municipal councils have the right to install parking meters in their areas.

However, I am of the opinion that the district is now ready for a change of status in view of the rapid and continuing growth

of the area. As mentioned earlier, there is sufficient population for this change and it has been predicted by the Town Planner that in a few years the area covered by the District Council of Tea Tree Gully will become one of the largest municipalities in the eventual metropolitan area. The council, of course, seeks this status.

Clause 5 covers the situation where a property owned by one person is situated in two adjoining council areas, and the addition of the new subsection to section 228 will permit one of the councils to exempt such a property from the whole or part of the minimum rate. Although I am not aware of such a case, I am sure this could arise and has arisen. The member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) gave various examples of how it could happen and he mentioned possible anomalies. Nevertheless, he still supported the amendment. I, too, support it.

Clause 6 makes a similar amendment in regard to district councils. I agree with the provisions of clause 7, which authorizes payments by a council for purposes other than specified in the Act, such as naturalization ceremonies. Clauses 8 and 9 provide for mayoresses and wives of council chairmen to be insured against personal injury when attending council functions. Of course, it will not be mandatory on councils to insure the wives of mayors or chairmen, but councils are given the opportunity to insure them. I am surprised that this provision was not inserted previously. As the member for Flinders has said, there is no similar provision to cover the wives of Ministers or members of Parliament. However, I do not think the fact that they are not covered is justification for not inserting this provision in the Local Government Act.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the husbands of members of Parliament?

Mrs. BYRNE: Yes, perhaps the word "spouse" would cover it. Perhaps the spouses of Ministers and members could be insured in respect of the times when they are carrying out official duties. I reiterate that I support these amendments. However, I am of the opinion that the sooner the Local Government Act is brought up to date consequent upon the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee the better it will be for all concerned.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I intend to speak for only a short time but I am always pleased when an amendment to the Local Government

Act is before the House, because members have few opportunities of paying tribute to the men and women in local government who give their services voluntarily and so unsparingly in the interests of the people in the districts concerned. Members of councils are made the subject of opprobrium and criticism by rate-payers. Most of that is unjustifiable and it is only right that members of Parliament, who are the counterparts of people in local government although perhaps on a higher plane, should occasionally have the opportunity to refer to what the community owes to these people.

This Bill refers specifically to Tea Tree Gully in regard to councils reaching city status. It is right that Tea Tree Gully should be given such status, because it meets the requirements, though perhaps the concept of a city has changed somewhat in recent years. The cities of Norwood, Unley and Prospect have definite commercial and business ventures within their boundaries. Members have only to think about these places to realize that they represent the old idea of a city, with a concentration of business and commerce. Today, this has changed with the rapid development taking place on the fringes of Adelaide, and we find that areas reach the population qualification more quickly than they did, although they do not have the accepted concept of a definite business area as the centre of their activities. This occurs in the city of Burnside: it does not have a city business area, but has several small areas where business and commerce flourish. Conditions are similar at Tea Tree Gully, and in the city of Campbelltown. Cities these days do not necessarily have to have a definite business centre, but can cover a wide area and yet fulfil the population qualification.

Clause 3 refers specifically to the District Council of Salisbury. The amendment places in the Act the machinery to permit councils to attain city status without there being the necessity for the introduction of special legislation. Because of that, the amendment has much merit. The other particular item to which I want to refer is the provision enabling councils to insure the wives of mayors or chairmen. I think this provision is long overdue. As the member for Barossa (Mrs. Byrne) has said, it is a wonder that a provision such as this has not been inserted before, because one only has to think of the service that mayoresses and wives of chairmen give to the community to realize that these people

can be involved in accidents and not otherwise be covered by insurance. This amendment is a wise and worthy innovation.

I can think of certain mayoresses. For example, the mayoress of the municipality in which I live has given service for many years and does not spare herself in identifying herself with activities within the municipality. Her husband has been re-elected Mayor of the City of Burnside and she is in her sixth or seventh year as Mayoress of the city. It is only right and proper that these people, who move around among the community and give themselves untiringly in the service of the people, should be covered in this way.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I support the Bill, but regret that it has not been introduced as a result of the activity of the Local Government Act Revision Committee, which, I understand is considering the Act to ascertain what amendments and improvements can be made to it. I trust that future amendments to this Act will be recommended by this important committee. The Bill deals with five important matters, the first provision extending to proclaimed areas the privileges that were extended to the Salisbury District Council in 1961. Salisbury had fulfilled the population qualifications to be constituted a municipality and receive city status, but it had not qualified under the requirement of section 7 of the Act. However, as it had assumed an urban character it was allowed city status. Clause 3 deals with the Tea Tree Gully area, which, while fulfilling the population requirement but not the requirement of section 7 of the Act, has assumed an urban character in recent years. The extension of the privilege to Tea Tree Gully will not be opposed.

Under this legislation it will be possible for any proclaimed area to apply for city status. Clause 5 provides that the minimum rate need not be paid on certain properties. In many cases a ratepayer owns land in adjoining district council areas and, frequently, the land is separated by a road, with a small area situated in one council district. The minimum rate fixed by the council on that land is inequitable. Originally, the minimum rate under the Act did not exceed 25c; later, it was increased to 50c and, in 1959, an amendment enabled councils to fix any sum as the minimum rate. It will be possible for a council to exempt a property from payment of a minimum rate, and this provision will be welcomed by many people. At present, district councils are allowed to

spend \$400 or 1 per cent of revenue, whichever amount is the lesser, for purposes other than those specified in the Act. This procedure, which is unsatisfactory, has now been altered so that councils may spend \$400 or 1 per cent of the rate revenue, whichever is the greater. Bearing in mind the many reasons why this expenditure is necessary (naturalization ceremonies, for example, are held at the expense of district councils), I think this provision will be more satisfactory than the one that previously obtained.

The fourth important amendment (in clause 8) enables a council to insure the wife of a mayor or the wife of a district council chairman against personal injury or death, and this also includes a person in *loco parentis* who takes the place of a wife in performing these public duties. The fifth significant amendment, which is contained in clauses 8 and 9, will enable the city of Adelaide to spend at least \$2,000 (previously \$1,000), other municipalities at least \$800 (previously \$400), and district councils to spend \$400 (previously \$200) on public functions and entertainment. As no alteration in these sums spent by councils has been made for 30 years, and bearing in mind the change that has taken place in the value of money over that period, I think the increases are not unreasonable.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I agree with everything that previous members have said.

Mr. Jennings: Well, sit down!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order. The member for Stirling!

Mr. McANANEY: I point out that some district councils are now already charging minimum rates on adjoining land, and yet we are considering a provision here relating to adjoining land in two council areas in respect of which councils can make a concession on the smaller section. In other words, some councils are at present charging the minimum rate when the assessment for the smaller parcel of land calls for a sum less than the minimum rate. I know of one council outside my district that is charging a minimum rate on adjoining blocks within the council area, although I cannot see a provision in the Act for this practice.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): The Bill relates to a small area of land which may be situated in an adjoining council area and for which the minimum rate may be far greater than the land is actually worth.

Mr. McAnaney: I was talking about land wholly within a particular council area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand that the Bill does not relate to that: it relates only to where the land concerned is in an adjoining council area.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 6—"Minimum rates."

Mr. McANANEY: This clause seeks to give a council powers concerning the one property that is situated in two adjoining council areas. However, power already apparently exists for councils to charge the full sum on a smaller parcel of land within the one council area. Can the Minister say whether the councils doing this are acting *ultra vires* under the present Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Lands): Although I shall be happy to have the matter examined to see whether or not the practice being carried out by the council to which he has referred is in accordance with the Act, I do not think that matter would be covered by an alteration to this clause.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 29, at 2 p.m.