

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 12, 1970

The SPEAKER (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS**RUBBER COMPANY**

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier say whether he is aware that a mid-day announcement indicates that the Goodyear rubber company will establish, in Sydney, a manufacturing operation for rubber products, needed mainly in Western Australia, in relation to mining? If he is, what effort have he and the South Australian Government made to have the industry established in South Australia because of its proximity to Western Australia and, further, why did we not succeed in getting that industry here because of our proximity to Western Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not hear the announcement at mid-day, but I will get a report for the Leader.

INSURANCE

Mr. CLARK: Will the Attorney-General examine the peculiar problems of a car insurance claim brought to my attention by a constituent? This is another of the many problems that I know members have been hearing about recently regarding Motor Marine and General Insurance Company Limited. My constituent was involved in an accident recently when the car in front of him stopped suddenly to avoid a car crossing over on the Philip Highway, and his car damaged the back of the other vehicle. He lodged a claim with the company three weeks ago, and an inspector for the company said that his car, which had been insured for about \$600, was a complete write-off. My constituent is now not certain what to do or what is his legal position as a result of this firm's closing down, and he wishes to know whether inquiries can be made on his behalf

to see whether he may now have to pay for the damage to the other vehicle, as well as losing his own vehicle, or whether the M.M.G. company will be able to pay out on this policy. My constituent said that he consulted his solicitor, who was not able to offer any advice of value. If I give the Attorney-General a copy of the letter I have received from my constituent, will he see what he can do about the matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will see what I can do, if the honourable member will let me have the particulars.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS' ASSISTANCE

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Lands, say whether applications have been received from landholders for relief under the Primary Producers' Emergency Assistance Fund?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member was good enough to inform my colleague that he would request this information, I have obtained for him a report on the matter. Although the Lands Department has received a number of inquiries since the Government announced on October 28 that applications would be received for carry-on finance from farmers who were in necessitous circumstances, mainly as a result of drought and/or frost, and were temporarily unable to obtain their usual financial requirements through normal sources of credit, response to the announcement in terms of actual applications lodged has been slow. To date, 31 inquiries have been made, and application forms have been promptly forwarded to the inquirers. Three applications have been lodged and are being processed for submission to the Primary Producers Assistance Act Advisory Committee, which will make a recommendation to the Minister of Lands. Two of these applications are based on the combined effects of drought and frost on cereal-growing properties. The third application has been made on the basis of the effects of drought on a sheep-grazing holding.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL: Referring to the reply that the Minister of Labour and Industry gave me yesterday, I ask the Minister whether he will continue his survey of and investigation into the motor vehicle industry in South Australia. In today's *News* is an article headed "A.L.P. Minister Hit by Union", and the following statement is attributed to a Mr. Scott:

It is inappropriate for a Labor Minister to have talks with industry leaders without involving union officials. We are the ones who can give him the information he is seeking.

I therefore put the question that I have outlined to the Minister, hoping that he will not be intimidated by this type of remark.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I certainly intend to follow up the question asked by the Leader yesterday, in reply to which I said that I would be discussing the possible actions of the car industry in this State regarding its policy on introducing new models. The Leader has referred to an article in today's *News*. Because of the attack the Leader made yesterday on the trade union movement in which he referred to the disputes associated with the motor vehicle industry, and because of the way in which this matter was written up in this morning's *Advertiser*, the impression has been given that I will speak to representatives of industry about industrial matters rather than about their attitude towards new models. If that were the case, I would certainly speak also to the unions on the matter. I understand that the Leader's remarks yesterday created the confusion that came about in relation to the comments of an official of the Amalgamated Engineering Union. I would certainly have spoken to that official had this been an industrial matter. I will continue my discussions with the motor vehicle industry representatives in respect of their attitude towards future model changes.

WORKING HOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of the Premier, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House briefly to explain it.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question is this: will the Government use its good offices with the trade unions to discourage them from seeking a 35-hour working week? In explanation of the question, I refer to the remarks just made by the Minister of Labour and Industry and remind the Premier that twice during the last few weeks I have asked him about the implementation of the policy of the Labor Party which, if my memory serves me correctly, is for a 35-hour working week. On the latter occasion on which I asked this question, the Premier said that it was not intended to legislate for a 35-hour working week in South Australia; that was after some comments by Mr. Whitlam and Dr. Patterson, I think. In view of the obvious and, indeed, notorious

links between the present Government and the trade union movement (an example of which we saw in the refusal of the Minister of Labour and Industry on Tuesday to intervene in the dispute on Kangaroo Island—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to debate the matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —I ask the Premier whether he will take up the matter with the trade unions, several of which are beginning to press for a 35-hour working week.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Question!

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's notorious and wellknown connections with big business are showing. Trade unions in this State and elsewhere have a right to make representations to arbitration and conciliation commissions, boards and the like, and this Government does not intend to say to them that they may not make representations on behalf of their members.

Mr. Millhouse: I said to use your good offices.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what the honourable member calls good offices. As far as I can see, his attitude with regard to the connection of this Party with the trade union movement is that whenever we can batten workers down he would like us to do so and, if we can ever stand up for the workers, he does not want us to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The spleen of the honourable member always shows in relation to obtaining rights for the workers of the country, and this is obvious to the whole of the people of the State. I do not have the slightest intention of having the honourable member tell this Government the way in which it should conduct its relations with the working people of the State.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Torrens.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members must conduct themselves in a proper manner, and when I call "Order" I mean just that. The honourable member for Torrens wishes to ask a question, and he should be given the courtesy of being heard. There should be no more interjections. The honourable member for Torrens!

STOBIE POLES

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the erection of stobie poles at Bellevue Heights?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received the following report from the Electricity Trust:

The cost of any particular transmission line, whether underground or overhead, will vary depending on the type of line and the nature of the terrain. The trust has never given a figure of \$100,000 a mile as the cost of an overhead line. For the particular line to be built south of Bellevue Drive in Bellevue Heights, the trust has quoted figures of \$28,000 a mile for an overhead line and \$160,000 a mile for an underground line. Even so, these are average figures as the topography of the land varies from place to place along the line. When this transmission line was being planned, the Electricity Trust board gave personal attention to the route and type of line to be adopted. Despite the high cost, it was decided that the line should be placed underground from the Panorama substation to the end of Bellevue Drive. At this point, the terrain becomes very rugged and it is technically difficult and abnormally expensive to use underground cable. It was therefore decided that the line should continue as an overhead line south of this point. The trust has a responsibility to allocate its available finances to electrical works throughout the whole community. It is not prepared to meet the high costs of replacing this particular section of overhead line by underground cable.

After the original decision was made, the line route was surveyed in detail and the 66,000-volt cable, which must come from overseas, was ordered specifically for the purpose. Three cables are involved and the required length of each is 14,881ft., making 44,643ft. of cable required. To allow for any slight discrepancy an extra 108ft. of cable

was allowed for and 44,751ft. of cable was ordered. It will be appreciated that the allowance of 108ft. represents only a margin of 36ft. of route length in a distance of 2.8 miles. The trust has other cable on order which is specifically ordered for particular work. Because of the very high cost of high voltage underground cable, it is essential that it should be ordered in exact lengths for specific jobs.

PROFESSIONAL SALARIES

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently regarding salaries of professional officers employed in Government departments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The salaries of professional officers employed in the Public Service are reviewed at frequent intervals by the Public Service Board and the Public Service Arbitrator. The following list, which sets out the various groups of professional officers who have been granted salary increases during 1970, does not include the many reclassifications of individual professional offices which have been made by the board during the year. At the present time the Public Service Board and the Public Service Arbitrator are considering claims for increases in the salaries of scientific officers (including analysts, chemists, agricultural scientists, foresters, curators, veterinary officers, psychologists, surveyors and librarians) in addition to claims affecting many other officers in the Public Service. I ask leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it the list to which I have referred and which sets out the details requested by the honourable member.

Leave granted.

PROFESSIONAL SALARY INCREASES (1970)

Group	Date increase gazetted	Date of operation of increase	Decision by
Medical Officers	29/1/70	3/1/70	Public Service Board
Engineers (certain positions)	22/1/70	27/1/69	Public Service Arbitrator
Pilots	12/2/70	12/2/70	Public Service Board
Guidance Officers	26/2/70	1/1/70	Public Service Board
Pharmacists	26/2/70	26/2/70	Public Service Board
Legal Officers	26/2/70	26/2/70	Public Service Board
Surveyors	19/3/70	2/3/70	Public Service Board
Geologists	19/3/70	19/3/70	Public Service Board
Senior Planning Officers	30/4/70	30/4/70	Public Service Board
Curators (Museum Department)	30/4/70	30/4/70	Public Service Board
Engineers (certain positions)	30/4/70	30/4/70	Public Service Board
Dental Officers	11/6/70	11/6/70	Public Service Board
Valuers	16/7/70	16/7/70	Public Service Board
Trained Nursing Staff	30/7/70	27/4/70	Public Service Board
Geologists	6/8/70	17/6/70	Public Service Board
Engineers (certain positions)	13/8/70	27/1/69	Public Service Arbitrator
Senior Education Officers	13/8/70	1/7/70	Public Service Arbitrator
Architects	13/8/70	29/6/70	Public Service Arbitrator
Foresters	10/9/70	17/8/70	Public Service Board
Quantity Surveyors	10/9/70	10/9/70	Public Service Board
Medical Officers (certain positions)	10/9/70	10/9/70	Public Service Board

INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry give the House further information regarding the industrial legislation he recently announced he intended to introduce? I refer particularly to Bills to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, the Industrial Code and the Apprentices Act. Will the Minister say whether such Bills will be introduced before the Christmas break or whether their introduction will be delayed until the autumn session?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I expect the Apprentices Act Amendment Bill to be introduced shortly, and I hope it will be dealt with before the Christmas adjournment. I hope to introduce the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill soon, certainly in the current session. However, because of the involved nature of the amendments to the Industrial Code, I do not expect that Bill to be introduced until the next session.

Mr. McRAE: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether one of the major reasons for industrial unrest over the last few years has been the blatant refusal of the Liberal and Country League Governments to produce up-to-date and modern industrial provisions? Does the Minister intend to do something about this?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I can say definitely that the answer is "Yes".

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member for Mitcham, who seems to laugh the loudest, will recall that during the short period he was Minister of Labour and Industry there were more industrial difficulties in this State than there had been for some time. He will also recall his attitude to a Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill when it was before the House and when he refused to accept reasonable amendments. During his period as Minister, his Government refused to introduce any legislation whatever in relation to the Industrial Code.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order: I understood that you, Mr. Speaker, objected to members' debating answers to questions. This is simply an unofficial debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister was asked a question and he is entitled to give sufficient explanation. I will determine when he has gone far enough.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order: I refer again to this incident. Yes-

terday you quoted from Blackmore regarding the practice of the House and I took the trouble to refer to the reference which you made. In your statement you said:

... more latitude is given by courtesy to a Minister than to a private member, in replying ...

I cannot recall whether you read the rest of the sentence, but it goes on to state:

... but a Minister should avoid expressions—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am making a point of order. The sentence continues:

... but a Minister should avoid expressions which call for observations from other members and excite debate.

This is exactly what the Minister has been doing and I make the point of order, which I think you will sustain.

The SPEAKER: If I think the Minister is being unduly lengthy I shall call him to order. I cannot agree with the point of order.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In replying to the question, which asked me to comment on industrial legislation, I have referred to workmen's compensation. I think it is also important, in replying to the question, to indicate that during the previous Government's term of office that Government refused to consider any amendments to the Industrial Code.

Mr. Millhouse: That is incorrect.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The previous Government did attempt—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Point of order!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Since I raised this point of order, the Minister has again failed to avoid expressions which call for observations from other members and which excite debate. That is exactly what he is doing.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The Minister is entitled to answer the question.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: During the term of office of the previous Labor Government—

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I take it that my point of order has been overruled?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move: That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: It is necessary for the honourable member to state his disagreement in writing.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Very well, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I have received the following from the member for Alexandra:

I move disagreement to your ruling because the passage from Blackmore to which you referred yesterday in giving a ruling states that, in replying to questions, a Minister should avoid expressions which call forth observations from other members and excite debate. In this case, the Minister of Labour and Industry has made inflammatory and incorrect statements about the previous Government, wherein he has said that no amendments to the Industrial Code were introduced. You ruled that he had not breached your ruling.

That is signed by the member for Alexandra. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This motion arises from the ruling you have just given in relation to my point of order. Members on this side of the House, in particular, are perplexed about the interpretations of Standing Orders as you are giving them. We are particularly perplexed (and I think I speak for every member of the Opposition) about what you consider is debating a question and what is debating a reply. Yesterday you gave a reply to a question that had been asked of you on the previous day on this matter and, in doing so, you referred to Erskine May and Blackmore (a former Clerk of this House) and you quoted from Blackmore the passage that I have recently stated. The full passage in Blackmore, of which you gave an extract, states:

An answer should be confined to the points of the question, with only such explanation as is necessary to render the answers intelligible. More latitude is given, by courtesy, to a Minister than to a private member in replying; but a Minister should avoid expressions which call forth observations from other members and excite debate. But in certain cases, *eg. gr.*, where the liberty of the subject is concerned, as Parliamentary usage sanctions minute inquiries, corresponding latitude is allowed to a Minister, who may enter into all details necessary to answer the question.

That last sentence, of course, does not apply in this case. The circumstances of the question and the reply being discussed are clear to every member. The member for Playford devised a question about which he undoubtedly

had told the Minister of Labour and Industry before he asked it.

Mr. McRae: No, I didn't.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I accept the statement by the member for Playford that he did not inform the Minister of Labour and Industry but, in any case, the question had a remarkable similarity to what is called a Dorothy Dixer. Whilst I accept that it was not a Dorothy Dixer—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Speaker, although looking at the member for Playford, I was addressing you. Even though I accept that the question was not technically a Dorothy Dixer, it was still a handy vehicle for the Minister of Labour and Industry to get in some snide criticisms (I use the word "snide" advisedly, because I have learnt it from the Government lately) by implying that—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It wasn't a criticism.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: —we had no interest in amending the Industrial Code, and claiming that we had refused to amend it. That is not correct. The Liberal Party, when in Government, did amend the Industrial Code on one occasion, and probably more than once. The Minister's statement was totally incorrect, and I am saying that the Minister should not make incorrect statements. I know that no-one would disagree with Blackmore and dispute the statement that the Minister should not excite comment. However, if it had not been for the extremely strict interpretations that you have expressed during the past few days, Mr. Speaker, particularly concerning questions asked from this side and concerning also a reply given by the Leader of the Opposition to a question asked by the member for Kavel, I would not have moved the motion. I think I have pointed out that, although the management of this House depends largely on a degree of tolerance in interpreting Standing Orders, the position can be extremely difficult for the Opposition if Ministers are allowed to get away with statements, such as the one made today, which members of the Opposition cannot in any sense parallel. No-one on this side wants to make inflammatory or misleading statements. However, the Minister took the opportunity, so handily given to him by the member for Playford, to do exactly that. It

was a snide criticism of the Opposition, and I suspect that it was aimed not only at the Opposition generally but particularly at the member for Mitcham, who was previously Minister of Labour and Industry. It is well known that some Ministers never tire of running down their predecessors. Although, fortunately, this does not apply to all Ministers, some of them do not tire of doing this. For those reasons, I have moved disagreement to your ruling.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I second the motion. The facts are these, as the member for Alexandra has rehearsed in great part: a question was asked by the member for Playford, and the Minister of Labour and Industry took the opportunity not only to reply to the question but also to attack the Opposition, and he referred particularly to me and to my time as Minister of Labour and Industry. He said that when we were in office we did not amend the Industrial Code, and this was so provocative and so inaccurate that I interjected, because the fact is that the Industrial Code was amended twice during our period of office: it was amended during the 1968 session and again during the 1969 session. Yesterday, Sir, you gave a ruling in reply to a question that I had asked you on Tuesday about Ministers and other members debating their replies to questions asked of them and, in the course of that reply (I now have a copy of it: *Hansard* has just come to hand), you quoted from Blackmore, but you quoted only a part of the paragraph that is set out on page 127 of Blackmore. This is what you quoted:

An answer should be confined to the points of the question, with only such explanation as is necessary to render the answer intelligible; more latitude is given by courtesy to a Minister than to a private member, in replying—

At that point you stopped, but Blackmore's ruling continues:

but a Minister should avoid expressions which call for observations from other members and excite debate.

Although you did not quote that, I cannot believe that you meant to rely only on a part of the authority that you quoted. Surely (and I hope I can make that assumption) when you quoted from Blackmore you meant to rely on the whole of the quotation and not only on the part that you chose to give in your reply. If one has in mind the rest of the quotation (the part which I have now quoted but which you omitted—"but a Minister should avoid expressions which call for observations from other members and excite debate") you must, because of what actually happened, rule

that the Minister was going beyond the bounds of your ruling which you had given the day before, because the Minister provoked me, by making an inaccurate statement as well as a personal attack on me, to interject, and this is wrong. When the member for Alexandra pointed this out to you, you said that if the Minister was "going too long" (I think that is the term you used) you would be the judge of that and you would pull him up, but that is not the point: the point is the way in which the Minister was answering the question, thereby bringing forth interjections from other members. Therefore, with great respect, Sir, I say that you were mistaken in the reply you gave the member for Alexandra: the length of the reply had nothing whatever to do with the matter, yet that was the only point you made. I suggest, with great respect, that the point taken by the member for Alexandra is a valid one, relying on the very authority from which you quoted yesterday.

The SPEAKER: In reply to the honourable member, I point out that the member for Alexandra was relying on a publication of 1885. What I was quoting was the present practice of the House of Commons and so much of it as applies to practices today. Standing Order No. 1 is the authority in reference to the present practice in the House of Assembly. In regard to being unfair, members ought to look at the question asked on Tuesday by the Leader of the Opposition, that question taking up a column and a half, and no objection was raised to that.

Mr. Millhouse: There was an objection to it.

The SPEAKER: I think I have been unduly fair. The time taken on that occasion by the Leader was longer than the time taken today by the Minister, who was attempting, in my view, to reply to the question asked by the member for Playford.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Becker, Brookman (teller), Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Allen. No—Mr. Lawn.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. HALL: My point of order is that, in referring to the question I asked on Tuesday, you said that no-one objected while I was asking it. However, *Hansard* shows clearly that frequent objections were made. Therefore, I seek leave to explain what is obviously an inaccuracy in your statement.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. HALL: Then I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL: I do not want to enter into argument.

Mr. McKee: Ha, ha!

Mr. HALL: When I can make myself heard, I just want to say that your reference, Sir, to my question on Tuesday was incorrect in so far as you said that no objection was taken while I was asking it. A perusal of *Hansard* will show that there were many objections. Someone said, "That's fair enough;" someone else said, "That's the law of the jungle"; and someone else said—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I rise on a point of order. This is not a personal explanation: it is argument as to a matter before the House. If this were a matter of personal explanation, no member on this side would raise objection, but what is taking place is not a personal explanation at all, and the Leader well knows it.

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. How can I correct the inaccurate statement that you made unless I can explain the exact circumstances to the House?

The SPEAKER: In referring to Erskine May in dealing with the Leader's question, I was referring to how long the Leader spoke before an objection was taken. However, I was not referring to interjections, as there are frequent interjections about which I can do little. I never intended to give the impression that has been construed by the Leader from my statement.

Mr. Hall: I haven't tried to construe anything.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The member for Playford asked me whether or not it

could be said that the refusal of the previous Liberal and Country League Government to take action could have contributed in any way to industrial unrest. In reply to an earlier question by the member for Torrens, I pointed out what the Government intended to do in relation to industrial legislation, and no objection was taken at that time. Before I was interrupted, I was pointing out that the previous Government had made no significant effort to amend the Industrial Code during its term of office, and it certainly had not up-dated sufficiently the Workmen's Compensation Act. When I was interrupted, the point I was about to make was that, during its previous term of office, the Labor Party introduced legislation (it passed through the House of Assembly but was largely rejected by the Legislative Council) which, had it been successful, would have contributed greatly towards reducing the number of industrial disputes that have occurred in South Australia since then. In answer to the honourable member's question, I say that I do believe that the blatant refusal of the previous L.C.L. Government to take action has contributed to industrial unrest in this State.

SNOWY MOUNTAINS SCHEME

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question regarding the amount of South Australia's contributions to the Snowy Mountains hydro-electric scheme?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As far as I can ascertain, the total cost of the Snowy Mountains scheme to date has been about \$730,000,000. The whole of the finance for this project was provided from the revenues of the Commonwealth, which in the main are derived from taxation. I understand that South Australian residents and businesses would contribute about 8 per cent of the total direct and indirect taxation collected by the Commonwealth. Thus, it could be said, as Sir Thomas Playford did say on a number of occasions, that South Australians had contributed about \$60,000,000 toward this scheme, which provides electricity and water supplies in New South Wales and Victoria, but which confers no significant direct benefit on this State.

EDWARDSTOWN LIGHTS

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether there are any plans to install traffic light control of vehicular and pedestrian traffic at South Road, Edwardstown, near the large shopping complex being constructed opposite Price Street?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Although the Road Traffic Board has often examined the matter of traffic light control on South Road, north of Daws Road, I do not think it is doing so currently. The board authorized the installation of traffic lights at the junction of Corunna Avenue and South Road, Edwardstown, which would probably be about one-third of a mile from the location referred to by the honourable member. I know that the board was becoming concerned at the number of traffic lights being installed and the consequential retardation of traffic that could result. However, I will discuss this matter with the board to see what plans, if any, it has, and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

EXCESS WATER

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding excess water accounts?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The problem of excess water accounts received by purchasers of properties covering a period prior to occupation by them has come under the attention of the Engineering and Water Supply Department on many occasions. Discussions have been held with the Real Estate Institute of South Australia Incorporated and the Law Society of South Australia Incorporated to provide a means of overcoming these problems. The situation is not the same as with the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the South Australian Gas Company, as in the case of these organizations it is a simple matter to read the meter at the time of changeover of occupancy and to render accounts to each party. Water and sewerage rates are a charge on the property and must therefore be apportioned between the respective parties at settlement. There is also the added complication of the rebate water entitlement against which the consumption must be offset.

In September, 1969, a system was introduced whereby for the payment of a fee of 50c the landbroker or solicitor is provided with a special meter reading showing details of the rebate water allowance for the year, the consumption to date and the excess charge to date if the property is in excess. Regarding the case referred to in the honourable member's question, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has no record of an application for a special meter reading. If the landbroker had obtained this, the excess water charge could have been included in the settlement and no difficulty would have arisen. Persons purchasing proper-

ties should therefore insist that, as is done with electricity, gas and telephone, the meter is read on change of occupancy and the settlement carried out on a proper basis. A circular concerning this matter was sent to all agents and solicitors on March 13, 1970, urging them to take advantage of the special reading system in the interests of their clients.

UNION BAN

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Minister of Works received from the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked recently regarding a soldier settler on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands states that since the commencement of the war service land settlement scheme, no Minister of Lands has put a settler under the scheme off his block because of his failure to meet departmental commitments when this has been caused by circumstances beyond the settler's control. There is no intention of departing from this policy. My colleague considers that it would be inappropriate for him to intervene in an industrial matter.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Premier say when it is expected that amendments to the Wheat Delivery Quotas Act will be introduced?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although I know that the introduction of amending legislation is imminent, I cannot say exactly when it will be introduced.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works find out from the Minister of Agriculture the cost of the inquiries being made into wheat quotas and their implementation, and will he also find out the reason for the additional 3 per cent cut in quotas for this season?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

FOSTER PARENTS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Social Welfare say whether it is intended to make any changes in the terms and allowances in respect of foster children? All members will probably have seen the report in the press recently regarding the difficulties that some foster parents are apparently having in looking after their foster children. I think the report said that more foster parents would be available if the allowance was increased.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Having been considering this matter, I have learnt with some surprise that the theory that has apparently hitherto been acted on in relation to remuneration for foster parents is that the amounts paid to them should, if anything, be somewhat less than the cost of maintaining a child, thereby ensuring that unsatisfactory people do not accept foster children merely for the purpose of making a profit. This seems a rather astonishing proposition to me and I was staggered to learn that it applied not only in South Australia but also in the other States. The rate paid in South Australia is about the average: it is slightly less than that paid in Victoria, and slightly more than that paid in other States. I do not feel satisfied with the amounts that are now being paid or with the reason that underlies the payment of an allowance less than the cost of maintaining a child. I have discussed this matter with the Director of Social Welfare, and with my authority he made a press statement about this a few days ago. I am investigating the matter. I am sympathetically disposed towards foster parents, especially towards those who are experiencing difficulty and financial hardship as a result of having foster children in their homes. I am investigating what is the true cost of maintaining a child in these circumstances and what would be the financial implications of altering the present rate. Although I cannot say that a change will be made soon, the matter is being investigated and I will make recommendations to Cabinet when I have a better understanding of the financial implications involved.

MODBURY WEST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say when the Modbury West Primary School will be ready for occupation?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This school is scheduled for completion in December this year and it should be ready for occupation at the beginning of the 1971 school year.

ABORIGINAL TRAINING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say what steps are being taken to develop the scheme of training Aboriginal teacher aides for work in the Education Department with Aboriginal children? A scheme for this type of training was initiated when the Hon. Joyce Steele was Minister of Education and I believe that when the Amata school was opened two Aboriginal teacher aides were employed successfully.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I know of no existing training scheme as described by the honourable member, but it is true that we do employ Aboriginal teacher aides at some schools. I made an announcement on Tuesday relating to the schemes that were being considered at present, not just for the training of Aboriginal aides but for the development of a training scheme that would enable Aborigines to enter the teaching profession and of schemes that could be related to the need for Aboriginal staff at places such as Ceduna, Port Augusta, Maitland and Meningie, and, ultimately, for the employment of Aborigines as fully qualified teachers in any of our schools. These schemes are currently being considered but to my knowledge no scheme is in operation.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, there ought to be. You said it in the Governor's Speech.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham cannot have listened to the question and the explanation given by the member for Kavel, who said that he thought that a scheme had been initiated not by the previous Minister of Education but by the Minister before the previous Minister and, if that scheme was initiated at that time, I would have presumed that when the honourable member's Government left office it would have been operating.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order. The honourable Minister must not pay attention to interjections.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I apologize for paying attention to the interjection, which was frivolous anyway. Considerable work has to be undertaken to plan any training programme in this field because in my view (and I am sure in the view of any of those concerned with the training of Aborigines) we must be certain that the scheme gets off the ground and works effectively. There would be nothing worse than the scheme ending up half-baked because it had not been effectively thought out, as this would only increase the dissatisfaction of the Aboriginal people and would not contribute effectively to their training or to providing another avenue of employment for them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question is to the Minister of Education.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What plans does the Government have for the training of Aboriginal teaching aides for employment in Aboriginal schools? I listened with attention to the

answer just given by the Minister of Education, and the purport of the answer was excuses for having taken no action. I remind the Minister that in paragraph 15 of the Governor's Opening Speech (I think he is looking for the reference himself now), which was delivered during July, the Government made the straight-out assertion:

... will train Aboriginal teaching aides for employment in Aboriginal schools.

That was over four months ago, and the Speech was actually drafted some time before that, so there has been ample time for the Government to put its announced plans into effect.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is peeved because he got a sharp reply to a silly interjection he made and that is the only reason for the question he has asked now. As the honourable member would be aware, the final details in relation to this matter are being worked out.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to give any further reply to the honourable member. It is no good giving any reply if that is his attitude.

SOUTH-EAST ELECTRICITY

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made on certain rural extensions of the electricity supply in the South-East, namely, at Naracoorte, Penola and Lucindale? I am particularly concerned about what is known as stage 4, with which the Minister is familiar. I understand that this is for a single wire earth return service and that, when it is completed, it will completely service the Naracoorte area. Stage 2 and stage 3 are well on the way to completion. What progress has been made on contracts for the completion of work on reticulation of the Lucindale area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Stage 2 is almost completed and stage 3 is well under way. I am not aware of the situation at Penola regarding stage 3. I believe the contract has been let to Frank Hunt Proprietary Limited for stage 4 in the Naracoorte area and deliveries of poles commenced on November 11. I believe that about 150 miles of s.w.e.r. line is involved in this. I will get a detailed report for the honourable member and bring it down as soon as possible.

RATE CONCESSIONS

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Works consider reducing the basic amount of water and sewerage rates for pensioners and superannuated persons? Many pensioners and superannuated persons residing in my district in home units and houses are experiencing financial difficulty in meeting the basic amount of their quarterly water and sewerage rates. I understand that the basic allocation of water for each rated property, including home units, is 140,000 gallons. Retired people, particularly pensioners, such as widows and widowers, do not use the full amount of water allocated. I understand that pensioners can allow their water and sewerage rates to accrue as a charge against their estate, but many constituents do not favour this. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether these people cannot be granted a concession on basic water and sewer rates, in the same way as they receive concessions in respect of telephone rental and television licences.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member suggests that concessions be granted on the same basis as concessions granted in respect of television licences and telephone rentals, this is not possible. The Minister has no power under the Act to remit any part of water or sewerage rates, and for a remission to be made an amendment to the Act would be necessary. The Government does not intend to give such a concession, because to do so would create tremendous problems, as the member can probably appreciate, because of the varying circumstances of people who have these services. As the honourable member has said, it is possible for the rate to accrue in the case of pensioners or persons, not necessarily pensioners, who are in necessitous circumstances. This can be done where people have an asset, and the department is willing and ready at any time to negotiate with people in this direction. I know that some people object to this practice, for a variety of reasons, but I believe that age pensioners or other pensioners should take advantage of this system where possible. Although they may not want to leave an encumbered estate to a relative or friend, I point out that, in the time that elapses from when a person allows the rate to accrue until death occurs, the asset usually increases in value by the amount of the rate that would have to be paid from the estate. Whilst the Government has much sympathy with pensioners and other persons in necessitous circumstances, for several reasons it cannot

see its way clear to do as the honourable member has suggested. I suggest that the honourable member talk to persons in those circumstances, with a view to getting them to agree to allow the rates to accrue rather than their paying them at the time.

GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say what has been the estimate of cost in the rough plans recently determined for the Gladstone High School? As has been said, the authorities are reviewing the plans for the Gladstone High School: I understand that that is being done because of the finance involved. That is why I ask what is the basic estimate of the cost of the initial plans of the school before any economic survey is undertaken.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In the process of departmental briefs being submitted to the Public Buildings Department for the design of schools, several reviews may occur because of costs, and I do not think any good purpose would be served by making public in each case what the costs were. When the plan has been submitted to the Public Works Committee for examination, the honourable member can closely examine all the plans proposed and find out the estimated cost. I would not propose that, as a general policy, the estimated cost of projects should be made available as public information before submissions were made to the Public Works Committee.

NAILSWORTH SCHOOLS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the development of schools in the Nailsworth area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The programme planned for redevelopment of the Nailsworth Technical High School is scheduled to have documents ready for the calling of tenders in September, 1971, with a completion date of May, 1973. Sketch plans and an estimate have been prepared and are currently under review to see whether costs can be reduced before proceeding further. It is expected that the programme will be adhered to.

HOUSE MICROPHONES

Mr. EVANS: My question is directed to you, Mr. Speaker. Will you look into the possibility of having the sound amplification system in this House improved? As members

are aware, the acoustics in this House are not good unless one is reasonably close to the person speaking or the person speaking shouts his comments rather than speaks them. I have noticed that at times even you, Mr. Speaker, seem to have difficulty in hearing members' comments unless there is absolute silence in the House. I am concerned also that at times it is difficult for the *Hansard* staff and the press representatives in the two galleries beside *Hansard* to hear clearly, even though the reporters have loudspeakers right alongside them. Members appreciate how important it is for *Hansard* to hear every word spoken so that it can be recorded accurately. No member likes to leave himself open to being misquoted in the press because of poor listening facilities available to the press representatives. Furthermore, I have been in the strangers gallery on occasions and have had extreme difficulty in hearing from that gallery, even though there are loudspeakers there. Since many persons avail themselves of the opportunity to hear proceedings in this House, it is unfortunate if, because of the noise of movement in the House, they cannot hear proceedings. If an improvement could be made, it would be appreciated by visitors to the House, by *Hansard* and by the press representatives.

The SPEAKER: The Public Buildings Department checks the system daily. However, I appreciate the problem of hearing at times. The position would be improved considerably if members conducted themselves in a much better way and ceased interjecting.

Mr. Venning: Particularly on the other side.

The SPEAKER: I have said before that when I am on my feet and making a statement members should not interject. If the member for Rocky River interjects again when I am on my feet, I shall immediately name him. This is the type of thing that is becoming most objectionable in this House. Honourable members do not maintain decorum, even when members on their own side are asking questions. If decorum is observed, it will assist considerably. However, I shall further examine the matter raised by the member for Fisher.

ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier and, with your permission and the concurrence of the House, Mr. Speaker, briefly to explain it.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question, Sir, is this: will the Government reconsider its decision not to accede to the request of the Police Association, through its counsel at the first sitting of the Moratorium Royal Commission, to enlarge the terms of reference? The Premier will recollect that the Police Association, through, I think, its junior counsel (Mr. Mark Harrison), asked that the terms of reference be enlarged to include the statements which the Premier had made, which his Deputy, the Minister of Works, had made, and which had been made by the Leader of the Opposition and by me during the week prior to the moratorium demonstration. A few weeks ago in the House, I raised this matter with the Premier and said then that neither the Leader nor I had the slightest objection to our names being included in such a way in the terms of reference. I am confident that the Deputy Premier (the Minister of Works) would not be frightened to have his name included in the terms of reference, and that leaves only the Premier of the four of us who could have some objection to his name being included. I therefore ask, as the matter has been raised, as it was, by the Police Association, and as it was raised (albeit in a rather different form) in this House, whether even at this stage the Government is prepared to reconsider its refusal. It is still three weeks or so before the Commission begins its—

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member has made his explanation long enough. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have said on many occasions that the Government's view is that the present terms of reference raise all relevant matters and, if any of the matters to which the honourable member refers have any sort of causative influence on the events of the day in question, they are already within the terms of reference of the Commission. However, just to reassure the honourable member, I indicate that I have not the slightest worry personally about the Commission's investigating my statements if they are thought to have any relationship to the events of that day, and I should be perfectly prepared to give evidence before the Commission.

JUVENILE COURT

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Social Welfare say whether the Government intends to take any action to change the present venue of the Adelaide Juvenile Court? At present, as honourable members will know,

this court sits in the magistrates court building in close proximity to courts where serious charges are heard and dealt with. I believe this is quite contrary to the intent, or at least the spirit, of the Act, and for that reason I believe the venue should be changed; I think most overseas authorities think so, too. I should be grateful if the Minister could reassure me that some consideration has been given to this matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Some effort is made, as the honourable member would know, under the present conditions to ensure that children appearing before the juvenile court do not mingle with other people having business before the magistrates courts. I should be the first to agree that the arrangement under which the juvenile court is situated in close proximity to the ordinary magistrates courts produces undesirable consequences. I think the ideal situation is for the juvenile court to be situated in a building that is separate from the magistrates courts. Although I have considered this matter, problems are involved, but I am hopeful that those problems can be solved. However, this is a matter that I intend to examine when the new arrangements, which will be required as a result of the enactment of the legislation that I have previously foreshadowed in relation to juvenile delinquency, are considered. When these arrangements are being considered, I will further consider the practicability of situating the juvenile court in premises separate from the magistrates court.

AGED COTTAGE HOMES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of the Attorney-General, and with your permission and the concurrence of the House, Mr. Speaker, briefly to explain it.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question is this: what further action is contemplated by the Government regarding Aged Cottage Homes Incorporated? A few weeks ago (on October 27, to be precise) the Attorney-General answered a series of questions on notice concerning this matter, particularly concerning the correspondence that passed, during September and early October, between the Chief Secretary, on behalf of the Government, and the solicitors for Aged Cottage Homes. Mr. Speaker, you will recollect that this was one of the main topics with which the Attorney-General dealt in his maiden speech, when he pretended to undertake—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" has been called. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: An officer is currently engaged in looking into this question, as I indicated in reply to previous questions asked. When a report is received from that officer, what action ought to be taken in the matter will be considered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General say what precisely the officer is doing in the matter? My information is that a Mr. O'Reilly has been appointed to act in the matter but that for some weeks nothing has been heard of him and no action has been taken, thus giving the impression that the Government wants the matter to die. I therefore ask the Attorney-General what action is being taken or what work Mr. O'Reilly is doing, in the matter and what instructions have been given him by the Government.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Mr. O'Reilly has been asked by the Government to look into the matters that have been raised in connection with Aged Cottage Homes to see what can be done to solve the problems of the tenants of the homes which were the subject of the matter canvassed in this House and to make recommendations in that regard. I am touched by the honourable member's concern that the matter should not die, although it stands in somewhat marked contrast to the attitude he took earlier when I first took up the matter.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when this House may expect to receive further information on the next stage of railway gauge standardization to be implemented in this State? Some time ago the Minister indicated that he had met Mr. Sinclair in Sydney and that the meeting had been amicable. As I understand it, the Latin derivation of the word "amicable" is "love"; I do not know how that works out. However, it appears to me and my constituents that the State Minister and the Commonwealth Minister are playing a game of draughts, and we wonder whose move is next.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should be delighted to answer the honourable member in Latin if I knew it. I am an Australian, proud of my birth and not versed in the Latin derivation of words.

Mr. Millhouse: You—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member is not interested in the reply I am

giving, I wish he would keep quiet, because I know the member for Rocky River is interested and would like to hear what I have to say. Since I went to Sydney in an effort to try to solve the problem left in my lap as a result of the change of Government, a request has been made for certain information to be given the Commonwealth Minister regarding the proposals contained in what is commonly described as the Fitch plan. This information, which is currently being compiled, will be given the Commonwealth Minister in due course. The only person who can properly answer the honourable member is the Commonwealth Minister, who belongs to the honourable member's Party. Since about three or four days after we assumed office, we have attempted almost continuously to get this matter resolved. I repeat what I have said before: that the one point of unanimity that appeared to exist was the general desire to have this matter resolved. On the one hand, we desire to ensure that the interests of secondary industries in and near Adelaide are properly served. On the other hand, we desire to see that pastoralists in the North are properly served. Unfortunately, the previous Government agreed to accept a proposal which denied rail connections to secondary industries in Adelaide and to primary producers in the North. We have used our best endeavours to provide a service to those sections and we intend to pursue that line, for we believe that primary and secondary industries are important to the well-being of South Australia and should not be brushed aside by Canberra or Adelaide interests that obviously, from their actions, do not give proper credence to the importance of these rail connections.

PSYCHIATRIST

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Social Welfare say whether any further progress has been made in relation to the appointment of a full-time psychiatrist in the Social Welfare Department? If the appointment has not been made, what further steps will be taken to fill this position, as the need for a psychiatrist is urgent?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No appointment has been made up to the present. I will inform the honourable member as soon as I can give him further information.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

Mr. COUMBE: About two months ago the Minister of Labour and Industry gave the House information about the flammability of

clothing, particularly children's clothing. Since then, has the Minister obtained further information about research being carried out in this connection? Also, can he say what was the response to pamphlets that were authorized to be sent out as part of a programme to educate parents and other people in an effort to avoid fatalities and injuries to children, particularly those resulting from the wearing of flammable types of night attire?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In reply to the second part of the question, there was an excellent response to the pamphlet, which was sent out to child-minding centres, kindergartens and such places to draw the attention of parents of children likely to wear flammable clothing to the dangers associated with such clothing. As I believe the pamphlet has served a useful purpose, we are presently considering whether this campaign should be further extended this year or in later years so that the parents of other children will obtain the pamphlets. With regard to the honourable member's question about research, I point out that it is difficult to define exactly what types of material should be used and what standard should apply. It is apparent to Ministers in all States that a standard must be adopted throughout Australia at the one time in order to avoid the problems that would be created as a result of various standards of clothing being sold in the various States. Although I believe something is likely to be forthcoming soon, up to now a final standard has not been completely agreed. When the matter was considered at the Minister's conference earlier this year, it was hoped that during the ensuing 12 months something constructive could be done to establish a standard so that this desirable safety measure could be implemented.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not even been able to direct it yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am asking the honourable member to state his question or to resume his seat.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With great respect, all I had got out of my mouth was that I wished to direct a question to the Minister. I had no chance to say any more than that. I was going on to say which Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. He has been deliberately attempting to disregard the authority of the Chair while I am on my feet. I will give the honourable member his last opportunity. Instead of making a preamble, he should ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, I think you have misunderstood. I have not even named the Minister to whom I wish to direct my question.

The SPEAKER: Order! To whom is the question directed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is what I was trying to say: it is directed to the Minister of Roads and Transport and, with your permission and the concurrence of the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question is this: will the Minister consider and pass on to the Road Safety Council a suggestion given me regarding road safety? As I now desire to explain the question, I seek your leave and the concurrence of the House to make the explanation. This morning I met in the street a lady of my long-time acquaintance. She suggested that it would be a good idea to enlist the aid of the newspapers in this State to publish each week a list of the casualties from road traffic accidents admitted to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, perhaps, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, setting out in detail the injuries that they had suffered in the hope that it would bring home to people the dreadful results of road accidents.

Mr. Coumbe: Without mentioning names, of course.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. This lady hoped that this might have some effect on South Australian drivers. I know that one school of thought regards such horror advertising as a bad thing. However, I know that the National Road Safety Council has used such advertisements in the press. The difference between those advertisements and this suggestion is that this would be based on what has actually occurred week by week in this State.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to direct this suggestion to the Road Safety Council. I emphasize the name of that body, as I regret that the honourable member obviously does not know quite what it is. The Road Safety Council is a group of people who are doing a tremendous job for this State and who I hope will be doing something soon to

reduce South Australia's road toll dramatically. I am extremely proud of the council. It will always be happy to examine any suggestion made to it. I only hope I sense in the honourable member's question a softening of his previous attitude, when he was rather critical, and I hope he will now wholeheartedly support the Road Safety Council in its task.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MAYORS

Mr. GROTH (Salisbury): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. GROTH: I referred earlier in this House to the Mayors of Salisbury and Elizabeth as dingoes. Although the House will appreciate the strength of my feelings in the matter, I used the term in the heat of the moment, and I now withdraw the remark.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Agriculture Department and Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department (Office and Laboratory Accommodation at Northfield).

Ordered that report be printed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FEES)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

D. & J. FOWLER (TRANSFER OF INCORPORATION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prices Act, 1948-1969. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its objects are, first, to extend the life of the Prices Act by one year and, secondly, to confer on the Prices Commissioner wider powers for the protection of the consumer. In support of the first object, attention is drawn to the fact that the Prices Act has continued in operation since 1948 and has been of substantial benefit to the people of this State. Maximum prices are currently fixed

for a number of items, some of which are important to family groups and people on low incomes, and others, such as petroleum products and superphosphate, which affect rural industry costs. In addition, the Prices Commissioner examines price movements of a wide range of non-controlled goods and services and a number of arrangements exist with industries regarding advice and discussions before prices are increased.

The reasons why price increases should be limited to reasonable levels are only too well known. Prices of a number of commodities in this State are still below those in other States but there is continual pressure to lift local prices to interstate levels, particularly by the increasing number of organizations operating nationally, even though costs might be lower in this State. One of the attractions for new industries to become established in South Australia is its favourable cost structure as compared with other States. It is considered important that a restraining influence be exercised on unwarranted price increases to maintain this position. Regarding the second object of the Bill, there is no need to stress the urgent need for legislation to combat unlawful and unfair trade and commercial practices in this State, as everyone is well aware of the Australia-wide awareness of the problem. New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and Tasmania have either passed or are considering legislation on consumer protection.

Broadly, the Bill is designed to widen the powers and functions of the Prices Commissioner so as to enable him *inter alia* to engage in research into all aspects of consumer protection, to inform and advise the consumer on all matters affecting consumer protection, to investigate and deal with complaints from consumers and, subject to certain conditions, to institute or defend proceedings on behalf of a complainant. The individual powers and functions will be dealt with in detail shortly. Several of the functions provided in the Bill are already being carried out by the Prices Commissioner, and it is obvious from the steadily increasing number of complaints received by him that he is filling, and should continue to fill, a very real and important need of the community. For the year ended June 30, 1970, over 750 complaints were investigated. Of the complaints concerning excessive charges, in 367 cases reductions or refunds were obtained, amounting in total to \$23,500. In other cases, arrangements were made for work to be completed or unsatisfactory work

to be redone. In addition, some hundreds of general inquiries were handled and advice given. In view of his and his department's experience in matters connected with consumer protection, the Prices Commissioner is ideally set up for the purpose of administering legislation on that subject.

The Bill also contains some statute law revision amendments. I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act by adding a definition of "consumer" as meaning the buyer or hirer or lessee or potential buyer or hirer, or lessee of goods or the borrower of money for the purchase of goods, or the user or potential user of services for fee or reward, but excluding the person who buys or hires or takes on lease or borrows money for the purchase of goods for resale or letting on hire and the person who uses any services for the purpose of his trade or business. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by up-dating the citation of the Public Service Act. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act by widening the administration of the Commissioner to cover all the provisions of the Act. This is purely a consequential amendment. Clause 5 amends section 6 of the principal Act by up-dating the citation of the Public Service Act, and by altering the reference to Public Service Commissioner to the Public Service Board.

Clause 6 enacts a new section 18a under the new heading of "Protection of the Consumer". New subsection (1) sets out the additional functions of the Commissioner, in five paragraphs. These include the conduct of research into aspects of and matters relating to the interests of consumers generally or a particular consumer, the taking of such steps as he thinks proper for the purpose of informing the public on consumer protection, the giving of such advice to any person on the provisions of the Act relating to consumer protection as he thinks proper, the receipt and investigation of and the dealing with complaints from consumers relating to excessive charges for goods or services (that is, any goods, not just those specifically controlled by the Commissioner under the Act) and relating to unlawful or unfair trade or commercial practices, or any infringement of a consumer's rights arising out of a transaction entered into by him as a consumer, and the making of reports to the Minister on any matter of importance investigated by him and, of course, on all matters that the Minister refers to him. New subsection (2) gives the Commissioner power,

when satisfied that it is in the public interest so to do, to institute or defend legal proceedings on behalf of any consumer whose consumer rights have been infringed. It is envisaged that as many complaints as possible will be dealt with by negotiation, as in the past, and that legal proceedings will be a last resort. Indeed, by new subsection (3) of this clause, the institution or defence of legal proceedings is rendered subject not only to the written consent of the consumer himself, but also to Ministerial control on such conditions as the Minister thinks fit. However, it will undoubtedly be expedient and in the interests of the public for the Commissioner to have this power to institute or defend legal proceedings in the name of the consumer, as there are frequently cases of hardship which should be dealt with quickly and by persons with experience, not only to redress the wrong but in some cases to make an example to the public.

New subsection (4) provides in relation to such proceedings that the Commissioner will have full control thereof including the right to settle any action, that he may conduct an action as he thinks fit without consulting the consumer, that moneys recovered must be paid to the consumer who must also pay any amount awarded against him, that costs in all cases will be the responsibility of the Commissioner, and that where an unrelated counterclaim arises in any action the court shall, on the application of the Commissioner, order a separate hearing for that counterclaim. New subsection (5) provides for an automatic appropriation out of general revenue of any money which the Commissioner becomes liable to pay under this section. New subsection (6) empowers the Commissioner to join with and consult any other department in this State, in any other State or the Commonwealth and all other bodies and persons who are concerned with consumer protection.

Clause 7 amends section 22f of the principal Act by up-dating the citation of the Licensing Act. Clause 8 amends section 27 of the principal Act by making a decimal currency conversion. Clause 9 enacts a new section 49a which provides that the Commissioner, any authorized officer and the Crown are exempted from any personal liability for acts done or defaults or statements made by any of them in good faith in the course of administering the Act. Clause 10 amends section 53 of the principal Act which provides for the duration of the Act, by renewing the Act for another year, so that the Act applies to transactions taking place before January 1, 1972.

This is the first major amendment in the course of legislation to be introduced for the purpose of consumer protection and it was outlined in this Government's policy speech at the last election. We then pointed out that in many cases it was impossible for the average consumer in relation to numbers of organizations which affect him to use the remedies supposedly given him at law under various pieces of legislation supposed to be for consumer protection, because the cost to the consumer pursuing his rights was so great that his rights became completely illusory. It is vital for adequate consumer protection not merely to have information available to the consumer and to have rights to be exercised by the consumer, but to have a public organization, commission or body able to pursue those rights for the consumer in cases where both the consumer's and the public's interests would be met by so doing. This is something which the Government has advocated for a considerable time. It is a considerable departure in administration in this field of consumer protection, but I believe it is vital for the working of any organization of consumer protection that there be a more adequate method of ensuring consumer protection than the kind of thing that has been tried and found wanting elsewhere, whereby a consumer protection council is set up to give the public information on certain commodities. This Bill gives real protection to consumers by ensuring that, when someone has wronged a consumer, the consumer will have the public actively and effectively seeking a remedy for him.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Education Act, 1915-1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Education Act in several important respects. It gives power to the Minister to delegate his power of appointing, transferring and promoting (but not dismissing) teachers, so that officers in charge of groups of schools who have the necessary experience, may thus lighten the loads of purely administrative work with which the Minister, the Director-General and Deputy Director-General are burdened.

The provisions in the principal Act relating to long service leave for teachers have had a long awaited and much needed overhaul. The Bill provides the same long service leave entitlements as those to which other public servants are entitled, namely, 90 days' leave after 10 years' continuous service, nine days for each extra year thereafter and in certain circumstances pro rata leave after five years. The Act in its present form provides that these periods of leave may, in the discretion of the Governor, be granted to a teacher only after 15 years of service and provides no pro rata leave at all; thus teachers suffer a distinct and unjustified disadvantage compared to public servants. The Bill remedies these and other long service leave inequities and anomalies which have caused much dissatisfaction and, as the South Australian Institute of Teachers pointed out earlier this year, have rendered a teacher's position in this State less attractive than in any other State.

The Bill also amends the provisions relating to a teacher's retirement. The Bill provides that a male teacher may retire on the last day of a school year in any year after he turns 60 years or, in the case of a female teacher, after she turns 55 years. This option continues until a male teacher reaches 65 years and a female teacher reaches 60 years, and then that teacher may either retire on his or her birthday, or continue on to the end of the school year. Where the teacher retires at the end of the school year he will be credited with service until January 31 following. The aim of these amendments is to bring retirement provisions into line with the new regulations governing resignations. The whole scheme provides a financial inducement to encourage teachers to think of service on a full-year basis. It is designed to minimize the number of mid-year resignations of teachers and the consequential disruptions which follow such resignations.

The Bill enacts some new provisions to enable a school committee or council to borrow money, subject to Ministerial approval, for the purpose of supplying facilities or amenities to the school. Provision is made for the Government to guarantee such of these loans as a School Loans Advisory Committee to be set up for that purpose recommends, and such a guarantee will be given subject to certain conditions, one of which requires the school committee or council to deposit with the Minister not less than half the proportion of the cost of the facility or amenity to be borne by the

committee or council. So that a school committee or council may effectively borrow money to provide school amenities, provisions have been inserted in this Bill which provide for the incorporation of these committees and councils, with all the normal powers of a corporate body, the only restriction being that the holding of real property must be subject to Ministerial consent. The reason for this restriction is that in most cases any amenity provided by a committee or council will be provided on land belonging to the Crown. The Government believes that it is desirable to enable and encourage school committees and councils to improve school facilities with the necessary degree of control provided by the Bill.

One of the difficulties which confronts a parent organization when it raises money to finance a large capital project such as a hall is that those who raise the money rarely gain any benefit for their own children. In addition rising building costs lower the real value of monies raised in previous years. By borrowing under the provisions of this Bill, a school committee or council can bring forward the commencement of the project and spread the burden of payment more fairly among those who benefit from the facility constructed.

The Bill also provides for the setting up of two advisory curriculum boards, one for primary education and one for secondary education. The principal Act at present provides for separate boards for each different type of school specified. At present there are four boards covering high, technical high, area and primary schools. The amendments will also enable the expansion of the composition of the boards to include representation from independent schools, parent bodies and industry, as well as teachers from Government schools.

The Bill seeks to clarify the position regarding teachers appointed to tertiary-level institutions. After a great deal of thought and discussion with the various bodies concerned it has been decided to exclude teachers from the right of appeal to the Teachers Appeal Board in respect of appointments to tertiary-level institutions. As these positions require special and diverse abilities and qualifications which may be found in younger or less senior applicants and are advertised openly around the world, it is thought desirable that this amendment to the Act be made.

Provision is made for further appointments to a teachers college of persons holding positions at a university in this State. At the

moment the principal Act purports to allow for only one appointment in respect of the Principal of Bedford Park Teachers College. In actual fact, the Act which contained this latter provision never came into force, and so the Bill also effects the repeal of that Act. Provision is, therefore, made in the Bill to validate any such appointment made before this Bill passes into law.

The Bill also makes an amendment in respect of marking roll-books. As this duty is relatively time consuming for teachers and is subject to review and change from time to time, it has been requested by the Director-General that the present method of marking each child's attendance be replaced by a method to be prescribed. It is expected that regulations will be made allowing for only the absence of a child to be noted. The Bill also contains many Statute law revision amendments.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends the arrangement section of the principal Act by correcting certain errors and inaccuracies. Clause 3 strikes out from section 4 of the principal Act the definition of "the Council" which is no longer necessary, as the Advisory Council of Education has been replaced by the Educational Policy Board. Clause 4 inserts in section 10 of the principal Act a provision that the Minister's power to acquire lands is subject to the Land Acquisition Act, 1969, and, consequential to that, strikes out the now redundant subsection (2).

Clause 6 alters to "Director-General" a reference to "Director" in section 15 of the principal Act. This clause also adds a new subsection (2a), which provides that the Minister may delegate the power to appoint, transfer and promote teachers to such officers in charge of groups of schools as he thinks proper, but not with respect to the dismissal of teachers. Clauses 7 and 8 make certain Statute law revision amendments to sections 17 and 18 of the principal Act.

Clause 9 amends section 18a of the principal Act, which provides for long service leave. Existing subsections (1) and (2) are struck out. New subsection (1) is inserted, which provides that a teacher who has had not less than 10 years' continuous service (whether that service occurred before or after this Bill becomes law) is entitled to 90 days on full pay or 180 days on half pay and nine days on full pay or 18 days on half pay for each continuous year thereafter. New subsection (1a)

provides that long service leave must be taken at a time designated by the Minister as convenient to the department. New subsection (2) provides for pro rata leave for a teacher who dies, retires or resigns on account of pregnancy, and who has had not less than five continuous years of service, at the rate of nine days for each of those years. The clause then effects certain Statute law revision and consequential amendments to subsections (3), (5), (6) and (7).

New subsection (7a) is inserted, which provides that a teacher may, if he so desires, be paid his long service leave salary in a lump sum immediately prior to taking the leave. Subsection (8) is struck out and the new subsection inserted in its place provides that the long service leave section in the Public Service Act does not apply to teachers. A definition of "salary" is added to subsection (9); the expression includes all allowances paid to a teacher under an award, but does not include cleaning allowances or allowances for service in areas specified in the award.

Clause 10 amends section 18b of the principal Act, which deals with the long service leave of a teacher who transfers to other Government employment, by striking out subsection (1) and inserting in its place a new subsection which provides that, in those circumstances, his service as a teacher shall be taken into account when computing his leave under the Public Service Act. This clause also updates the reference to the Public Service Act.

Clause 11 amends section 18c of the principal Act which deals with Government officers who transfer to the teaching service, by striking out subsection (2) and inserting in its place a new subsection which provides that, in these circumstances, service as an officer shall be taken as service as a teacher in computing long service leave. Because of this provision, subsections (3) and (4) are redundant and are struck out. Several Statute law revision amendments are also effected.

Clause 12 repeals section 18d of the principal Act, which deals with the retirement of teachers, and enacts a new section in its place. New subsection (1) provides that a male teacher, on attaining the age of 65 years, and a female teacher, on attaining the age of 60 years, may retire on their birthdays. New subsection (2) provides that such a teacher may continue in employment until the last day of the school year. New subsection (3) provides that a male teacher, after turning 60 years, and a female teacher, after turning 55

years, may retire on the last day of a school year, but may continue in employment until retiring under new subsection (1) or (2). New subsection (4) provides that any service under the section after a male teacher turns 65 years or a female teacher turns 60 years shall be taken into account in computing long service leave. New subsection (5) provides that the last day in a school year is January 31 of the next calendar year. New subsection (6) provides that the provisions of the Public Service Act relating to retirement shall not apply to teachers.

Clause 13 enacts new sections 27a to 27d. Subsection (1) of new section 27a provides that, on a day to be proclaimed all existing school committees and councils shall be incorporated, and all future committees and councils shall become incorporated under this section, as bodies corporate with perpetual succession, a common seal and the capability of suing, being sued and holding and dealing with real and personal property in their corporate names. A committee or council may not hold or deal with real property without the written consent of the Minister. Subsection (2) provides for the corporate names of the committees and councils. Subsection (3) provides for the cancellation of registration of any committee or council incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act. Subsection (4) provides that all property of, claims and actions by and against, and rights and obligations of any existing committee or council shall vest in the incorporated body.

Subsection (5) provides that, when a school changes its name, the corporate name of the committee or council shall accordingly be changed. Subsection (6) provides that, when a school is closed, or for any other reason, the Minister may abolish a committee or council and transfer its assets to another school committee or council or apply the assets in payment of its debts or otherwise dispose of them as he thinks proper. Subsection (7) provides that the procedure to be followed at meetings shall be as prescribed or, if not prescribed, as the committee or council determines. New section 27b deals with the borrowing power of committees and councils. Subsection (1) of this new section provides that a committee or council may, with the approval of the Minister, borrow money from a banking corporation for the purpose of supplying facilities or amenities for the school. Subsection (2) provides that the Treasurer may guarantee the repayment of any such loan.

Subsection (3) provides that a guarantee shall not be given unless the Schools Loans Advisory Committee so recommends, and the loan does not exceed half the proportion of the cost of the facility to be borne by the committee or council, and the other half of that amount is deposited in cash with the Minister, and the banking corporation has made or offered to make the loan, and the committee or council enters into such agreements as the Treasurer requires. Subsection (4) provides that the guarantee may extend to interest and any incidental expenses. Subsection (5) provides that the committee or council must supply all information sought by the Minister, the Treasurer or the School Loans Advisory Committee.

Subsection (6) provides for the normal Government guarantee conditions to be attached to any guarantee for the protection of the Treasurer. Subsection (7) provides for an automatic appropriation out of general revenue for any money that the Treasurer may become liable to pay under any guarantee. New section 27c deals with the School Loans Advisory Committee. Subsection (1) of this new section provides that there shall be such a committee, the members of which shall be appointed by the Minister and the number of members to be as prescribed. Subsection (2) provides that the functions of the committee shall be the consideration and investigation of applications for guarantees and such other functions as shall be prescribed. New section 27d provides that the Governor may make regulations with respect to all matters specified in or arising out of new sections 27a to 27d.

Clause 14 amends section 28 of the principal Act by striking out subsections (2) and (3) and inserting two new subsections, the first of which provides for an Advisory Curriculum Board for Primary Education and an Advisory Curriculum Board for Secondary Education, and the second of which provides that such boards shall consist of such officers, Education Department teachers and representatives of private schools and other bodies as the Minister shall determine. A consequential amendment is also made to this section. Clauses 15, 16 and 17 make self-explanatory Statute law revision amendments to sections 28ca, 28s and 28zb respectively of the principal Act. Clause 18 enacts new sections 28ze and 28zf. New section 28ze provides that an appointment of a teacher to a tertiary level institution shall not be subject to the provisions of sections 28zc and 28zd of the principal Act, which relate to

the Teachers Appeal Board. New section 28zf provides in subsection (1) that the Minister may arrange with any university in this State for a person holding office at the university to hold office at a teachers college. Subsection (2) provides that such an appointment shall not be subject to Part IIA or IIB of the principal Act, which relate to the Teachers Salaries Board and the Teachers Appeal Board. Subsection (3) provides that any such appointment made before this Bill becomes law shall be valid as if made under this new section.

Clause 19 makes Statute law revision amendments to section 34 of the principal Act. Clause 20 amends section 42 of the principal Act, which deals with the compulsory attendance of children at school. The reference to marking a child's attendance in the roll book is altered to marking the roll book in the prescribed manner. The penalties for a parent who fails to comply with the requirements of the section are raised to bring this section into line with other sections of the principal Act that were similarly amended in 1966. Clause 21 makes a Statute law revision amendment to section 46 of the principal Act. Clause 22 raises the penalties provided by section 47 of the principal Act for parents of blind, deaf, mute, and mentally defective children who fail to send such children to a specified institution, to bring this section into line with other similar sections in the Act. A Statute law revision amendment is also made.

Clauses 23, 24, 25 and 26 make self-explanatory Statute law revision amendments to sections 59a, 59m, 71 and 76 respectively of the principal Act. Clause 27 repeals the Act previously referred to in this report. The repealed Act purported to enact section 28ze of the principal Act but, in fact, never came into operation. Clause 18 deals with the provisions that have been substituted for that section.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

STOCK EXCHANGE PLAZA (SPECIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make special provision in respect of buildings proposed to be erected within the area known as the Stock Exchange Plaza. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members may be aware that the Corporation of the City of Adelaide is sponsoring the redevelopment of the area between Grenfell and Pirie Streets near the Adelaide Stock Exchange. It is proposed that the redeveloped area will be known as Stock Exchange Plaza. Redevelopment of the nature and extent envisaged by the Stock Exchange Plaza scheme has the support of the Government. To assist in the realization of the scheme, this Bill, which is introduced at the request of the corporation, will in two fairly important respects modify the building laws of the State in their application to the buildings proposed to be erected in the plaza. The first modification is to permit building to a height of 300ft. instead of to the limit of 200ft. that obtains at present. The second modification will be to limit the floor area index of the plaza to eight.

The effect of the increase of the height limitation is, I consider, clear, but it may be helpful if I enlarge somewhat on the limitation of the floor area index. In simple terms, the floor area index represents the relationship between the total floor area of buildings on the plaza and the area of the plaza. Thus, a building of, say, 20 storeys, covering the whole of the plaza, would have a total floor area of about 20 times the area of the plaza; that is, the plaza would have in respect of such a building a floor area index of 20. Similarly, if the building covered only half the plaza the index would be 10. This concept of floor area index is, of course, of great importance to town planners and developers, since there is an obvious relationship between the total floor area of a building and the number of people who can be accommodated therein.

If the floor area index is too high the planner will object, because it will result in an unduly high concentration of activity in the area and strain ancillary facilities such as roads, transport and parking. A high index may also reduce the amount of open space in relation to the building. On the other hand, if the index is too low, the developer will object, since it could result in uneconomic development of the area. Considerable research is necessary before appropriate indices can be established for sites in the city and elsewhere. In this case, however, the corporation is satisfied that an index of eight is appropriate, and such an index applied to, say, two buildings in the plaza built to the proposed limits of 300ft. would mean that almost three-quarters of the 84,000 sq. ft. of plaza area would be available as a public concourse and open space.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act will come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. Such a proclamation will not issue until the corporation has acquired control over the whole of the redevelopment area lest there be any suggestion that the rights of the owners of property within the area are prejudiced in their negotiations with the corporation, by reason of the fact that this Bill imposes limitations on the redevelopment of the area. Clause 3 provides certain necessary definitions of which the definition of "floor area index" is the most significant. Clause 4 makes the appropriate modifications to the building law otherwise applicable, and at the same time makes clear that, aside from these modifications, the general building law will apply. The schedule provides a plan of the plaza and shows its relationship to the surrounding area. Since this Bill is, in the terms of the relevant standing orders, a hybrid Bill it will, in the normal course of events, be referred to a Select Committee of this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

THE FESTIVAL HALL (CITY OF ADELAIDE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the time for bringing up the Select Committee's report be extended to Thursday, November 26.

Motion carried.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2437.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I have read the second reading explanation of the Minister of Works, and I agree with him wholeheartedly in many respects. As a result, I support the Bill. Many aspects of the principal Act were written into it in 1932, but the legislation originated in 1882. As a result, many of its provisions are completely out of date, and some are archaic. From time to time, piecemeal amendments have been made to the Act, which is one of the most important Acts on the Statute Book, because it deals largely with the development of all sections of South Australia. I believe the whole Act needs to be rewritten. Several matters were brought to my attention to this end when I was Minister of Works. I agree with what the Minister

has done now in bringing in an interim Bill to take care of the more urgent measures that need to be taken to solve the problems that have arisen.

In his second reading explanation, the Minister correctly said that the original architects of the legislation thought of nothing but laying mains in the ground in streets. I remind honourable members that this legislation is based on the English system, where pipes were laid in the ground in streets. However, with our sparse population and the need for pumping, many mains have had to be laid in or above the ground across properties. Probably South Australia has more mains than have all the other States put together. Whyalla, which is served by two mains, could not exist without them, and a similar position applies in Port Augusta. Those mains are the result of recent development. Credit should be given to Sir Thomas Playford for starting much of this work, which was never envisaged by the original architects of the legislation.

I agree with the Minister that there is considerable doubt as to the validity of many parts of the legislation. Much litigation has occurred in this connection, and many points have arisen on which it is difficult to get clarification. In many cases this has resulted in a feast for lawyers. Like the Minister, I do not intend to refer in this connection to Supreme Court writs. The principal Act refers to the Commissioner, as originally there was a Commissioner of Public Works. However, the name of this office has been changed to Minister of Works, and it is the Minister's duty to supply water on demand, although in certain cases he can refuse to do so.

The Bill clarifies the question of direct and indirect services, and other questions that have arisen recently as a result of the growth of subdivisional estates in suburban areas. Also, it deals with lands subject to rates and with certain water districts and their proclamation. These matters, which are most important, are clarified by the Bill, which will enable the Minister and the department to overcome certain difficulties that have arisen so that they can get on with the job of reframing the whole Act, without being unduly rushed. When I first looked at this matter about two years ago, I was told that rewriting the whole Act would take about two years. A similar position applies in respect of the Sewerage Act.

Several matters connected with this Bill can be more properly dealt with in Committee. One problem that the Bill will overcome is

in relation to the Keith main, and I do not intend to go into the question of writs. This matter has concerned me, the two Ministers of Works before me, and the present Minister. I was also concerned with it as a member of the Public Works Committee. The member for Mallee and the present and former members for Murray have also been involved. Considerable doubt has arisen in the minds of certain people about their liability regarding the laying of this main. However, I have no doubt that without this main much of this country will not be as productive as we hope it will be when work is completed. The same can also be said of the Ceduna trunk main, which is currently being enlarged, and of the Kimba main. The Minister of Works has rightly applied to the Commonwealth Government for assistance in relation to these mains, just as I applied to and obtained a grant from the Commonwealth Government for the Tailem Bend to Keith main. I wholeheartedly support this action. Although I should like to refer to one or two matters in Committee, I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I should like to take this opportunity to raise a matter that was brought to my notice only today. Although I cannot give the Minister any written information on the matter, and although a question on it will probably be asked of him next week, I thought I should raise this matter before this Bill passes. Proposed new section 35 (1) (a), inserted by clause 5, provides that, where the land or premises involved are adjacent land or premises, the Minister shall (and I stress that word), upon payment of the prescribed fee, provide and lay down a direct service for the supply of water in respect of the land or premises. New paragraph (b) provides that the Minister in any other case may, upon payment of the prescribed fee (and I stress "may"), provide a supply of water to a point determined by the Minister, from which the land or premises may receive a supply of water. A person living at Anzac Ridge, Aldgate, applied to the Engineering and Water Supply Department to have an indirect supply connected to this property (to which new paragraph (b) would refer). The department accepted the application and the fee for a water supply, as a result of which the person concerned proceeded to have his house built. After the walls of the house had been topped, the owner received a letter from the department informing him that he could not get a water supply. This person has committed his life savings to building a house, having received from the

department advice that an indirect supply would be provided, and he has paid a fee of \$38. I raise this point now so that the Minister is aware of it. Perhaps the Bill could be left until next week in case an amendment needs to be introduced to cover this contingency.

Community halls which are built by community groups and in which dances or youth club activities are held are rated normally by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. I do not blame any Government for this position. However, these rates are a burden on the people who contribute voluntarily not only by erecting the hall but also by giving their time to promote the community activities that are so necessary in the type of society in which we desire to live. For this reason, I think that some exemption should be given them. I am not saying that any exemption should be granted when this Bill is still being debated. However, I hope that a new method of rating will be introduced by which people will pay for the water they use and not pay a rate based on the value of their property. When the House is considering that matter, an amendment can be moved. In the case to which I have referred, the department could exercise the discretion provided in new section 35 (1) (b).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I shall be happy to examine the matter referred to by the honourable member. Perhaps in the terms of this Bill something can be done about it, especially if the department took the prescribed fee and undertook to provide a service. I will inquire to see what has happened in this matter. The honourable member raised the matter of community halls. I am sure he would realize that only charitable organizations, schools and churches are exempted from rating. I think that one would be hard pressed to define accurately the sorts of activity referred to by the honourable member. Indeed, many organizations that should not be exempted might be able to fall within the definition. This matter has been raised before, and perhaps it will be discussed later.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider a new clause relating to the exemption of certain lands from rates.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

New clause 5a—"Property exempted from rates."

Mr. COUMBE: I move to insert the following new clause:

5a. Section 88 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by inserting after the passage "State school" the passage "and, subject to subsection (2) of this section, no lands acquired for use for any of the purposes referred to in paragraphs (a), (b) or (c) of this subsection";

and

(b) by inserting after the present contents thereof, as amended by this section, (which are hereby designated subsection (1) thereof) the following subsection:—

(2) If any lands acquired for any of the purposes referred to in subsection (1) of this section are at any time used for a purpose other than those purposes, that subsection shall be deemed never to have applied to or in relation to those lands.

(3) The Minister may in his discretion remit all or portion of the rates that would by virtue of the operation of subsection (2) of this section be payable.

I thank members for suspending Standing Orders to enable me to move this motion. Some members will recall that a few years ago, as a private member, I moved a motion to assist charitable, church, and similar types of organization regarding their property rating. That motion aroused much interest and was debated at length but, unfortunately, it was lost. What I am doing now will help solve the problem facing these organizations. Section 88 of the principal Act provides that no lands or premises used exclusively for charitable purposes, for public worship, or for the purposes of any State school shall be subject to rates on assessments to be levied in respect of such lands and buildings.

If a church or charitable organization that wants to buy land in an expanding area, such as Salisbury, Elizabeth, Modbury, or Christies Beach, does not buy land when a large area is being sold, it finds that either there is no land available or it must pay excessively for any land available. My amendment will enable such an organization to buy land several years before it intends to build and still come within the provisions of section 88, provided that, if the organization sells the land, it must pay back rates. The amendment also provides that the Minister, in his discretion, may remit all or portion of the rates that may be payable. I am trying to help community-minded people, whether in religious or charitable organizations,

and I ask the Minister to accept the amendment, which achieves the purpose for which I moved unsuccessfully a few years ago. When I carried out research on this matter, the churches combined to have the matter brought before Parliament, and this amendment has the backing of many charitable organizations and most of the churches. I assure the Minister that I do not intend to move a similar amendment when the next matter on the Notice Paper is being debated, nor will I move a similar amendment to any Bill of this type.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I have considered the amendment carefully and the honourable member will be pleased to know that I do not intend to oppose it, because I think that the reasons he has stated are legitimate and reasonable. I am pleased that the amendment gives the Minister a discretion, because otherwise, regardless of how generous these bodies may be, they could take advantage of being able to make a profit on land that they had held for, say, 10 years. This would not be a desirable way of raising revenue for an organization. The Minister will have to make decisions in each case, but I do not think many cases will arise, because the organizations do not purchase land willy-nilly. I realize the problem of purchasing land in a developing area for future use without knowing the kind of development that will proceed. In those circumstances, the site may not be suitable when it is needed.

New clause inserted.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SEWERAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2437.)

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. Many of the comments that I have made in relation to the Bill that has just been passed apply equally to this measure. The principal Act, which has been in force for many years, urgently needs updating, in my opinion. Although the Act has been in operation for many years and great technological advances have been made since its early days, we find that in more recent years successive Ministers of Works have entered into new arrangements as a result of rapid subdivisional development occurring in many parts of a sewerage-proclaimed area. Sir Glen Pearson, I think, was the first Minister of Works to whom this applied, followed by the Hon. C. D. Hutchens, then by me, subsequently by the member for

Victoria, and now by the present Minister. Under these arrangements, subdividers can deposit certain moneys with the Minister, sums being refunded by the Minister to the subdivider as connections are made and houses completed.

As the member for Elizabeth well knows, from his experience on the Public Works Committee, many sewerage extension projects that his committee has examined simply would not have been possible but for this arrangement. Unfortunately, under the existing Act, from time to time doubts have been expressed about the validity of certain actions, and this Bill, in part, sets out to rectify, ratify and clarify matters that have been raised. Although we have this horrible word "retrospective" inserted in the legislation, I see no alternative to it. It is clear what is meant in regard to liability for paying rates, and anyone who tries to get out of paying rates will, I think, have a job to do so once this Bill is passed. I say this on behalf of not only the administration but also all people, because if a person gets out of paying rates someone has to make up the difference, and everyone should be treated equitably. From time to time, problems have arisen concerning the disposal of effluent into sewers, although much progress has been made in this regard, in that factories that have to dispose of certain wastes can now, with the permission of the Minister or Engineer-in-Chief, dispose of wastes into sewers, while other wastes must be treated before entering the normal sewer.

In certain council areas, as well as, for instance, in the district of the member for Tea Tree Gully and in certain river districts also, there are other systems of drainage. Here, we find that the Minister is required to give a certificate, although he cannot always do so, and the Bill provides that, if the Minister cannot give a certificate, the property in question will not be ratable. It is important that this matter should be borne in mind. Although the Bill is brief, it is important and has my support.

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

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 2211.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill. Although I have examined the various clauses and the Premier's second

reading explanation, I have not made far-reaching inquiries into the provisions because, as most of them are unrelated, I consider that it will probably be better to consider them in Committee. I think that one of the reasons for the success in this State of many of its fields of administration is the quality of the Public Service. The Public Service Act provides civil servants with considerable security, to such an extent that, provided there is no misconduct or gross inefficiency, or anything of that nature, civil servants are secure in their employment. Security in employment or in one's vocation is the aim of almost every average Australian. I think it is a characteristic of people in this country that, in preference to seeking adventure and perhaps insecure employment which, although it may involve greater rewards, may also involve greater catastrophes, most of us look to the future, wishing to ensure that we will not be embarrassed by loss of employment and income.

This is not the case in respect of the public administrations of many other countries of the world, the United States of America being a first-class example. However, often in various States of that country, and in the Federal Administration, too, many officers change their positions when there is a change of political control. No doubt, following changes at the higher level, many other changes take place down the line. I do not think that is a satisfactory situation, although no doubt it would act as a spur to people who became too complacent. Throughout Australia, we are conscious of the need for public servants to confine themselves to their own job and to stay out of Party political strife. This has called for tact and judgment to be used by public servants, particularly senior officers, and no-one can deny that public servants have responded with great success to this challenge. I am sure that I speak for members on both sides when I say that members of Parliament generally have great confidence not only in the personal integrity of public servants but also in their integrity in relation to matters of political import.

I was in Parliament for some years when there was no change of Government. However, the changes of Government in the last few years have been a test for public servants, and I believe that test has been passed with great success. All Ministers have been able to fully trust officers around them. In many cases a Minister neither asks nor knows the political opinion of his officers. He has the support of public servants, who do their best

to see that he is able to do his job, and they stick to him loyally, whoever he happens to be. Members have heard me criticize proposals to establish a public accounts committee and an ombudsman. I consider that what I have said about the Public Service amply answers people who want to establish inquiries of that kind. If further committees of inquiry were appointed to oversee decisions of the Public Service, I believe that to some extent public servants would lose their initiative. Such committees would not have time to overlook all decisions of the Public Service but would select a few. For that reason, I will always oppose altering the present system, which I believe has worked so well. In view of the many members of Parliament who represent people, anyone who has a genuine grievance has little difficulty in finding a member of Parliament willing to take up the matter with the Minister and, through him, with the Public Service. In few cases indeed is a satisfactory solution not found. Despite the amendments to the Act over the years, I believe that the type of legislation we have is designed to protect our public servants, provided they are doing their jobs well. Our legislation helps public servants to do their job without encouraging them in any way to do the job of anyone else.

The provisions in the Bill vary so widely that I do not intend to deal with them in detail. Such matters as rights of appeal, dismissal of officers for various reasons, early vacations of office by officers, sick leave, and long service leave entitlements are dealt with. Perhaps the matter of most immediate significance is the increase in annual leave from three weeks to four weeks. I notice that the grace days granted during the Christmas period, although they were not deducted from the three weeks' leave, will be deducted from the four weeks' leave period. As I think that is fair, I agree with the Government's provision in that respect.

The Bill also deals with the matter of long service leave when an employee is dismissed. I will ask the Minister about this later but, as far as I can see, the payment of a lump sum is at the discretion of the Public Service Board, after the board has considered the circumstances of the dismissal. I think that generally the Public Service Board recommends the payment of the lump sum. Having been a member of a Government when employees have been dismissed, I can say that almost always a lump sum has been paid and it has almost

always been justified. Whatever offence a person commits, we must also consider that he may have worked well for many years and may have been working well at the time of the offence. During that time he will have accumulated long service leave legitimately. I believe this is in the nature of money in the bank, and I see no reason why a lump sum should be withheld from such a person.

However, I think that some provision must be made whereby the board has discretion. There must remain certain types of offence, particularly those involving danger to others (and offences such as drunkenness, while appearing to be minor, can have disastrous consequences for other people) the committing of which can result in a person's losing his long service leave entitlement. In any case, I believe the board still has a discretion. Also, I understand that in future the Public Service Board instead of the Government will make appointments at the base grade level. I am not clear whether or not this applies only to appointments to the lower positions. I can see no harm in the present system, because it does not take up much time. In his second reading explanation the Premier, after I had asked him whether this provision would take away from Cabinet the supervision of these appointments, said:

Yes. The fact is that Ministers have to agree to this. The original creation of the position has to be agreed to by Cabinet, and the Public Service Board will proceed to make these appointments at the base grade level, approved by a Minister.

We realize that, whatever action is taken by the board, the Minister has the responsibility. If there is dissatisfaction about the appointment the Minister will be questioned, perhaps in Parliament. I wonder whether it is wise to remove this right to approve from Cabinet and place the responsibility with one Minister. Honourable members realize that, from time to time in Parliament, controversy is caused by certain appointments made by Executive Council. However, in future appointments will be made by the Public Service Board but approved by individual Ministers. I am speaking of the appointment of a person, not of creating the position. The position will be created by the Government, but the appointment will be made by the board with the approval of a Minister. I think this is placing too much responsibility on the Minister. This new procedure will not save much time, and when things are not going smoothly the Minister may be placed in a difficult position,

For that reason I question the wisdom of this provision, although I do not necessarily oppose it. With those reservations, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Definition of 'appointing authority'."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Does the Minister consider that the saving in time (which is not great) is worth the risk of the criticism of the Minister that may be caused if there is some fuss?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): At present, appointments and resignations are dealt with in Cabinet and, subsequently, in Executive Council. Normally, the board created a position and it was dealt with in Cabinet and Executive Council, but the Government considered that too much time was wasted administratively because of the paper work involved. With the board making the appointment and with appointments subject to appeal, the Government considered that the Minister could approve the appointment, because there seemed to be sufficient and necessary safeguards.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I realize that much paper work has been involved, but will the new procedure lead to any looseness in administration? Also, was the new procedure recommended by the Public Service Board?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know whether the board made the recommendation, but it would have agreed. Its powers are not altered. Although the dockets are not put before the Executive Council now, the Governor may call for them, so they must be prepared. I do not think the honourable member could tell me of any instance in which Cabinet or Executive Council has gone against the decision of the Public Service Board or the Minister. Therefore, there will be no loosening of administration: we are merely trying to make the procedure more efficient and to save costs in doing so.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Closure of offices, etc."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Am I correct in thinking that after July 1, 1971, there will be four weeks annual leave, from which the grace days will be deducted?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, that is correct.

Clause passed.

Clauses 20 and 21 passed.

Clause 22—"Long service leave."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has not the provision regarding the lump sum payment referred to in new subsection (6) existed in the past? I am sure this provision already exists in the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It has existed in the latter Act but not in the Public Service Act, although it has been the practice to make an *ex gratia* payment. Indeed, in many cases it has been submitted that Cabinet should make an *ex gratia* payment.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (23 to 26) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 11. Page .)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I commend the Bill to members. It puts into effect an arrangement made by my Leader, when Premier, when a satisfactory method of considering the needs of the city of Adelaide in respect of its commitment to the festival hall was agreed to. It is interesting, when researching this Bill, for one to refer to the Highways Act and the

Local Government Act. Pursuant to section 300a of the latter, which was inserted in 1948, \$40,000 is made available annually to the Adelaide City Council for roadworks. This Bill does not interfere with that provision: the amount it provides will be additional and will be made available from a sum that represents .83c a mile travelled by all Municipal Tramways Trust buses. I was intrigued as to why the figure should be .83c, but reference to the 1954 amending legislation shows that the sum to be made available to the Highways Department funds was 1d. a mile travelled, and .83c is the equivalent of that amount.

The formula referred to by the Premier in his second reading explanation is that the equivalent number of miles travelled by M.T.T. buses in the city of Adelaide against the total will be the amount made available for city council funds and, from this additional amount, plus other amounts, the Adelaide City Council will find its portion of the Adelaide festival hall requirements. I commend the Bill.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, Mr. Brown, Mrs. Byrne, and Messrs. Coumbe and Hall; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report on November 26.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.39 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 17, at 2 p.m.