

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, April 1, 1971

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Agent-General Act Amendment,
Highways Act Amendment (Fund),
Lottery and Gaming Act Amendment
(Tax),

Marketable Securities,
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment. (Revenue),

Public Service Act Amendment (Leave),
Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (POOLS)

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.

COMPANIES 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

TOURIST BUREAU BUILDING

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Works say what is the programme for constructing a new Tourist Bureau building in King William Street? I understand that the old building has been vacated for about three months and, from the street, nothing appears to have been done towards constructing a new building. I would be dismayed if, because of its age and the service it has given to the community, the building had been added to the list of buildings to be preserved, for I am sure that that would not only add to the Government's difficulties in the matter but would also certainly delay construction of a useful new building on the site.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader may recall that the Public Works Committee recommended that the building be not proceeded with. He would almost certainly know that that recommendation was based on legal

complications in relation to the site. However, the Government did not accept the committee's recommendation, and indicated that it intended to proceed with the construction of this building. The time spent in straightening out the legal complication has had some bearing on the programme for the detailed design of the building, delaying this to some extent. The Government does not intend deliberately to delay the construction of the building. Although I am not certain what stage planning has reached, I will find out and let the Leader know.

SOUTH ROAD LIGHTING

Mr. PAYNE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of March 25 about lighting on the South Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Investigations are currently in hand by the Highways Department with a view to undertaking the necessary upgrading of street lighting in the vicinity of the shopping complex near Price Street, Edwardstown, soon.

CO-EDUCATIONAL SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Minister of Education say whether he has yet had an opportunity to consider the recommendation of the Karmel committee at paragraph 8.46 (c) that all secondary schools should be co-educational and, if he has, what conclusion he has reached on the matter? This morning's newspaper contains a report of the suggestion that Scotch College, one of the independent schools in the metropolitan area of Adelaide, should become co-educational rather than remain an all-male school, as it has always been. This morning I have read a letter written by Mr. Roff (Headmaster of Scotch College) to parents and collegians of the school, and part of the letter is as follows:

The situation of two schools in one, where boys and girls are segregated within the same campus, exists at a number of Education Department schools. The committee feels that this is worse than single-sex schools, and would therefore certainly not advocate it for Scotch College.

I realize that in South Australia there are only a few of those schools, one of which is the Unley High School, which I know quite well and which is in the district I used to represent. In view of the Karmel committee's recommendation, which, for all I know, may have been amongst those few chapters of which the Minister was aware before the report was published or which he allowed himself to look at before publication, he may have had

an opportunity to consider this aspect. As this matter is, in the light of the report in this morning's press, now very topical, I ask this question.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Before the Karmel committee report was published and before I had seen the relevant chapter, I made it clear that it was the Government's policy that secondary education should be both co-educational and comprehensive. Therefore, the Government's policy on this matter has been determined; indeed, it was determined before the Karmel committee report was published. As it turned out, it was in line with the committee's recommendations. I certainly agree that, where co-education occurs within the one school, it is unsatisfactory for the sexes to be kept segregated. However, the Government considers it wise at present to encourage schools in the direction it wishes them to follow rather than order them to do so. I point out that Scotch College will not be the first independent school in the State to go co-educational: The Marist Brothers College at Mount Gambier has combined with the Mater Christi Convent school to establish a co-educational Catholic college in Mount Gambier, and the department has provided assistance in that operation as well as advice regarding the sort of things to be done. We must recognize that, in the process of changing over secondary schools to schools that are both co-educational and comprehensive, the transition is likely to be slow and, in some cases, because of the additional building requirements, expensive. However, we are already moving in this direction wherever possible. As an example, I cite the amalgamation that occurred at the end of last year or the beginning of this year of the Croydon Park Girls Technical High School and the Croydon Park Boys Technical High School into one co-educational establishment. This was done with the unanimous support of the parents of children attending those schools. I think this is a wise move, and it is also wise for the department to ensure that such schools are co-educational not just in theory but also in practice. Certainly, that is the department's and the Government's policy.

NOARLUNGA MEATWORKS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question regarding the Noarlunga meatworks?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that liquid waste disposal at the Noarlunga meatworks is satisfactory, following installation in 1966 of oxidation ponds designed by the Public Health Department to treat these wastes and exclude them from the Onkaparinga River. Complaints of odours have been investigated in 1966, 1968 and this year. Complaints are now less frequent. The odours are believed to come from the by-products section. Following previous investigations the management of the meatworks has effected improvements in the equipment and processes in this area, with considerable benefit. The company has employed a firm of consultants to advise them, and it has been suggested that they use an Alfa-Laval Limited spiral heat waste recovery system. These units have been installed in New Zealand, and the literature states, "Air pollution from rendering vapours were almost eliminated even without burning." An alternative quote for a similar piece of equipment has been sought. However, owing to the pressure of work caused by the United States attitude, suppliers are hard pressed to meet their commitments. It may be noted that the cost of the equipment will be more than \$50,000. The major source of complaint should thus be dealt with, but some odour from a number of minor sources within the plant will remain. Most complaints come from areas some distance from the plant. It is understood the Bureau of Meteorology is surveying the Sturt valley in relation to Highways Department activities in that area. It is proposed to seek extension of this investigation in the lower end of the Onkaparinga valley to gain more knowledge of local pollution potential.

ADELAIDE ABATTOIRS

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider recruiting or training additional slaughtermen at the Gepps Cross abattoir in readiness for the forthcoming export lamb season? Members will recall that last year, during the export lamb season, restrictions were placed on the delivery of lambs to the abattoir. We were told this had been brought about by the shortage of slaughtermen and, as a result, one chain at the abattoir could not be worked. This caused much financial loss to the producers, because they had to keep their lambs on their properties, with the result that the lambs became overweight and infested with grass seeds. It seems to me that, as a result of the better season, there will be more lambs

this year than last year and, if the Minister could make provision to meet this increase, that would be helpful.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to take the matter up with my colleague and get a report.

KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works say what steps his department is taking to ensure an adequate supply of pipes for the Polda-Kimba main? Constituents in the Darke Peak area have told me that there seems to be a shortage of pipes for the main and this is causing the work to take much longer than it should take.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not aware of the situation to which the honourable member has referred, but I will obtain a report for him.

WAKEFIELD STREET LAND

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works information on certain land being acquired for possible use by the Government? I understand that the Government intends to acquire land in Wakefield Street, in the city, at the rear of the old Engineering and Water Supply Department building, which was formerly owned by the Unitarian Church. I understand that this parcel of land was procured some time ago or was intended to be used by the Public Service Association for its future headquarters. I should like the Minister to explain what action has been taken to acquire this property, the purpose for which it is being acquired, and whether this purchase is intended to replace the project planned by the former Government when it purchased land on the other side of Victoria Square for a future Government administration block? Will the Minister also say what has happened regarding the previous Government's proposal?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: For the past 12 months (maybe a little longer) the Government has been negotiating for the purchase of the Unitarian Church building in Wakefield Street. I believe the Crown Solicitor was negotiating for the purchase of the building but, unbeknown to him, the proposition submitted to the Government was evidently withdrawn, and we learned that the Public Service Association had purchased the building. Almost immediately steps were taken to serve on the association a notice of intent to purchase the building. The Government believes that it is absolutely imperative for its development plans that it purchase this land. This week I have had discussions on this matter with

the President of the association and it appears that the association was under the impression that the Government was aware that the church authorities had withdrawn the offer to sell. That is the reason for the Government's taking the steps it has taken following the purchase of the land by the association. I might add, however, that we are not disregarding the needs of the association in this area. The land is required as part of a total development that will be spread over some years. It is a very desirable development and one that will be of great benefit to the community.

I think it has already been announced by the Premier, as Minister in charge of tourism, that the Government is trying to enter into a consortium in the development of an international-type hotel on the land that was purchased by the previous Government, adjacent to Moore's store. I cannot give details of the discussions that have taken place on this subject because it concerns the Premier. I believe the Government intends to try to attract that type of development in that area which is in accordance with the recommendations made by Professor Winston, who is a member of the Lord Mayor's committee on the future development of Victoria Square.

MINING COMPANIES

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to legislate to tighten laws on mining and commercial companies in this State? During the course of mining operations, statements, rumours and sometimes untruths are circulated to try to gain support from would-be investors. This also occurs in relation to some commercial activities. Investors would be pleased to know that reports are reliable, as many people who invest small sums in supposedly gilt-edge securities—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment: he may explain his question but he must not comment.

Mr. LANGLEY: Although I am sure that most companies are reliable, I notice in the press that in Western Australia, where there has been a boom in mining, the Government is considering the possibility of legislating to ensure fair play.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Certain amendments to the Companies Act which are being considered will have a bearing on the matters raised by the honourable member, and the Government hopes to be able to introduce legislation to amend the Act next session.

INSECTICIDES

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked on March 9 about insecticides?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health reports that the distribution, control and packaging of dangerous insecticides is dealt with under the poison regulations which do not apply to the possession or use of insecticides once they have been sold. There are always risks with the accidental loss or breakage of poisons such as drugs, medicines, insecticides, and so on, but generally these do not warrant the introduction of legislation applying to persons who have purchased the substances. It is the practice in all cases, where a poison has been accidentally lost and there is some public risk, for warnings to be issued by the police. This action was taken in the present instance and resulted in the recovery of the insecticide. I do not believe that it is practical to introduce legislation applying, for example, to the transport of poisons by the user, particularly the primary producer. The present system of police warnings in such cases appears to be adequate; no cases of accidental poisoning arising out of circumstances similar to the present instance have been reported.

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Government take positive action to strengthen the regulations governing the packaging, distribution, and control of dangerous insecticides? Members of the public will not be reassured by the reply given by the Attorney-General, because they are concerned about the accident to which my original question referred. Several doctors have spoken to me about their concern over this and similar accidents that have occurred in the transporting of dangerous insecticides, and they told me that they appreciated the question being asked in the House. The reply given by the Attorney-General is rather like closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. In the latter part of his reply he said:

No cases of accidental poisoning arising out of circumstances similar to the present instance have been reported.

This seems to me to be on a par with waiting for several fatal accidents to occur at a dangerous intersection before putting up "stop" signs. In all sincerity and earnestness, I ask the Attorney to refer this matter again to the Minister of Health.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I shall refer the matter back to the Minister and let the honourable member have a reply.

BUILDERS LICENSING BOARD

Mr. EVANS: Can the Premier say how many times since May, 1970, the Builders Licensing Board has met and whether it is true that the only builder member of that board has, because of illness, been unable to attend meetings over this period? I have been asked by people in the building industry to ask the Premier this question, because they are concerned that the only builder member of the board has not been able to attend meetings and to put the industry's point of view to the board, whose activities have a direct effect on the industry. These people believe it is vital to ascertain whether the person concerned has been able to attend meetings and whether or not he will be able to attend future meetings.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot say offhand how often the board has met, although I know it has met frequently. True, during the period since May, 1970, there have been occasions when Mr. Baulderstone has been ill, but I know that he has attended the office and, having been kept apprised of the course of the board's activities, he has had ample opportunity to comment. In fact, we ascertained that he was able to continue on the board. Knowing Mr. Baulderstone well, I am certain that he would not undertake any job that he was unable to do. Mr. Baulderstone was certainly recommended by the Institute of Builders, and he is continuing on the board. I am certain that, on questions concerning building work, Mr. Baulderstone's advice has been available to the board. However, I will obtain a more detailed reply for the honourable member.

KEROSENE

Mr. WELLS: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary to supply the statistics covering the last five years of the number of cases treated in the Adelaide Children's Hospital as a result of children's drinking kerosene, and will he ascertain how many deaths have resulted therefrom over this period? Further, will he ascertain whether the Chief Secretary is satisfied that the regulations applying to the bottling and labelling of kerosene are sufficient?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague and obtain a reply.

AMENDMENTS

Mr. CARNIE: I wish to ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. Will you say whether, when identical amendments to a Bill are filed by a member and a Minister, the member

whose amendments were filed first will be called on first to move those amendments? It can happen that a member gives notice of amendments and several days later absolutely identical amendments appear on the file in the name of the Minister. As a relatively new member in this House, I was not prepared for this to occur yesterday because of the very arrogance of the action. As my amendments to the Fisheries Bill were filed several days before those of the Minister of Works, and as they were drafted as a result of lengthy conferences I had with representatives of the fishing industry (I am sure this applies also to the Minister), I consider that the Minister would have had ample time to make a decision on this matter and to give notice before he actually gave it. In view of what I consider to be complete rudeness on the part of the Minister, I ask what is the decision of the Chair in this matter.

The SPEAKER: Normally, it is not the practice to answer hypothetical questions, and this question is hypothetical. However, generally speaking, when there are two amendments to the same provision in a Bill the date on the amendment is the determining factor, except when the amendment is that of the Minister or member in charge of the Bill: in that case, such an amendment takes precedence of any other amendment.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have a survey undertaken regarding the parking of cars on or near railway crossings? At present, I understand that, under regulation 405 (g) of the Road Traffic Act, no person is allowed to park a car within 50ft. of a railway crossing. At some crossings this distance would be sufficient but at others it would possibly be more desirable to vary the distance with the use of the appropriate signs.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If I understand the question correctly, the honourable member desires a survey to see whether cars are parked on or near railway crossings. I do not think it would be necessary for me to conduct a survey in relation to cars parked on railway crossings, because they would not be there after the first train went through! If the honourable member has in mind a specific crossing on which he would like information, I shall be only too pleased to obtain it for him. However, I remind him that there are about 1,800 level crossings in South Australia, and I

doubt whether the honourable member is asking me to conduct a survey in relation to all those crossings. However, if he is willing to be a little more specific, I will get a report.

SPEED ZONES

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the Road Traffic Board intends to resite speed zones on the Port Wakefield Road south of the township of Two Wells? New speed zones have recently been created south and north of this township, the 45 miles-an-hour speed limit commencing where the 35 miles-an-hour speed limit originally commenced and the 35 miles-an-hour speed limit zone having been moved nearer the township. I have received a petition signed by 95 per cent of the townspeople of Two Wells opposing the siting of the speed zone south of Two Wells, and I understand that the Minister and the Road Traffic Board have received a copy of this petition. In view of what is contained in the petition, I ask whether consideration has been given to resiting these speed zones.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At this time I have not seen the petition. Whether it is filtering through the system to me, I cannot say.

Mr. Ferguson: About a fortnight ago.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am afraid I have not seen it. I will inquire of the Road Traffic Board to see whether it has the petition; if it does not have it, I will ask the honourable member to give me a copy. I will certainly look at the question he has raised.

PARA HILLS WATER

Mr. McRAE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the possibility of serving the Para Hills area from the Barossa trunk main rather than from the Mannum main?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware of the existence of the petition referred to by the honourable member. Unfortunately, some eastern suburbs, including Para Hills, are receiving water which has a milky appearance. This is caused by water from the Menindee Lakes which entered the Murray River from the Darling River and is now being picked up by the pumps at Mannum. The water in question contains much finely divided colloidal clay which results in a milky appearance. As I have emphasized before, the presence of the clay has no effect on health, nor on the bacteriological safety of the water.

I am informed by my departmental officers that the effect of the clay is likely to continue until at least the end of May. In regard to the particular situation existing at Para Hills, I can inform the honourable member that this area is normally supplied from the eastern suburbs system. The petitioners have suggested that Para Hills be connected to the system serving Salisbury and Elizabeth where the water is not affected. However, the position is that the Barossa trunk main does not have the capacity to cater for the whole of Para Hills. The upper areas must be fed with metropolitan water. Under peak conditions the lower areas must also be fed with metropolitan water. However, at the present time it is possible for the lower areas of Para Hills to be supplied from the Barossa system and the areas up to Robert Court should now be receiving better quality water. The petitioners are located in this lower zone and thus should have gained relief.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister for Conservation a reply to the question I asked on March 9 about possible air pollution caused by jet-engine aircraft?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I informed the honourable member in my original reply to this question that any legislation or action in regard to modification of aircraft jet-engine combustion chambers would have to be on a Commonwealth level. I have been informed that the State can only legislate in respect of aircraft which do not fly outside this State. The aircraft referred to by the honourable member would be engaged in interstate flights and therefore it would not be practicable for State legislation in this regard as we would be overlapping the Commonwealth Constitution. The Environment Committee in South Australia is considering the effects on air pollution of jet-engine aircraft in this State and has taken evidence from the Commonwealth Department of Civil Aviation. If the Environment Committee recommends that there is a need for further action an approach will be made to the Commonwealth on this matter.

RESERVOIR LAND

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about the acquisition of land near the Mount Bold reservoir?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Engineering and Water Supply Department will acquire 3,200 acres of additional land near Mount Bold, not 32,000 acres as reported in

the press. Action is taken to acquire land when properties come on the market or information is received that it is available for purchase.

KAPUNDA ROAD

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on March 25 about the Gawler-Kapunda road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Investigations are currently in hand to determine a location and design for a new bridge on an alignment that will permit the upgrading to modern standards of the remaining two miles of this road into Kapunda. The alignment selected will also permit the future construction of a bypass road which will avoid the necessity of heavy transports travelling beyond Kapunda from having to negotiate the Kapunda main street. At this stage, investigations are well advanced but are being complicated somewhat by mineral explorations being carried out in the area. It is expected, however, that construction of the new bridge will commence within two years. In the meantime, adequate warning signs have been erected to warn road users of the conditions on the existing road.

MURRAY DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question about the surfacing of playing areas of schools in the Murray District, including the Monarto Junction school?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The repaving work at the Monarto Junction school, which is included in a group contract for similar work at other schools in the area, is expected to be completed by the end of this school term. A separate tender call is to be arranged for paving requirements at the Mannum Primary School. Documentation for tender call is nearing completion, and it is expected that tenders will be called towards the end of this financial year.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS

Mr. VENNING: Will the Treasurer make available to the House the names of organizations that have received finance through the Loans to Producers Act, and state the sums involved?

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

FESTIVAL HALL

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to my question about the festival hall?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have received the following letter from the Town Clerk of the Adelaide City Council:

With reference to the question of the Leader of the Opposition regarding the construction of the festival theatre, I advise as follows: In order to maintain the desirable construction programme, it was necessary to enter into three contracts prior to the receipt of the main tenders for the theatre. These contracts were: bulk earthworks; piling; and manufacture of rubber sound isolation blocks. On receipt of the main tenders, it became evident that steps would have to be taken to eliminate from the contract all items which, however desirable, could not be classed as essential. Although an amount of \$23,359.60 had been committed for the sound isolation blocks, it was established that, by not using these blocks, the sum of \$60,000 could be saved in construction costs by a modification to the structural plans.

The sound isolation system was originally planned to guard against a sound and vibration nuisance which could have arisen as the result of the operation of an underground railway as illustrated and described in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. Therefore, the acoustic engineers were asked to report whether or not it would be equally effective to incorporate safeguards against noise and vibration in the design and operation of the railway itself, if and when the railway is constructed. They reported in the affirmative. The decision was then taken to eliminate the sound isolation blocks from the structure of the theatre, and thus an expenditure of \$60,000 on construction costs was saved without reducing the efficiency of the theatre. Immediately this decision was made, the suppliers of the sound isolation blocks were asked if they would cancel the uncompleted portion of the contract and accept the return of the blocks already supplied. This they declined to do, acting within their rights under the terms of the contract. At present the blocks are stored in a depot of the corporation of Adelaide. Their suitability for use in other structures is being investigated with a view to recovering as much as possible of their original cost.

LOTTERIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the member for Tea Tree Gully, if she is prepared to give me the time. Can she, in her capacity as Chairman of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, say whether she intends to move for the disallowance of the regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act? I asked the honourable member a similar question on Tuesday, when I pointed out that today was the last day on which notices of motion could be given in this House this session. In reply, she told me that the committee was meeting yesterday, I think, during the conferences, and again this morning. If members are to rely on the committee, that notice must be given today. Many members, including me, are anxious about this matter and would like to give such notice if the honourable member, on behalf of the com-

mittee, will not give notice today. I therefore ask the honourable member what her committee's decision may be, so that the position is safeguarded.

Mrs. BYRNE: The Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation is still meeting on this matter, and I do not wish at this stage to present a report on the committee's behalf. However, I have had discussions with the Clerk of the House, which were proceeding when the member for Mitcham asked this question, regarding how much later I can table the report in accordance with Standing Orders. I have been assured that this can be done later.

DENTAL CHARGES

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Premier consider giving the House the contents of, or lay on the table of the House, the report prepared for the Government by the Prices Commissioner on fees charged by members of the Australian Dental Association? On March 9, the member for Florey directed a question to the Attorney-General regarding fees charged by the Australian Dental Association, and, on behalf of the Dental Mechanics' Association, asked the Minister of Health to receive representatives of that body to discuss matters of vital concern to the general public. He claimed that irrefutable proof had been presented to him suggesting that "the general public is being fleeced in respect of charges made for dental work." Although the Attorney-General undertook to refer the matter to the Minister of Health, no reply has been forthcoming in answer to that question, although a week later (on March 16) the same member directed a question to the Premier, asking him to consider having the affairs of the Australian Dental Association brought under the jurisdiction of the Prices Commissioner. In doing this, he repeated the details contained in his explanation of the earlier question asked of the Attorney-General, but added details of specific charges made.

In reply, the Premier assured the honourable member that the matter was already the subject of an investigation and that a report he had already received from the Prices Commissioner disclosed that "dental fees are significantly higher here than they are elsewhere in the Commonwealth". He further said that a serious situation had been disclosed by the report currently being considered by the Government. This statement was challenged publicly by the President of the Australian Dental Association, who compared the fees charged here with those charged in other States, which

showed that, although some of South Australia's charges were higher than those in New South Wales and Victoria, where fees that have not been changed for some years are currently under review, charges in Western Australia are considerably higher than they are in South Australia. Members of the Australian Dental Association consider that they have been given no opportunity to refute the charges which were made against them and which were obviously included in some detail in the report to the Premier by the Prices Commissioner. Because of this concern, I ask the Premier either to supply the House with this information or to lay this report on the table of the House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member will realize that, under the provisions of the Prices Act, certain of the information obtained by the Prices Commissioner and reported to the Government may not be made public. Indeed, it would be an offence if it were to be made public. However, as I have said previously, the matter is still being considered, and I have asked the Prices Commissioner to keep in touch with the Australian Dental Association and to negotiate with it on any future movements in charges. I am sure that the association is still aware of this, because it has circularized its members regarding information they could give to any officer of the Prices Branch who may be inquiring of them. I hope we shall be able in our negotiations with the Australian Dental Association to reach a reasonable conclusion on this matter.

VIVISECTION

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier received from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question on vivisection?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Director of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science reports that it is not possible at present to programme a computer to cover the huge number of variables that may occur in testing the reactions to a drug. Although there is not much of this work done in South Australia to his knowledge, it is absolutely essential that new drugs be thoroughly tested on animals before they are applied to humans. Recently, even stricter measures have been introduced since occurrences such as the thalidomide tragedy. True, with modern monitoring equipment and computers, the number of animals used can be reduced and the amount of information gained can be increased. Small animals, such as mice, rats and guinea-pigs, are used for diagnosis, and a computer could not possibly tell at this stage whether or not the sputum from a patient con-

tains *tubercle bacilli*. However, even the use of animals in diagnostic work is being reduced and eliminated wherever possible. For instance, it was once necessary to use animals in pregnancy tests. This work is now done using modern chemical and immunological techniques.

Returning to tuberculosis investigations, methods of culturing *tubercle bacilli* are being continually improved and at present have reduced greatly the number of animal inoculations required for accurate diagnosis. Nevertheless, animal inoculation is essential for recovering and identifying certain of the atypical strains of the tuberculosis organism. The Director knows of very little experimentation on animals of the type mentioned by Mrs. Mills in her newspaper article. It is sometimes necessary for a surgeon to learn or practise a new technique (for example, heart surgery or minute brain vascular surgery) on an animal such as a sheep before attempting such an operation on a human patient. Animals are always completely anaesthetized and are seldom allowed to regain consciousness. They are treated in the most humane way possible.

KARMEL REPORT

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Education say when copies of the Karmel committee's report can be made available to schools? I have been approached by many school committees in my district to see whether copies of the report can be made available to them.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Complimentary copies of the report are being made available to all organizations that have made submissions to the committee, but copies are not being made available to all schools. As there are more than 700 schools in South Australia, the cost of making complimentary copies available to all schools would be considerable. In the present circumstances, it was deemed to be not appropriate to supply copies to the schools. However, the report is available for sale to persons who are not on the complimentary list.

Mr. Gunn: What is the cost?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The cost is \$4 or any lesser amount that the booksellers determine. The maximum price is \$4 but, if booksellers want to sell it for less, they may.

COWELL SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Education expedite action regarding work on the oval at the Cowell Area School? I have received from the school committee copies of correspondence dating back to July 18, 1967, on this

matter. About 12 letters have been received from the Education Department, the last being written on February 4, 1969, stating that it was not possible to arrange ground preparation before the spring of 1969. Since then no further information has been received, despite that the school committee wrote to the department on December 3, 1969, and on September 1, 1970. The Director-General did not answer either of those letters until February this year. This matter has been going on for some time. There was a gap of two years after a submission was made that work on the oval should be proceeded with. In anticipating part of the Minister's reply, I mention that I am not concerned about which Government was in office at the time, as this is a departmental matter that has been going on for too long. I ask the Minister to examine the matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member knows, I shall be pleased to find out whether something can be done.

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say when it is expected that work will commence on the new library accommodation at the Cowell Area School? Last December those connected with the school received plans for a new school library and were informed that the building would be started early in this current school year. However, in the *School Post* for February, 1971, this project was not listed in the major work for area schools in 1970-71. Although this may be a simple omission by the magazine, the school is concerned to know whether it is an omission or whether the project has been shelved for some time.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into the matter for the honourable member.

SAVINGS BANK MORTGAGES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked recently about interest rates on Savings Bank of South Australia mortgages?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The General Manager of the bank states that the position regarding the protection clause for interest rates as stated by the honourable member in his question is correct. Owing to the introduction of more flexible interest rates by the Commonwealth Government, savings bank interest rates have been subject to more frequent change than heretofore. When, as a result of a general rise, an increase in interest rates is granted to depositors, such increase takes effect immediately, and as a consequence it is necessary for the trustees to be able to increase

the bank's income as soon as possible to meet the additional cost of depositors' interest. It has therefore become impracticable for the bank to continue to include a protection clause in mortgages in regard to interest rates. Similar conditions in this respect apply in the Commonwealth Savings Bank and the State Savings Bank of Victoria. Our bank's current interest rate on loans for housing is one of the lowest available in South Australia.

LEIGH CREEK ROAD

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently about upgrading the Hawker to Leigh Creek road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department's present proposals are that, subject to approval of the necessary finance, construction of the Hawker-Marree road will commence from Hawker, travelling northwards, following the completion of the construction of the road from Hawker to Wilpena. It is expected that this construction will commence during 1973-74. It is also expected that some sealing will be undertaken between Copley, Leigh Creek and Lyndhurst.

NORTH ADELAIDE STATION

Mr. CUMBE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider having improvements made at the North Adelaide railway station? That station is rather unusual, in that no persons live within a considerable distance of it but many people alight from or board trains there. These are mainly people who commute daily to and from stations to the north, such as those in the Elizabeth area, or Islington. The station also caters for persons from the western portion of my district. At present there is a small car park outside the station. As the station is used extensively by commuters, will the Minister consider the possibility of providing an extended car park outside this station and, if necessary, seeking the co-operation of the Adelaide City Council on this matter? Any such car park provided and advertised, as is commonly done elsewhere in Australia and overseas, could increase railway patronage and also provide improved facilities for persons using the station.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to consider the matter.

CRYSTAL BROOK SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: I hope that this question does not get the Minister of Education into any trouble. Will the Minister find out why there has been a delay in providing new toilets

at the Crystal Brook Primary School? This matter was brought to the attention of the Director-General of Education in October, 1969, and was referred to the Minister of Education when he visited the school on September 18, 1970. Subsequently, a letter was sent to the Director-General on October 8, 1970, about the matter. The school committee, which understands that tenders were called for the erection of a new toilet block, is anxious to know the reason for the present delay, in view of the urgency of providing facilities that do not contravene modern health standards. The present toilets have been in existence for nearly 90 years, and about 20 years ago a septic system was installed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have two comments to make about this matter. First, I hope that the honourable member does not intend to take up the matter with the National Trust to ensure that these toilets can be given permanent protection against displacement. Secondly, I hope the honourable member is certain that the new toilets have not been built already.

Mr. Venning: I am positive.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member would be aware that he had certain difficulties about a matter at Clare. However, I shall be pleased to examine the matter and find out the position.

COUNTRY HOUSING

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, find out whether the Housing Trust imposes a transfer fee on occupants who desire to move from one trust house to another in the same country town? It has been reported to me that there is a fee of about \$60; this does not take into account the transfer of the occupant and is purely an administrative fee. The Minister would be aware that, where there are dwellers in prefabricated Housing Trust houses, of necessity there must be some time lapse before the trust considers the transfer of such a family from the prefabricated temporary house into the solid-construction house. Apparently a fee does exist for the transfer of a family from one dwelling to another within the same area, and I should be pleased if the Premier would discover for me whether there is such a fee, how much it is, and why it is charged.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As I presume the honourable member is speaking about Housing Trust tenancies and not where there is a transfer to a house that is being sold, I will obtain a report for him.

COURIER SERVICE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about extending the courier service in the Education Department?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not considered to be an economic proposition to extend the Education Department's courier service to service schools in the central Hills area. At present, four couriers are employed; two provide daily services to the larger educational institutions around the city and to technical colleges on five days a week. The other two visit all departmental schools once a week in the area from Smithfield in the north to Port Noarlunga in the south. The eastern boundary is Belair, Athelstone, and Tea Tree Gully.

The present courier service is fully committed and could be extended only by employing an additional driver. The estimated cost would be \$3,700 a year for wages and operating costs plus \$2,000 for the purchase of a vehicle. The provision of a courier service in the central Hills area presents several difficulties; first, the schools are scattered, and travel between them could not be easily or economically arranged; secondly, apart from the Heathfield High School, Mount Barker High School and the Raywood Training Centre, the volume of letters and parcels would not be sufficient to justify the cost of the courier service.

NON-EXEMPT SHOPS

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether it is possible for a non-exempt shop to be considered an exempt shop by partitioning off any goods that are non-exempt while the shop is open during hours that would normally be considered "after hours" for a non-exempt shop? Because of recent changes in the law concerning public holidays, Easter Saturday has now been declared a public holiday. Within the Hills area in particular many small family businesses normally would open on a Saturday morning and, for them, Easter Saturday would be a good business day. They will now be compelled to close, even though they may not employ outside labour, but some of their competitors in direct opposition may be able to remain open. This situation is causing discontent between the two groups. As an example, a newsagent selling toys will be allowed to remain open on Saturday if he does not display the toys, whereas another business that may, in the main, sell toys and

sporting equipment and only a few non-exempt goods will be forced to close. This situation is causing a problem to people who rely on small businesses for their livelihood.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will obtain a report for the honourable member, but I remind him that these regulations do not apply until after Easter.

TENDERS

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, say whether, when seeking tender prices for a connection of Housing Trust and other Government-owned houses to a new sewerage system, it is the usual practice to have included in the specification either that equipment to be disturbed or updated will be returnable to the trust or become a salvable item distinctly offset against the cost of the new connection? The Premier will know that, from time to time, sewerage systems are placed where Housing Trust units and other houses can be connected. Recently, at Gawler many items of apparently salvable equipment (such as baths, hand basins, and toilet pedestals) have been thrown down the old dry well of the septic system, which is part and parcel of the present system available to those houses. These materials must have some value and could be expected to be available to reduce the actual cost of connection in each instance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member a reply offhand on the question of the form that is sought by the Housing Trust for tenders in these matters, but I will obtain for him a report from the General Manager of the trust.

KADINA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the paving of the playing area at the Kadina Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply to a letter forwarded on January 15, 1971, I informed the Leader that this work formed part of a group contract for similar work at other towns in the area, and documentation was completed, before calling tenders. The position has not changed since that date. It is expected that tenders will be called in June-July this year, and the work will be undertaken as soon as the project can be satisfactorily included in the financial programme.

LAND TAX

Mr. GUNN: I ask the Treasurer what action the Government will take against rural producers who will not be able to pay the increased land taxes under the new quinquennial assessment? Over the last few weeks much concern has been expressed to me by rural producers who are finding it difficult to meet commitments; they consider they will not be able to pay the increased land taxes they will be called upon to pay under this new, unrealistic assessment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has already been given information regarding the position of rural producers. I point out that 80 per cent of rural assessments do not attract more than \$24 a year in land tax.

Mr. Gunn: In what part of South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member was obviously not listening during an earlier occasion in the House when I proceeded to give random samples.

Mr. Millhouse: Carefully selected!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members have a responsibility in this Chamber. I have been requested by the *Hansard* staff to quieten the audible conversation that goes on, because it is almost impossible for the staff to hear the actual transaction of the business. I expect honourable members to conduct themselves in a manner commensurate with the position they hold. When questions are asked, members are entitled to receive replies, and anyone interjecting immediately after a question is out of order. I am not going to continue rising and warning members about this; their conduct has to be improved considerably. I ask the Premier whether he will reply. I also ask members to face the front when they are asking questions and to try to turn the microphone up to enable the *Hansard* reporters to hear the question accurately. I sometimes have difficulty myself in hearing what is said.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will reply and, what is more, I will reply to what was said across the Chamber a moment ago. I told this House that the Valuer-General had been instructed to get statistically random samples, and that in no circumstances was any weighting to be given other than that they should be statistically random samples; and for the member for Mitcham to say that they were "carefully selected" is a filthy lie and an attack on the Valuer-General which I

bitterly resent. It is typical of the personal denigration that he gives out to any person with whom he has any sort of difference on any occasion.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be silly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Oh yes it is. He can never do anything in this place which is in accordance with the Christian principles that he so publicly parades.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned honourable members not to interject, and I have asked them to conduct themselves in a manner befitting the position they hold. The Premier is replying to a question, and if anyone interjects further from now on he will be named without any further warning.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I desire to take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: You sit down and I will tell you.

The SPEAKER: I take strong exception to the manner in which the honourable member for Mitcham is endeavouring to direct the Chair, whose responsibility it is to control this Chamber. I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to withdraw the remark instructing the Speaker to sit down, because it is completely out of order in this Chamber and completely out of context. I ask him to withdraw immediately.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course I will withdraw, but I point out that you were still on your feet when you asked me what my point of order was.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My point of order—

The SPEAKER: Wait until I sit down.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want—

The SPEAKER: It is up to the honourable member to conduct himself in a proper manner in this Chamber. He has been here long enough to know the requirements of the Standing Orders, and it is up to him to observe them and try to set a good example. What is the honourable member's point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Now that you allow me to rise, I can make my point of order which I could not do before. You have asked members not to interject during replies by Ministers to questions, but I take the point of order that the Premier in what he said about me was being provocative, and deliberately

provocative, to try to provoke me into interjecting, and I ask you whether that is in order.

The SPEAKER: You are not in order at the present time. Honourable members know that a point of order must be taken at the time the matter arises.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There is no point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. I was directing members' attention to their conduct in the Chamber, and after I had done that the honourable member tried to take a point of order, and that is wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, I arose immediately after the Premier had made a tirade against me and I asked you to rule on that point of order, namely, whether the Premier was in order in making a personal and bitter attack on members, in this case on me, when replying to a question.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. You should take the point of order when the Premier is making the attack, not afterwards.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I did.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member gives his attention to the statistically accurate random samples that were given to this House, he will see that they included random samples in relation to his district. If the honourable member has cases where people in his district are unable to meet the obligations of land tax on their land, I shall be interested if he will let me have them, but I hope that they are genuine cases of difficulty in relation to rural obligations and not of the kind the honourable member gave me in an example last week.

Mr. VENNING: Will the Treasurer investigate the delay in issuing unimproved land value assessments, which have not been issued to some landholders in various parts of the State? A meeting at Spalding last Monday night was informed by Valuation Department officers that all assessments had been sent to rural landholders. In many areas, particularly the Spalding and Crystal Brook areas, many landholders have not yet received the assessments, yet the officers said they had all been sent out. They said that they had been sent to my own area in January, but it is now April 1 and some landholders have not received them. Under the Land Tax Act, all landholders are given 60 days in which to appeal against assessments. Will the Treasurer check

with the department to see what has happened to the assessments and will he see that landholders are given a clear 60 days in which to lodge appeals?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Landholders will certainly be given 60 days in which to lodge appeals. So that I can check with the Valuation Department, I should be grateful if the honourable member would give me a list of the names and addresses of the assessees. I will then check with the department as to when the assessments were sent out and under what circumstances they were sent out.

SAVINGS BANK LOANS

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about Savings Bank loans?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Assistant General Manager of the Savings Bank reports:

Owing to the heavy demand for rural finance, applicants for loans on properties were required until recently to have deposits of at least \$2,000 with the bank for a period of several years. In the case of young people the depositor status of the parents was taken into consideration. However, over the last few months the demand for rural finance so far as this bank is concerned has diminished and applications are now being accepted from applicants who are established depositors.

COURT INTERPRETERS

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my question of February 25 about court interpreters?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I looked into the question, which arose out of remarks made by the Senior Special Magistrate in the Adelaide Magistrates Court about a difficulty that had arisen in a certain case because of the unavailability of an interpreter in, I think, the Serbian language—at all events, a foreign language. The interpreter, who had been serving the Police Department in a number of languages, including Italian and Serbian-Croat, retired on attaining the age of 60 years. Since then, when translation has been required, this man's services have been availed of from time to time on a part-time basis in addition to the services of other interpreters.

I have discussed with the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate the possibility of engaging an interpreter to serve the courts. It seems obvious that his services would not be required full time; so, it would be necessary, if his time was to be used economically, to employ him on other duties as well. A difficulty arises because I think it is inappropriate for an interpreter on the court staff to take part in police investiga-

tions as an interpreter. He should not be used in a way that is inconsistent with the traditional separation between the function of investigation by the police and the function of adjudication by the court. It is not a simple question. The matter has been considered by the Public Service Board, from which I have received a report. I have had a further discussion with the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate and have asked the board to reconsider the matter on a different basis. I hope the matter will be resolved in a way that makes the services of an interpreter available to the courts regularly.

RAILWAY FINANCES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport the second part of his reply to a question I asked on railway finances? Regarding the first part of his reply, I can assure him that I would be most happy if railway revenue were considerably increased. The Minister reflected on farmers for not using the railways, but I point out that they do not use them because they cannot afford to make purchases and pay the additional taxes as well.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have a reply to the honourable member's question but not to the comment that he added.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member's comment was entirely out of order, and I did not hear it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased that you did not hear it, Mr. Speaker, because you would have had to rule it out of order, and doing that is unpleasant. The reply is as follows:

As at December 14, 1970, railway revenue was \$1,106,000 greater than that for the corresponding period of 1969-70. This was occasioned, in the main, by increased receipts of \$310,000 for wheat, \$363,000 for merchandise, and \$333,000 for Broken Hill ores. However, since that date there has been a deterioration in the movement of grains, manures, ores and livestock, resulting in the overall position as at February 28, 1971, being only \$390,000 ahead of the corresponding period in 1969-70. No part of this recession has been within the control of the South Australian Railways.

Working expenditure at the same date was \$2,844,000 greater than that for 1969-70. Of this, \$2,804,000 was on account of industrial awards and increased service payments. The figure of \$200,000 quoted by the honourable member would represent the cash paid in by the Railways to the Treasury and does not represent actual earnings, some of which were accrued earnings, and only payable in March.

MAGISTRATE'S REPORT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney-General say when the report on the taking of complaints and the issuing of summonses that was to be prepared by Mr. O'Loughlin, S.M., will be distributed? The Attorney-General will recall that, following a question about a case involving the city of Salisbury, he discussed this matter with Mr. O'Loughlin and the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate. It was agreed that there was a case for preparing such a report, and Mr. O'Loughlin undertook to do that for the Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will ask the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate what the position is and let the honourable member know.

DUPLICATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, will you please explain to members the rules relating to the roneoing of material by members? You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that about three weeks ago I had arranged to have roneoed a number of copies of a paper which I was to deliver to the Australian Capital Territory group of the Royal Institute of Public Administration at Thredbo, in the Snowy Mountains. On the day I was due to take the copies of the paper with me, when they were actually being run off, you at first forbade the duplication of those papers and, after I had explained to you that it had been my practice on many occasions in the past to have matter roneoed and that I understood that was the case with all members, you finally allowed the duplicating to continue but obliged me to pay, I think, \$3.40 for the copies. That, of course, was paid by the A.C.T. group, to which I was giving the paper. You said at the time that you had been forbidden by a previous Speaker to have roneoed a Red Cross letter, I think, to go out to people in your own district and that, in your view, members were not allowed to have any material roneoed in the House. However, you did say that you intended to send a circular to members to make clear what the rules were. I have waited about three weeks to see whether the circular would come but, so far as I know, you have issued none. Will you now explain to members what are the rules?

The SPEAKER: I will examine the question and send a written reply to all honourable members. However, I should like to make some corrections to what the honourable member said in asking the question. First, he said that he had arranged to have the duplicating done, but that was not the case: neither

I nor the Clerks knew about that. Indeed, this was on an occasion when there was a shortage of staff, the member for Bragg having asked in the House that day whether I would provide additional staff to cope with the situation. I will look into the facts, but I make quite clear that no arrangement was made with the Clerks or me concerning this private job.

Mr. Millhouse: Private job! It was no more private than any other.

The SPEAKER: I am not entering into a debate and, when I say that the matter will be examined, I wish the honourable member would take notice, instead of trying to provoke debate on the matter. He will receive a written reply.

MEMBERS' BEHAVIOUR

Mr. McANANEY: Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago you asked us to behave in this House in a certain way, but immediately after that there were three interjections from the Government side and one from this side. You said you would name members. Will you name Government members as well as Opposition members for not carrying out your instructions?

The SPEAKER: I will do as I have warned the House I would do: I will name members. So far as I am concerned as the Speaker, there is no difference between the Government and the Opposition.

UNIVERSITY GROUNDS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Attorney-General received from the Chief Secretary a reply to the question asked by the member for Kavel about university grounds?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the police may investigate behaviour to determine whether any offence has been committed against the provisions of the Police Offences Act. It is relevant whether the behaviour was in a public place or not and this can depend on circumstances, which may change from day to day, or from time to time on any day, in a place such as a university. As the police received no complaint from any person who was present at the debate at the university on March 11, no inquiries were made by the Police Department, and it is not considered that an investigation should be made by the police at this stage.

GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Local Government say whether he or the Government has yet come to a conclusion on

the future of the Garden Suburb? Several times during the present session I have asked the Minister whether any conclusion has been reached on this matter, and certainly during the earlier part of the session the Minister replied, quite accurately, that when the previous Government was in office it had had a report for about nine months, I think, and had not acted on it. He said he had not been in office for as long as that. Therefore, he was justified in saying that he had not come to a conclusion. However, I remind all members, if any reminder is needed, that today it is 10 months, I think, since the present Government came into office (one is tempted to say, "Ten months' hard Labor"), and I therefore ask the Minister whether or not he has yet been able to come to a conclusion, and, if he has, what it may be.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The answer is "No".

ROAD GRANTS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say why the Government intends to reduce spending on road projects involving district councils and the Highways Department in country areas? Is this to allow the Government to continue spending money on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, which the Minister has said that the Government will withdraw?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am indebted to the member for Eyre for asking this question; I am sure the Leader will be as annoyed that he has asked it as he was when a question was asked about a week ago that embarrassed the Leader tremendously. The Leader was one of the four Liberal and Country Party members at a regional conference of the Local Government Association who was peddling, for all he was worth, the complete untruth that the Government would reduce grants to country councils. That was at a conference held on the Monday on Yorke Peninsula, I think, and—

Mr. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Roads and Transport has attributed remarks to me concerning road grants. I have not referred to these.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was at a recent conference of the Local Government Association.

Mr. HALL: It is untrue.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What's the point of order?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I have no objection to the Leader's seeking leave to make a personal explanation,

but there is no point of order here, and I rule his remarks out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The fact remains that this statement was peddled by the four Liberal members (the Leader and three members of the Legislative Council) last Monday at the local government conference. The statement was untrue, and it was so bad that a senior officer of the Highways Department had to get up and tell the meeting that the information that the members of Parliament were giving was untrue. The Highways Department has not at this stage completed (the work is not nearly completed) the drawing up of the works programme for the coming financial year, 1971-72. It is not possible at present to say what money will be available for which jobs. However, it is confidently expected that there will be no overall reduction in the grants allocated for this work. As always occurs, however, there will be some areas where work has been completed, the work force in the area concerned being transferred to another job and, as a result, there may be a reduction in some council areas, while there will be an increase in others. To say, as has been said, that the Government will reduce the roadwork grants is a complete and utter untruth.

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

Leave granted.

Mr. HALL: The Minister of Roads and Transport, in his answer, has just attributed remarks to me about road grants at the local government conference held on Monday at Minlaton. What he has said is completely untrue. The facts are as follows. The only politician who spoke at that meeting was I, when I was asked to explain the effect of land tax collections in relation to capital charges and the current annual charges on rural land. I spoke on that in a non-political manner; the member for Goyder can confirm that and so can friends of the Minister who were present at that meeting. I was congratulated after I had spoken by someone at that meeting for handling the matter in a completely non-political way. I dealt only with the competitive demand between land tax and council rates in relation to the lowering of income earning capacity. That was the only basis on which I tackled that question, having no intention of bringing Party politics into a local government discussion at that meeting. On another occasion I answered a question on road grants. However, a comprehensive question that was asked about

road grants was answered by the Commissioner of Highways. What the Minister says about what I said is a deliberate and malicious mis-statement.

Mr. Venning: Apologize!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: He made the statement.

The SPEAKER: Order!

POINT PEARCE RESERVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs say whether a conclusion has been reached regarding the transfer of the Point Pearce reserve to the Aboriginal Lands Trust and, in particular, whether it is proposed that the village will be transferred to the trust or remain under some arrangement, such as the present one, and only the surrounding farm area will be transferred? I raised this matter with the Minister a couple of weeks ago and he said in his reply that that week (indeed, I think it was that day, although the Minister said "that week") the Secretary of the trust was going to Point Pearce for further discussions. During the time that my Party was in office, this matter was initiated (I hope the Minister will acknowledge that), and I am glad he has followed the line that we were travelling, but one of the difficult questions to be resolved was about the future status or future arrangements for the village.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government has approved in principle a policy that will involve the transfer of the Point Pearce Reserve to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. Further details of the implementation of the project are still to be settled, as to both the method and the time of its implementation. The future of the village will have to be discussed further with the council of the Aborigines at Point Pearce. A further decision will be made by Cabinet. When the details of the plans are finally settled an announcement will be made.

WANBI TO YINKANIE RAILWAY LINE

The SPEAKER laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Wanbi to Yinkanie Railway Line.

Ordered that report be printed.

INDUSTRIAL SAFETY

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon what legislative measures, if any, are considered to be desirable

to make proper provision for occupational safety, health and welfare in industry and commerce and related matters.

Last year the Minister for Conservation (then Minister of Labour and Industry) announced that the Government proposed to review the Industrial Code completely. This review has been commenced but, as a result of consideration so far, it has been decided that the provisions presently contained in Part 12 of the Industrial Code relating to the working conditions of employees should be considered separately from, and in a different Act from, the main provisions of the Industrial Code that relate to our system of conciliation and arbitration.

Consideration has been given to the desirability of considerably widening the scope of the legislative provisions regarding working conditions of persons in employment, which at the present time in the Industrial Code are confined to persons employed in factories, shops, offices and warehouses. To give interested organizations, both trade unions and employer organizations, the widest possible opportunity to make submissions on the whole question of working conditions, I have moved this motion so that the Select Committee may consider what provisions should be made in relation to occupational safety, health and welfare matters for all persons employed in industry and commerce in this State. I want to make it quite clear that the Select Committee will deal only with these matters and not with any matters concerning industrial relations and the conciliation and arbitration system, which are the principal provisions of the Industrial Code.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for Conservation) seconded the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES

In Committee of Supply.

(Continued from March 31. Page 4588.)

Grand Total, \$2,800,000.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): We have had three significant references this financial year to the budgetary situation. There was the Budget in September, and then a statement by the Treasurer in February of this year about the deterioration of the State's finances and the initial details of the seven new taxation measures for increased charges in South Australia. We now have the third statement—the Supplementary Estimates. This year, the Supplementary Estimates have been

introduced earlier than usual. I do not criticize this move. I agree that, as Parliament has been in session until now and as the Treasurer is able to see his way clear to introduce these Estimates now, it is more efficient with regard to Parliamentary sittings not to have to meet again before the end of the financial year to consider these Estimates. There are few individual items of any substance in these Estimates which one can tackle or which leave such an impression that they are worth criticizing, praising or assessing at this time. The Government is not obliged to introduce such Supplementary Estimates: if it had been able to do the impossible and achieve absolute accuracy in budgeting, remaining within the Appropriation Act and Governor's warrants, these Estimates would have been unnecessary. However, it has had to introduce Supplementary Estimates, and they deal with only portion of the increased expenditure in which the State has become involved since the Budget was presented last September.

As the Treasurer has said in introducing these Estimates, the deficit may not be as great as he believed in February that it could be; it may be contained at about \$10,000,000. If it is, the increase of just over \$5,000,000 involves much expenditure that is not contained in the Supplementary Estimates, as the expenditure therein amounts to only \$2,800,000. As the Treasurer explains, wage and award increases will be mainly met by the Appropriation Act, and other variations in the lines of individual departments will be met by the Governor's appropriations. These Estimates are involved with particular expenditures, which are outlined in some detail in the Treasurer's explanation. However, this gives us an opportunity to look again at the overall situation and at the reasons behind the expected increase of \$5,000,000 in the State's deficit, part of which is referred to in these Estimates. On February 23, the Treasurer said that he expected the State deficit to be about \$11,500,000. He now says that this has been reduced to \$10,000,000 because of favourable factors in relation to increased surveillance of expenditure and increased income as a result of revenue measures the Government has since enacted. However, \$10,000,000 is still a considerable deficit.

The history of this shows that the deficit has arisen despite a large increase in reimbursement grants from the Commonwealth Government and the injection into the finances of a sum of \$1,400,000 to \$1,500,000 this year in increased taxation, this sum being

based on figures given by the Treasurer on introducing the Budget in September. The sum of \$1,400,000 comes from insurance duties and other stamp duty increases of \$900,000 in this financial year; an increase of \$350,000 in respect of the Marine and Harbors Department in this financial year; and an increase of about \$150,000 in succession duties, although succession duties naturally always vary. This means an increase in State taxation, on top of the September budgetary position, of \$1,400,000. In a full year, this sum would probably approach \$3,000,000. The subsequent revenue measures outlined by the Treasurer, although bringing in only a small proportion of increased revenue this year, will, in a full year, have an impact of \$6,000,000. If we add together the tax increase included in the Budget this year and the taxation increases included in the supplementary measures, we find an increase in taxation in a full year, based on what has happened this year, of \$9,000,000.

As a consequence of the measures taken, there will be increased charges in the community in other directions. This is a large increase in State taxation. Based on State taxation collections of \$56,400,000 last financial year, the increase of \$9,000,000 in a full year represents an increase of 16 per cent, a very large increase. Undeniably this impost will be felt by the community; it is not something the community can just take in its stride with no reaction, because the increased charges will affect everyone's personal budget. There must be this effect.

Mr. Mathwin: Does the Government have a mandate for this?

Mr. HALL: I believe the Government does have a mandate for this, but I believe the day will come when the people will understand the mistake they made in giving this mandate to the Government. That proportion of this \$9,000,000 additional tax that the Government will receive this year will enable it only to reduce its deficit and to go on to next year, which must inevitably be a larger deficit year. The Government cannot set up this increased rate of expenditure and expect next year to be easy. When the last State Budget was introduced, I warned the Government of the consequences of running so far ahead in expenditure of revenue receipts from all sources. The Government has not drawn back from the mistake it has made, and next year will be most difficult for it financially. I believe that the present calculated deficit of \$10,000,000 will be small compared with the deficit that

we can expect next year, unless the Commonwealth Government again helps the State out of its financial troubles.

It is interesting to look at the increases in taxation and at the increase in State expenditure. The Budget Papers indicated a programmed increase of expenditure this year by the Government of 12.3 per cent over the actual expenditure of the former Government in the previous year. In other words, this Government set out in September to increase Budget expenditure by 12.3 per cent. However, since then it has added, by my calculation, about \$12,000,000 to its total expenditure. For the moment, let us forget the reason why.

As the Treasurer has said, most of this expenditure has been in connection with award and wage increases, which account for \$11,000,000 of that sum. I consider that at least part of the Supplementary Estimates (at least \$1,000,000) is increased expenditure that will not be contained by lower payments from the Treasury or increased taxation revenue, and therefore we can fairly apportion, in addition to the Budget expectations of September, an additional expenditure of \$12,000,000. Of this, \$5,000,000 is simply a run-on in deficit and the other \$7,000,000 is contained in expenditure by reimbursement from the financial formula of the Commonwealth Government and some of the Government's own taxation measures.

The important aspect is that the \$12,000,000, added to the figure budgeted already, means that the increase in expenditure this year over actual expenditure last year will be 15.8 per cent. A member of the public is inclined to say that that is good. Why not? He may say that last year the L.C.L. Government increased its expenditure by 12.6 per cent in real terms, compared with the year before, and the present Government is increasing actual expenditure by 15.8 per cent and more services or wages will be supplied.

However, is anyone in the Government or any member of the public concerned about what the increased expenditure each year should be? Does the Treasurer assess a healthy percentage increase each year? I do not think he does. Indeed, I do not think most Governments do that. This is a great danger for Australia. It is easy to label as conservative someone who complains about over-expenditure by Governments. I shall give statistics to prove my point. The figure with which we start is 15.8 per cent, the amount by which the State's Budget expenditure will increase this year and I shall make a comparison with the increase in population. The rate of

increase in population in South Australia is not large. We are lower than normal, by Australian standards.

The latest reported figures on increases, which I consider give a handy prediction, show that in 1968 the percentage increase in South Australia was 1.6 per cent, while in 1969 it was 1.66 per cent. Another area of concern is in regard to average weekly earnings. If government expenditure increases by 15.8 per cent this year, at what rate are average weekly earnings increasing? I have not a figure covering the present position, but I have other figures to go back many years and they give a good guide. A table that I have is as follows:

Year	Average rate of increase
1965-66	3.5 per cent
1966-67	5.8 per cent
1967-68	6.2 per cent
1968-69	6.5 per cent
1969-70	8.1 per cent

That table indicates the average rate of increase of weekly earnings. The increase is probably running somewhat higher this year but the average in recent years is nowhere near the Government's increased expenditure this year. The percentage increases in the Budgets show the position that Government's expenditure has got to at this stage and how far out of average it has gone. The following table of figures, taken from the South Australian Budgets, shows the percentage increase in Government expenditure in recent years:

Year	Percentage increase
1964	6.8
1965	8.2
1966	8.4
1967	6.1
1968	7.2
1969	7.4
1970	12.6

The average for the years from 1964 to 1969 is nowhere near the 12.6 per cent increase in 1970, the last year we were in office, or the 15.8 per cent increase being made by the present Government. I shall refer now to the national income, expressed in two tables. The increase in personal income in Australia has been as follows:

Year	Percentage increase
1963-64	10.6
1964-65	8.7
1965-66	5.0
1966-67	9.8
1967-68	4.7
1968-69	12.3

Going back over the years, we see that there was a small variation, except in the years of

the wool boom, when there was a significant increase for that reason. The average increase in personal income nowhere near equals the expenditure increase being made by the present Government. Gross national product is a difficult term to define accurately but the statisticians say that the G.N.P. in real terms in Australia is increasing by about 2.5 per cent a year.

These figures are related. The population increase is low and the increase in average weekly earnings is well below the Budget increases throughout Australia, particularly in South Australia. Our average Budget increase for recent years has been well below the increase in the last two years and the G.N.P. is increasing in real terms at an infinitesimal rate compared to the long-term increase in Government expenditure. We could draw a graph to show that, if this rate of increase in Government expenditure continues, the taxation imposed on the public of this State will increase from year to year. There is no alternative. Nothing will be stabilized, because Governments will be searching for sources of increasing revenue, which is completely out of step with the private sector of the community.

Doubtless, this situation is extremely uninteresting to the man in the street, and probably to some members of this House, yet in years to come it will be one of the basic flaws in Government administration. Although emotive reasons may be given, we know that this rate cannot continue. The Government of the day must tell the public that it cannot increase expenditure at the rate of 15 per cent to 16 per cent a year, because it does not have the resources to do that. There may be short-term exceptions. Perhaps the new Prime Minister will agree to help the States at this time, and if he does we will probably see an increase next year of 15 per cent or 16 per cent in expenditure and, in the short-term, that will be beneficial, because the new Financial Agreement last June enabled the States to spend more. However, the benefits will be short-lived, as for the smaller States there will be great danger inherent in a growth tax.

Those who have studied the Grants Commission's recommendations know that the commission uses Victoria and New South Wales as the standard States by which to adjust the assistance it gives the claimant States. It is no secret that the larger States have been concerned about the subsidy given to the smaller States by way of the reim-

bursement formula. Also, the smaller States have been jealously guarding the in-built subsidy in the present system. One way the additional help to the smaller States can be reduced is by the introduction of a growth tax. Unless there are special provisions that the larger States would oppose, a pay-roll tax will yield taxation revenues to the States according to their own resources in that field.

Instead of receiving from the Commonwealth Government from every \$100 a significant percentage of in-built subsidy, the States would be forgoing that part of the subsidy. I hope the Treasurer will not forget this when he negotiates in Canberra, because this safeguard must not be given away without compensation. The Treasurer may say, as he has said, that we have a Grants Commission. Well, we do have one, but we would be foolish to rely on it alone. At present, with other smaller States, we have a relatively favourable formula that enhances development prospects the States have available for their citizens without this subsidy, but to give it away is to give away at least one of the two advantages we have: having the present formula, and having the approach to the Grants Commission. I do not want the Treasurer to think that the Opposition does not support a search for a growth tax. As Premier, I helped prepare a document that contemplated such a tax, but the Premiers of the smaller States have considered this matter on the basis that they had to safeguard the interests of those States.

The Treasurer will have the support of the Opposition when he negotiates in Canberra to safeguard what we now have. The individual items in these Estimates are not matters for controversy, because they are not a complete picture. We will receive that when the Budget is considered, no doubt in September. However, I emphasize the serious position in which the Governments in Australia are now placed in relation to the increase in their Budget expenditures. As I understand it, the Commonwealth Government is increasing its expenditure by between 11 per cent and 12 per cent each year. Other States are having higher percentage increases, and it is 15 per cent to 16 per cent in this State. This figure cannot be maintained, and the Government should be planning for the day when it will have to come back in line with what the private sector of this community is doing.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I fully endorse what has been said by the Leader, as we cannot maintain this great percentage increase in public expenditure. This year the large

increase of reimbursements and other grants from the Commonwealth Government has amounted to a 19 per cent increase. Despite this large increase, we have had to budget for a deficit of more than \$5,000,000. Our priorities must be determined: there is no point in building an ultra-lavish school for children who attend it during the day but then go home to an unsewered house with poor accommodation. The Government has decided to do things to give a quick return rather than use Loan funds to produce something that is worth while to the community.

The largest increase in expenditure has applied to Government and administration, which accounts for an increase of 27½ per cent, and there is very little or no return on this money. When other sections of the community are expected to prune expenditure, the Government has increased its expenditure by this large percentage. The other important point emphasized by the monthly financial statements is the deterioration of the situation of the Railways Department. Surely we must face the fact that we cannot continue to lose \$2,800,000 in providing this service. Perhaps the service provided by the Railways Department should be considered a benefit to the community, but we should not borrow Loan funds to finance the day-to-day loss by this department.

The answer to this problem may be difficult to find, but many committees of inquiry have been appointed and perhaps another should inquire into this matter. The Minister of Labour and Industry has already given notice that he intends to move a motion for the appointment of another Select Committee, of which no notice will probably be taken. Surely, an investigation into the railways should be conducted. One might ask whether there is an alternative way of carting goods in South Australia. Following a similar recommendation by the Railways Commissioner and the Transport Control Board, the Public Works Committee has recommended the closure of the railway line between Wanbi and Yinkanie, over which every ton of material carried costs the taxpayer \$7. However, if Wunkar farmers purchased two semi-trailers, and carted their wheat to Adelaide, returning to Wunkar with goods, they could do so at two-thirds of the Railways Department's charge.

The State cannot continue carrying railways losses when alternative services are available. Every State is suffering losses on their railway systems, even though people in other States are being compelled to use rail services. Even

if the railways were closed here, \$7,000,000 a year in interest charges would be lost to the State. Surely the Railways Department could be set up as a business. In this respect, I am not criticizing the departmental officers concerned, because the present set-up must make them lose hope. However, if they were told that they had to run the railways as a business, the situation would improve and the department would at least be able to pay its own working costs. Unfortunately, this is not happening at present, to the detriment of the South Australian public which, as a result, is getting fewer schools, sewerage systems and other amenities to which it is entitled. The Treasurer will probably not even mention the Railways Department other than saying that the loss it has incurred is due to increased wages. However, other sectors of the economy have had to pay the 6 per cent national wage increase. Therefore, we must face up to this problem and not bury our heads in the sand like the proverbial ostrich.

Regarding our water supplies, South Australia will not get lovely clear water if the Government does nothing about getting the Dartmouth dam constructed; in a dry year there will not be sufficient water for the country areas. Then the Government will be able to blame its problems on the drought. However, it will eventually have to admit its ineptitude and lack of initiative in not ensuring earlier that the construction of Dartmouth was started. Despite the mis-statements or half-truths that the Treasurer has made that South Australia would not get water from Dartmouth for at least 10 years, South Australia would get water from Dartmouth within five years. The Treasurer's statement is the sort of statement that makes the public lose faith in politicians. Indeed, had Dartmouth been completed this year, South Australia would have been able to get water from it in April, and it would have been able to get its increased quota. Had construction of the dam commenced in the last 10 years, South Australia would have been able to get water from it in the first year and, within two or three years, it would have got its increased allocation. However, what has the Government done in this respect? Because of its pride (I would call it stupidity), it ensured that the construction of Dartmouth did not proceed.

The Government has budgeted unwisely in not ensuring that it confine its expenditure to within the limits of finance available. It has been able to continue only by transferring

money from Loan funds. The Government is not facing up to its responsibilities, and, if it continues in this vein, South Australia will be in similar difficulties to those it experienced a few years ago.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): I intend to put the items *seriatim*.

CHIEF SECRETARY AND MINISTER OF HEALTH
Hospitals Department, \$350,000.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Treasurer say what action is being taken by the Hospitals Department to collect outstanding fees incurred as a result of vehicular accidents? In his latest report, the Auditor-General states:

During 1969-70 the amount of such fees outstanding increased by \$202,000 to \$972,000. This amount approaches in total the outstandings for all other types of hospitalization. He later continues:

In previous reports I have suggested that a fund should be created by insurance companies from which third party hospital claims could be met, either wholly or in part pending determination of the liability between companies and final claims. Any payments would then be reimbursed to the fund after the liability had been finally determined. For some years I have drawn attention to the unsatisfactory position regarding these outstandings, but there has been no improvement. As the amount involved is nearly \$1,000,000, will the Treasurer say whether any action has been taken since this report was issued, or whether any future action is contemplated?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): This matter has caused the Government considerable concern for some time. However, the Government has not reached any conclusions regarding what further action it should take other than the normal action of trying to recover the sums involved. One big problem is that the amounts outstanding in relation to vehicular accidents are often in respect of claims that are not settled within three years or more. What is more, when these claims are eventually settled, they are sometimes settled on the basis of some contribution being made by the patient. This creates considerable difficulties in our recovering sums from the patient, as he recovers decidedly less in respect of special damages; indeed, he gets a proportionate reduction. Whether the Government should then write that amount off, or whether it should keep it on its books is a complicated problem. However, the Government has continually examined this matter to see whether there is a more satisfactory means of ensuring that better recoveries are made, so that it could

then make clear the basis on which it is not proceeding to recover in other cases.

Dr. TONKIN: I should like briefly to refer to the proposed changes in the administration at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and, presumably, at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. In this respect, I refer to the committee of inquiry into hospitals, which was set up last year. The committee's terms of reference were aimed at improving means of communication between members of the staff at all levels both in the delegation of authority and communication from trainee nurses and medical officers upwards. Those terms of reference were explicit, yet in the part of the report tabled here we find that that committee seems to have grossly exceeded them. This is an important matter because, although a considerable sum is spent on hospitals and health, we are now being asked to provide an extra \$100,000 for the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Many of the recommendations made in this report are extremely good (and I wholeheartedly agree with them), such as the provision of a personnel service, nurses' counselling service, and co-ordination management training. However, the report goes further than that. It talks about redefining the post of medical superintendent and it would give considerable power and authority to the Administrator of the hospital over the professional Medical Superintendent and Superintendent of Nurses.

It proposes considerable changes in the construction of the boards of management of the major teaching hospitals, including the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There are many other matters I should mention but I do not intend to. The findings of this committee of inquiry, without any reasons given for their adoption or as to why we should adopt them, are still causing considerable concern in the community. The Treasurer said only last week in reply to a question that he had no further report from Dr. Shea that would change the situation. I do not know where the fault lies but I am assured that the State branch of the Australian Medical Association has written protesting about the terms of reference of this committee of inquiry which, while the association is not criticizing them *in toto* at present, the association feels are far and above the terms of reference usually given to such a committee. All the recommendations in this report will cost money to implement and, although I agree with the Treasurer that we must not cut down on health spending, I still feel that this is even more reason why these recommendations should be investigated by

experts. I think we do the community a grave disservice if we let the Government implement these recommendations without giving members of the medical and nursing professions an opportunity to comment on them and possibly to save the Government money.

As the A.M.A. has protested and has expressed disquiet because it has not been given an opportunity to discuss this matter (and the nursing organizations are in the same position), will the Treasurer undertake to look at this matter again? Will he give the informed members of the community, whose future is so vitally affected by these recommendations, an opportunity to discuss them and to advise the Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly ask the Chief Secretary whether he will see representatives of the organizations concerned and discuss the matter with them.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF WORKS

Public Buildings Department, \$800,000.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Auditor-General points out in his most recent report that the Public Buildings Department has engaged a firm of consultants to examine ways and means of improving the service provided by the department in the under-\$20,000 project area, and states that the first phase of the consultancy has been completed. Can the Treasurer say whether there has been any development in this field? Everyone recognizes that one of the big problems in organizing work on public buildings is in the field of small contracts. There has been decentralization in the reorganization of the department over the past few years and I assume this is continuing. Has the Treasurer anything further to say about this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as I know, nothing more has come to Cabinet on this matter.

Mr. GUNN: Grave concern has been expressed to me about the inefficiency and the failure of the Public Buildings Department to cope with the requirements which come under this department's jurisdiction. What action will the Treasurer take to improve the Public Buildings Department's efficiency in country areas, especially in areas that are a long way from the major centres where the department operates? I do not think there is one town in my district where there are no complaints about the failure of the department to cope with the needs that arise. During the last two years many promises have been made by the department in relation to Government

buildings in my district but the department has failed to keep most of those promises. Can the Treasurer and the Government have this matter rectified and would they consider having architects available in some country areas so that a more efficient service may be provided?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Although this matter is of constant concern to the Minister of Works, it is not only the department that finds it difficult to carry out building work on Eyre Peninsula: it is the case with private builders as well. The Housing Trust also has more problems on Eyre Peninsula with buildings, particularly in the southern part, than in any other part of the State. It is not possible to maintain supervisory architects in the field on small maintenance jobs. As it is, we have difficulty in maintaining an adequate architectural and drafting staff for major work. The costs of carrying out works in country areas would be increased markedly if we had to have additional supervisory services at professional level. The problem of maintenance works in country areas, whether a local contractor is engaged or whether someone is sent out on day labour, is a matter of constant concern to all Governments, not only to our Government. I know that previous Governments have also had this problem. I assure the honourable member that it has been the subject of investigation and reports in the past, but at this stage I cannot assure him that any new procedure will be adopted.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF EDUCATION

Education Department, \$630,000.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Treasurer say whether, since the Karmel report has been presented, Government policy has been reviewed in relation to bonding student teachers? That report recommends that bonding and special allowances for student teachers be discontinued as soon as conditions permit. In his most recent report the Auditor-General states that at June 30, 1970, \$903,232 was due from students and teachers as a result of breached agreements; that was \$329,410 greater than the corresponding sum for the previous year. Can the Treasurer say whether the Government is continuing to collect these outstanding amounts and whether Government policy is being reviewed as a result of the Karmel report?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some collections of outstanding amounts are proceeding. There are arrangements for collection of such amounts in certain cases, but in other cases

we find it impracticable to collect them. As a result of his Ministerial experience the honourable member will know of amounts being written off, and from time to time they are written off nowadays. The Government considered the bonding system prior to the publication of the Karmel report, and it is still under consideration.

Line passed.

Miscellaneous, \$350,000.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Treasurer say whether Professor Medlin's salary is being paid whilst he is in gaol?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no idea. That is a matter for the Flinders University Council. It is not a matter of Government policy and the Government cannot intervene.

Line passed.

MINISTER OF ROADS AND TRANSPORT AND
MINISTER OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Railways Department, \$670,000.

Mr. EVANS: I wish to refer to a matter connected with the outwards freight office of the Railways Department. The following is a letter sent by the Secretary of the Railways Department to the Manager of R. Cox Constructions Proprietary Limited:

I refer to the tender submitted by you for the demolition of the existing freight office and construction of a new outwards freight office—stage 3—at Mile End, and have to advise I am in receipt of a governmental direction that a clause be inserted under the General Conditions of Contract providing for preference of employment being given to financial members of an appropriate union, in the following terms:

In engaging labour preference of employment shall be given to financial members of a union appropriate to the position of employment provided that the contractor shall not be compelled to give preference to any member of such a union who may have been discharged for dishonesty, misconduct or neglect. In the event of no financial members of any union appropriate to the position of employment being adequately experienced in and competent to perform the position of employment, employment may be given to an unfinancial member or person being a non-member of a union and it is expressly agreed that in the event of the contractor subletting any part of this contract the contractor shall include this condition as a term of such subletting.

It is proposed to include such a provision in all contracts, and in the circumstances, I would appreciate an intimation from you as to whether you still desire your tender to be considered.

We are considering giving more money to a section of the Railways Department yet at the same time we are excluding certain contrac-

tors who may be able to operate with non-union employees. Those contractors may be able to carry out the work competently and effectively; indeed, they may be more efficient than some other contractors and therefore able to save the State money whilst still abiding by the provisions of the Industrial Code. Yet here we have a Government directive saying that the department must not even consider a tender unless the contractor gives them the undertaking I have quoted. The Treasurer has introduced Supplementary Estimates, yet the Government is ignoring a way whereby money may be saved. The Treasurer may say that that is not true, but I believe it is true. Why should we exclude a contractor who may be able to employ non-union labour? Is there any reason except that the instruction was issued to support a political Party through the union dues that will be paid into that Party's funds?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must connect his remarks with the line.

Mr. EVANS: As a result of the directive to which I have referred the contractor will have to guarantee that in all cases he will give preference to union members, even though that may mean he has to sack some of his workers. This directive will result in greater expense for the State; indeed, even the distribution of this letter has cost the Railways Department something. The only reason I can see for this directive is that a certain political Party will benefit.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I cannot allow the debate to continue along those lines.

Mr. VENNING: I view with concern the attempt to improve the financial position of this State through the medium of rail freights. It is a matter of concern that the Minister does not do something about reducing railway freights to make the railways more competitive with road transport, and thereby help railway finances. As I have said previously, silos have been built along various railway lines, and it is up to the railways to compete with other means of transport. The primary producer, at this stage particularly, cannot be expected to be subsidizing the finances of the State through the railways.

Road transport can cart grain in some areas at half the rail freight and, in many areas, at two-thirds of the rail freight. I recently introduced to the Minister a deputation of northern road carriers, who listed their freight rates from areas in the Port Pirie division, and those rates were substantially below those

of the railways. Today rail freights have again been increased, and I am concerned that we are asked to provide a further \$100,000 to help the railways. I should like to see the railways become more competitive and efficient and go out and get the business.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Before the member for Rocky River spoke, I thought the Treasurer was going to answer the points made by the member for Fisher.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Oh! There was no substance in them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Roads and Transport may sneer; we remember his record in the Highways Department regarding preference to unionists, and I think the less he says about this, at present, the better. The letter the member for Fisher quoted in full concerns, in my view, a serious matter. This means that the Railways Department, by a Government direction, is to insert a condition in every contract that it wants to let, and this may well substantially increase the price that it has to pay for work done. I ask the Treasurer whether he will explain why the Government has caused the railways to insert this clause in the general conditions of contract.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is well aware that it is Government policy that preference shall be given to unionists, and the reasons for that have been stated at length in this Chamber. There is not the slightest evidence that those people who are engaging non-union labour tender competitively against those who are engaging union labour. Not an instance of that has been cited. Concerning the engagement of union labour, it is essential for the maintenance of industrial peace in South Australia that this be done.

Mr. Millhouse: That's rot.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Workers in South Australia who have made their contributions to the obtaining of conditions extant for workers in this State now bitterly resent the fact that other people gain the advantage of those conditions without making such a contribution.

Mr. Mathwin: Some non-unionists are paid higher wages than unionists are paid.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Obviously the honourable member was not listening when I was saying that non-unionists were required by unionists to make some contribution towards wages and conditions established by the unionists through the arbitration system. The arbitration system recognizes unions. Just as the Government negotiates with the Chamber of Manufactures and the Chamber of Com-

merce and seeks to encourage people to join those bodies or employer organizations where they are appropriate, in the same way we believe that people who are potential unionists should be encouraged to join unions. The Government's policy on preference to unionists is clear; it has been stated on many occasions, and the Government will continue with it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am fascinated with the explanation given by the Treasurer on this matter. It did not surprise me; it fascinated me that he could say what he has said, no doubt coerced by the trade union members of his Government. It makes me very disappointed. We hear much from the Treasurer and from the Attorney-General (I was going to include other members on the Labor side, but I am not sure from whom else we hear it) about personal freedom. We hear that we are not going to dictate to people what they can see and what they cannot see; that these are matters of individual choice. We hear much lip service from the Treasurer about personal freedom and his desire to keep freedom, but when it comes to the crunch, and when it is a matter of persuading people by ultimatum to join unions, the Treasurer toes the line, and there is a complete dichotomy between what he says about personal freedom and the mouthings we have heard from him now about preference to unionists in the Government. It is a complete sham on his part.

I should like to know whether the Treasurer really believes what he says or which he believes. Does he believe in personal freedom (in censorship, and so on) so that people can do as they wish, or does he believe in persuading people by ultimatum to join trade unions? One cannot have it both ways. One cannot, as the Treasurer does, speak with one voice when it suits one to be liberal, and talk about freedom of choice, and so on, yet be a party to putting out a direction of this nature by the railways, because we know that that is coercion, and the Treasurer knows that it is coercion. It is persuasion by ultimatum, to use the unhappy, but accurate, phrase used by the Minister of Roads and Transport a few months ago. I think it was withdrawn in that case, but we know that he meant it, and that that is the policy of the Government.

I ask the Treasurer how he squares what he says about personal freedoms of choice in music, art, literature, and so on, with the undoubted element of compulsion that is involved in the policy of preference to unionists, especially as it is put into effect by directives such as this.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The occasion of a debate on the Supplementary Estimates and on the line—

Mr. Millhouse: Don't get out of it that way.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member hands out abuse any time he likes but never likes to get it back again. The incorrigible twerpishness of the honourable member—

Mr. Millhouse: Just answer the question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants me to answer the question, I suggest that he allow me to do so.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The occasion of a discussion on the line "Office expenses, materials, services, general expenses incurred in normal operation and maintenance" in connection with the Railways Department is not really an occasion for a philosophical discussion on the principles of liberalism. If the honourable member had bothered to listen to some of the exposition that I gave at the university at the time he was attending it concerning the meaning of liberty, he would know that liberty is the ability to act within a social context. If he likes to work that out, he will see precisely why I adopt the attitudes I do.

Mr. EVANS: When replying to my first point, the Treasurer said we wanted industrial peace. This State has as good a record of industrial peace as any other State or possibly any other country in the world. The Government's action and the direction it gives in this case could cause industrial unrest.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How will it do that?

Mr. EVANS: I am keen to be rational about this if the Minister of Roads and Transport will allow me to continue. The Treasurer has said that some people within the work force bitterly object to some of the workmen not belonging to a trade union. I take it he realizes, too, that some people (and particularly those coming from lands where they may have been suppressed in their way of life) bitterly object to joining a trade union that may have some political affiliations, regardless of what they may be.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Particularly if they are affiliated to the Liberal Party.

Mr. EVANS: That may be so, but the Treasurer uses the argument that people who object should have their wishes granted but,

if a person is compelled to join a union, his wish not to join should not be granted. He also said that, when a person derives benefits as a result of the efforts of an organization, he should contribute to it. There is nothing in the arbitration legislation providing that benefits shall be made available only to unionists.

Mr. Clark: They are not "scabs" then.

Mr. EVANS: The other point is that only recently we heard the Minister of Local Government state that, if a body did not want to belong to the Municipal Association when it was operating, it did not have to join it, but there were benefits—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I shall not allow the debate to become an open discussion. The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Railways Department and the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. EVANS: Thank you, Sir. I was drawing a comparison from the answer the Treasurer gave me in reply to my first question on that matter. This is a comparison with the line of thinking of one of his own Cabinet colleagues. Also, during that discussion, by way of interjection, it appeared that "they do not have to think the same as you blokes". That was said by a member of the Government. For the same reason, a person who does not wish to join a union does not have to think the same as a person who wishes to join. In this case, we are by this type of direction to increase administration costs to the railways, the State and its people, because we shall have to check the Railways Department employees to make sure they all belong to a union; or the department will have to rely on some union representative or representatives to inform it that they do or do not belong to a union. To check those things will entail more office work. That will be one extra cost, small or great as it may be.

Secondly, if a person wishing to tender in these circumstances is only a small contractor, having in his employ mainly or wholly non-unionists, he either does not tender at all or he tells his employees to join a union; or he can sack them. It will mean that there will be no chance of employment for non-unionists in Government work in this State. The contractor will have to keep something up his sleeve for the unforeseen, and the Treasurer knows it. I do not know whether or not the Treasurer sincerely believes in what he has been saying. I do not believe he did until recently. I hope he has not changed his

mind and been forced into this sort of attitude. The Railways Department will have to pay more to have its contracts completed, and its present losses will be greater in future because of this Government's action in saying, "Unless you join a union, you will not be able to work on a Government contract; you will not be able to receive a tender." It will mean that such a contract will not be considered. Belonging to a union will be part of the contract itself. We have reached a very low level.

Mr. Harrison: The honourable member has.

Mr. EVANS: Those who think along these lines have some difficulty in realizing that they themselves have not perhaps reached, in the eyes of the public, a lower level than the level they enjoyed formerly, before this direction was sent out to Government departments by the present Government. People who employ non-unionists in many cases pay over-award rates, and the men themselves, whoever they may be, are quite happy. Under these conditions, the employer is obliged to pay the ruling rates set by the Arbitration Court and also operate under the conditions set down by that court.

Mr. Payne: That is not true.

Mr. EVANS: He is liable to be charged, and members opposite know that.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. EVANS: This type of direction that has been issued by the present Government will not be altered until we have a Government in power that can operate free from pressures.

Mr. CARNIE: I abhor this need for extra money to be provided for the Railways Department. It is easy to understand why it is necessary when we consider the inefficiency of the department and the increased charges that are being made. I have an example of a silo in my own area—the Ungarra silo, 48 miles from Port Lincoln. The freight differential for shipping grain to Port Lincoln is 9.385 cents; it will be 9.9 cents, or more. Ungarra is on the railway. Five miles further on, off at an angle, is the Port Neill silo, which is not on the railway, so grain is transported from there by road. In that case, the freight differential is 6.25 cents, although the distance is further: that is roughly two-thirds of the rail cost, and for a greater distance. This is the sort of thing that results in the railways losing business.

In the 1969-70 delivery season there were, after losing the grain of several farms to other silos, 37 local farmers using Ungarra. This number dropped to 22 in the immediate past harvest. With the increased rail freight, which is already much higher than the road transport freight that I mentioned, most, if not all, of those 22 graingrowers using the Ungarra silo will stop using it because it will be cheaper for them to freight the extra few miles to the Port Neill silo, and they will pay a differential for the grain transhipped to Port Lincoln. While this inefficiency continues, this sort of thing we are now considering will continue. The railways must go out and seek business and compete with road transport in a normal business process. Until it does that, money will continue to be lost.

Mr. McANANEY: Through you, Mr. Acting Chairman, I ask the Treasurer to speak up when he is addressing the Chamber; we cannot hear what he says.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have no control over the Treasurer's voice.

Mr. McANANEY: I think that trade unionists retire to this Chamber to warm seats here, and that they are getting frustrated because they have not been achieving much. Since 1962, with full employment, the employees' share of the gross national product has been constant and would have been so without any trade union officials.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Debate must be confined to the lines.

Mr. McANANEY: The Railways Department makes its losses in respect of country and city passenger services. Surely if we have reached the stage when we can have these little buses flitting around on corridors we should not have losses of \$3,700,000 in respect of suburban passenger services. We should institute a form of transport which can pay its way. The country passenger service of the Railways Department, which loses \$3,000,000, would not be used much by members of the farming community but would be used by people who live in country towns. Surely some alternative service could be provided, even if the Railways Department was to obtain modern buses to transport people to these towns. Private bus operators must make a profit from the service they provide to various areas, or they would not operate. Therefore, the Railways Department makes a loss of more than \$6,000,000 in carrying passengers and alternative services could be implemented. Perhaps then this \$6,000,000 could be spent on something useful in the

community. Surely the Treasurer must give some reply about this. In October, the member for Unley asked a Dorothy Dixer of the Minister of Roads and Transport about the increased traffic being carried by the department. The Minister was most elated to say that to that period there had been an increase in revenue of \$1,000,000. However, that increase has now dropped to only about \$200,000. Despite the fact that the carriage of wheat, livestock and other farming merchandise has paid its way, the Railways Department has increased the charges for transporting these items. This will cause a further falling off in this traffic, and the department will lose more money. Will the Treasurer explain these matters?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows that there is nothing to explain. It is not possible in a short period to change the operations of the railway service; the Government has been in office for only a short period. The honourable member knows that we have received a report on the question of upgrading our administration of transport services. The Director-General of Transport will be appointed soon. In addition, experimental work in transit areas will be undertaken. We cannot achieve results in changing a railway system overnight, as the honourable member knows perfectly well.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The reply which the Treasurer gave to the points made by the member for Fisher and me in relation to the letter quoted by the member for Fisher illustrates better than anything else could illustrate the fundamental contradiction, and therefore weakness, in the position of those members of the Labor Party who would like to parade as liberals. The Treasurer suggested that I should think back to what he said when he was at the university. That is over 20 years ago, and he has certainly changed his position on a number of items. I must confess I cannot recall any lecture or talk he gave that was worth remembering. Certainly what he said in justification of the policy of preference to unionists (and one could call it compulsory unionism) would justify as well a measure of control of literature, plays and so on.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Nonsense! What has this to do with the railways?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not allow debate to continue unless the honourable member can link up his remarks to the expenditure of the Railways Department.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I link up my remarks by referring to the letter quoted by the mem-

ber for Fisher, obviously with your permission, Sir, because you did not object to it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Fisher linked up that letter to the item being considered.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and out of that grew this discussion on fundamental issues of personal freedom. If one talks of the freedom to see and to say what we like, what about freedom of association or non-association of individuals? Why should a person, if he does not want to associate with others, be obliged to associate with them in the course of his employment? The answer to that question is the same as the answer to the question: why should there be personal freedom in matters of literature, arts, taste and so on? I know that the Government can clamp down and stop us from debating these fundamental matters. However, sooner or later the people of the State will find out the truth about the Treasurer and those other members, such as the member for Mawson and the Attorney-General, who like to mouth things about their liberalism, because the policy of the Labor Party is a policy of Socialism and that ultimately is a policy of compulsion. One cannot act in conformity with that policy and also act on mouthings such as we hear from these members.

Mr. BECKER: It is a pity that we have to consider injecting further funds into the Railways Department. In the report of the Railways Commissioner for the year ended June 30 last, the Commissioner said it was gratifying to be able to report increased revenue for the second successive year, the figure of of \$33,566,064 being 10 per cent higher than the previous year's record, and the increase in revenue since 1959-60 being 30.9 per cent. On the expenditure side, the Commissioner said that unfortunately the increased revenue was matched by a corresponding rise, the figure being about 8.3 per cent. Will the Railways Department in future be able to contain increased costs in this area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot guarantee that the Railways Department will always be able to contain increased costs. I cannot give an assurance to the honourable member on that.

Line passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 3)

The Supplementary Estimates were adopted by the House and an Appropriation Bill for \$2,800,000 was founded in Committee of Ways

and Means, introduced by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan, and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is based upon the Supplementary Estimates that have been dealt with by the House. Clause 2 authorizes the issue of a further \$2,800,000 from the general revenue. Clause 3 appropriates that sum and sets out the amount to be provided under each department or activity. Clause 4 provides that the Treasurer shall have available to spend only such amounts as are authorized by a warrant from His Excellency the Governor, and that the receipts of the payees shall be accepted as evidence that the payments have been duly made.

Clause 5 gives power to issue money out of Loan funds, other public funds, or bank overdraft, if the moneys received from the Commonwealth Government and the general revenue of the State are insufficient to meet the payments authorized by this Bill. Clause 6 gives authority to make payments in respect of a period prior to the first day of July, 1970. Clause 7 provides that amounts appropriated by this Bill are in addition to other amounts properly appropriated. Except for the amount of appropriation sought, and the period covered, this Bill is the same as the supplementary Appropriation Bills passed by the House in recent years.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

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

That the members of this House who have been appointed to the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation have leave to sit on that committee during the present sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

FISHERIES BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such moneys as might be required for the purposes of the proposed amendment to clause 67.

In Committee.

(Continued from March 31. Page 4600.)

Clause 4—"Repeal and savings schedule."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

In subclause (5) (a) to strike out ","; in subclause (5) (b) to strike out "(b)"; and in

subclause (5) to insert the following new paragraph:

"(b) shall not be entitled to the grant or renewal of an authority under this Act on the ground that by virtue of this section he was deemed to be the holder of such an authority under this Act."

The amendment makes clear that a person who held a licence or permit under the Act during the transitional period will not be automatically entitled to be granted a similar licence or permit when the transitional period expires. He must make further application for a new licence under the new Act when this period expires, and holding a licence during the transitional period does not mean that he will be granted the same licence when his application is considered.

Mr. RODDA: Does that mean that there will be a period when all fishermen could not have authority to fish?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No. During the transitional period and until his application is considered he will be granted a licence as near as possible to the licence he held previously, so that he need not fear that his livelihood will be endangered. His application will then be considered on its merits under the provisions of the new Act.

Mr. CARNIE: I cannot altogether see the reason for this, for I understand that these provisions are already included in the legislation. A licence can be revoked or refused.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This amendment makes it clearer. A person may not automatically receive the same licence as he held previously, because each application will be considered on its merits.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5—"Interpretation."

Mr. CARNIE: Why are definitions for both "device" and "declared device" included?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Certain devices used by amateur fishermen are declared devices, whereas "device" means any sort of device.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It seems to me that amateur fishermen will be treated rather severely when this Bill operates. At present, I think there are about 14,000 licences, but when these expire it is possible that about 10,000 people who now hold licences will be restricted by the operation of clause 29.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Perhaps the honourable member could discuss this matter when the clause is reached. This

clause deals only with the interpretation of the Act.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am trying to imagine what an amateur would be allowed to do. Declared devices will be subject to regulation and to Parliamentary surveillance. The Bill provides that they shall be declared by proclamation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I have an amendment on that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If an amendment to a later clause was carried, a consequential amendment would be needed in this clause, so it would be necessary to recommit it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: We can still proclaim a device and regulate for the number of devices.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I shall be happy to discuss this matter fully when the Committee is considering clause 29, so long as I have a chance to recommit clause 5.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: If an amendment to another clause moved later affects clause 5, that clause can be recommitted.

Mr. RODDA: Did I understand the Minister to say that he has an amendment on file in this regard? If there is one, I have not seen it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There is no amendment on file in relation to this clause.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I have tried to explain to the member for Alexandra that this clause deals only with the interpretation of the Act. The terms used in the interpretation clause are set out in separate clauses. If, later, an amendment that is passed affects clause 5, that clause can be recommitted.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Delegation by Minister or Director."

Mr. RODDA: This clause provides that the Minister and the Director shall each have power to delegate any of their powers or functions, and this seems to be an extremely wide power of delegation. I have no quarrel with the Minister having this power, as he is answerable to the Parliament, and the Director, who is a public servant, is answerable to his Minister. As it seems that the Director is to have extremely wide powers, similar to those of the Minister, will the Minister say why this clause has been included?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This matter was raised earlier, when I said that this was not an unusual feature in other legislation. Indeed, I think I cited two other Acts as

examples. It stands to reason that neither the Minister nor the Director would delegate powers that he should rightly exercise himself. It would be physically impossible for them to do all the things they would be required to do if they could not delegate their powers. This kind of provision is widely used. It will relieve the Minister and the Director of the need to do things that it would be physically impossible for them to cope with personally. However, if the Minister believes that the powers of delegation are being abused, he can revoke them immediately.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I agree that powers of delegation must be provided for in a Bill like this to enable the legislation to be effectively administered. No Minister could be expected to handle administrative detail that is more properly handled by junior officers. However, I wonder whether the powers of delegation in this Bill go too far and whether we should limit them. Clause 7 (1) provides:

The Minister and the Director shall each have power to delegate by writing to any person any of his powers or functions under this Act (except this power of delegation), so that the delegated powers or functions may be exercised by the delegate with respect to the matters specified in the instrument of delegation.

The Minister has the duty of reviewing the Director's decision. However, the Minister may delegate someone else to review the Director's decision and the Director, in turn, may have delegated someone else to make a decision for him. Consequently, the powers of delegation seem to go too far. I shall not deal further with this matter now because, if I sustain my point, an amendment will be necessary to a later clause and, if that amendment is carried, clause 7 will need a consequential amendment.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 11 passed.

Clause 12—"Powers of inspectors."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The powers of inspectors are all-embracing. Under other legislation an inspector can burst into people's houses and look for Cape Barren geese in the refrigerator. Perhaps under this Bill an inspector could search for undersize whiting. In the interests of people who complain about the loss of civil liberties, I think the Minister should give an assurance that these powers will be handled with all reasonable care and tolerance.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, the powers will be handled with all reasonable care and tolerance.

Mr. RODDA: Subclause (5) provides:

If more than one-tenth of the fish in a receptacle are undersize an inspector may take and retain possession of all of the fish in the receptacle and dispose of them by sale, destruction or otherwise as the Minister directs. During my second reading speech I drew attention to the harsh, abstract penalty provided in this clause. I think some tolerance should be shown. The limit of one-tenth of the fish in a receptacle seems to be a harsh and arbitrary limit that could involve hardship for a fisherman.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If more than one-tenth of the fish in a receptacle were undersize, obviously the fisherman involved had intentionally retained an undue proportion of undersize fish; in that case the whole of his catch could be confiscated.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He might be a Naracoorte farmer.

Mr. CARNIE: Does subclause (5) mean that, if a person is found with a receptacle containing fish, less than one-tenth of which are undersize, he is exempt from prosecution?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No; but it would mean that he would not lose the remainder of his catch. Of course, the undersize fish would be taken as evidence against him. If less than one-tenth of the fish in a receptacle are undersize, there could have been an oversight on the part of the fisherman. I stress that subclause (5) provides that an inspector "may" take possession of all the fish in a receptacle; it does not say that the inspector must do that.

Clause passed.

Clause 13—"Duty to state name and address."

Mr. RODDA: Subclause (3) provides:

If a person on being requested by an inspector in accordance with this section to state his name and place of abode fails or refuses to comply with the request the inspector may arrest him.

Does that provision mean that an honorary warden is given the powers of arrest? I realize that, under the Bill, all police officers are inspectors.

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

Mr. RODDA: I should like to know whether an inspector has the power to arrest or whether this power lies with members of the Police Force.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I thought that the honourable member was originally asking whether an honorary warden would have this power. If he reads subclause (3) he will see

that only an inspector, not an honorary warden, has this power.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Distinguishing marks."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (3) to strike out "two months" and insert "one month".

The effect of this amendment is to reduce from two months to one month the period in which the registration marks on a boat must be obliterated after the expiry of the boat registration. This amendment has been requested by the industry. Although we believed that two months was a suitable period, we consider the request reasonable.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 26 passed.

Clause 27—"Licensing of fish dealers."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In certain areas, people whom we call part-timers are providing most of the fish. One fish dealer to whom I have spoken has said that the way in which a B class licence is issued is important, because there could be a shortage of fish if there were a restrictive policy on issuing these licences.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I think I can deal with this matter more fully when we reach the licensing provisions, I think it is right and proper that a fish processor or dealer should comply with the legislation and purchase only from people licensed to sell. I do not believe that the case to which the honourable member has referred will occur. The fish dealers or processors have agreed to this provision, because they realize that it is necessary. Although it may involve a problem, I do not think it will be of any magnitude.

Clause passed.

Clause 28 passed.

Clause 29—"Duty to hold fishing licence."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (1) after "dollars" to insert "for a first offence and five hundred dollars for a second or subsequent offence".

This amendment is to provide for a higher maximum penalty for a second or subsequent conviction relating to unlawful fishing, and this has been requested by the industry, which considered that people should be made aware, by the penalties that may be imposed, of the value of what they hold. I thought that, if people in the industry wanted this penalty, there was no reason why we should not agree to it. This is a maximum penalty, and the court can exercise its discretion to impose

smaller penalties for minor offences. I understand that representatives of the industry approached me about this as a result of a meeting of the Australian Fishing Industry Council.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I oppose this amendment. I know that the professional fishermen's organization has sought a penalty of \$500 for a second offence. Having been in touch with many professional fishermen, I favour almost all the things that their organization has asked for. However, I believe we now have a habit of prescribing penalties that are much heavier than the penalties we used to prescribe a few years ago. We do not generally prescribe a penalty for a second offence. If people without a licence consistently caught fish and it was found that \$200 was an insufficient deterrent that would be the time to alter the penalty. If we increase this penalty now, we will be going to an extreme in respect of what may vary from a serious offence to a trivial offence. If we prescribe a penalty for a second offence in this case, we may begin to prescribe such penalties in other cases, and eventually we could be prescribing penalties amounting to thousands of dollars for third and fourth offences.

If people break this law consistently, they may have to go to gaol. However, at this stage it is unreasonable to prescribe such a heavy monetary penalty. Professional fishermen, who have suggested this penalty, will not be involved, as unlicensed fishermen will be affected by it. Although I respect the wish of professional fishermen to see that stocks of fish are preserved and to be able to make a reasonable living, I am not so sympathetic to them when it comes to imposing heavy penalties on these amateurs who are not necessarily criminal types. Through a technicality, some unlicensed fisherman may not have a licence. I doubt whether the penalty in the Bill of \$200 would often be applied for a second offence. Ministers should try to bring in Bills that they will not have to amend. Occasionally arguments arise in Committee or representations are made by people outside that necessitate Government amendments. However, this legislation has been discussed for some time, the previous Minister of Agriculture (Hon. C. R. Story) having been preparing a Bill on it. Therefore, there should be a compelling reason before the Government amends its Bill.

Mr. CARNIE: I, too, oppose the amendment. As the Minister said, the same organiza-

tion that approached him approached me, but I told its representatives that I considered that the penalty they suggested was too severe and, in my view, unwarranted. This was the suggestion of one section of the fishing industry. Many representatives of other sections of the industry believe that the penalty suggested in the Bill is adequate.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand the reluctance of members opposite to accept the amendment but I point out that the penalty provided is merely the maximum, and the tribunal hearing a prosecution has a discretion about what fine to impose. It can be profitable for persons to take fish and sell them illegally through outlets in the South-East and across the Victorian border. The value of a bag of crayfish is about \$100, and these persons would need to sell only three bags to be able to pay a fine of \$200 and still have \$100 for themselves. If these persons engage in illegal trafficking, they must accept the penalty. If this penalty acts as a deterrent, it will help not only the professional but also the amateur fisherman.

Mr. RODDA: This provision will require much policing. I know many people who have a great interest in fauna and flora and who would be pleased to act as honorary wardens. They would make it hot for persons who indulged in illegal practices. I consider that a \$500 penalty for a second offence is too steep.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you suggest that the fine should be only \$200 each time?

Mr. RODDA: I am not suggesting anything. The Bill has plenty of teeth in it without our walloping some people. Unless policing falls down, amateur fishermen will not be able to gather several bags of crayfish, as the Minister suggested. I protest at the steep increase in the penalty.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I should like to hear a back-bench member of the Government speak on this. The spirit of Committee work lies in members thinking for themselves but, although I have put a case against the Minister's amendment, no member of the Government back-bench has applied himself to the matter. If I called for a division on this amendment members would come in and then ask which way to vote.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Including your own Leader.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Leader is extremely interested in the industry, but the solid phalanx of Labor Party solidarity will prevail.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I cannot allow the honourable member to continue debating on those lines. He must confine his remarks to the clause being discussed.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: If a penalty of \$200 is inadequate the penalties in most legislation are inadequate.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take exception to the attitude of the member for Alexandra about back-bench members of the Government not speaking. The honourable member knows that the Government wants to get its legislation through. I hope that I am capable of handling the discussion on behalf of the Government, and I have not instructed any back-bench Government members not to speak. It is up to them, the same as it is with back-benchers on the other side. I have often heard that there is no logic in politics: it is the numbers that count. It seems as though this depends on which side one sits. The member for Alexandra enjoyed a long run on the Government side, and he would recall how many times we applied sweet reason but were not listened to, as the numbers counted. If a person, after having committed a first offence, commits the offence again he deserves to be hit harder than he was hit the first time.

Mr. Hall: It applies to amateurs.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If they sell fish without a licence.

Mr. Hall: Not only selling fish, but taking them without a licence.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not want to interfere with amateurs, but people who make their livelihood from fishing are concerned that, if the penalty for the second offence is not heavy, people will break the law continually.

Mr. CARNIE: Why was this penalty not included in the Bill as drafted?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I can learn and change my mind.

Mr. CARNIE: As I consider the penalty too steep, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. EVANS: I, too, think the penalty is too high. The Minister who spoke about Opposition back-benchers being seat warmers should remember what his Ministerial colleagues, particularly the Minister of Roads and Transport and the Minister of Education, did when they were on this side.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I rise on a point of order, Sir. We are discussing clause 29 and, much as I would like to argue the point raised by the member for Fisher, it is

not relevant to this clause. I suggest that the honourable member is out of order.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: In Committee the discussion at all times must be relevant to the clause being discussed.

Mr. EVANS: I was replying to a comment made by the Minister of Works. He said Opposition back-benchers were seat warmers, but the same thing happened in the previous Parliament, and some of the present Government members were the worst offenders.

Mr. RODDA: Ned Kelly rides again!

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not tolerate discussion other than that relevant to the clause being discussed.

Mr. RODDA: The Government wants money, and we know it needs it: penalties like this will provide it. Let the seat warmers and the puppets of unionism get up and say something.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Unless the honourable member stops making these remarks I shall have to name him.

Mr. RODDA: We are dealing not with criminals but with good honest fishermen, who will have a class A or class B licence. Many thousands of them will be amateur fishermen and will be in dire circumstances if this penalty is imposed.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: How does a licence holder commit an offence under this clause?

Mr. RODDA: I am talking not about licensed fishermen but about unlicensed people.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Did Ned Kelly have a licence?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I rule the remark of the Minister of Education out of order, and the member for Victoria should not reply to it.

Mr. RODDA: We are being asked to agree to an increase in the penalty for a second offence from \$200 to \$500. This Parliament does not have the right to enact a provision, the penalty for breaking which will do nothing but fill the Government's coffers.

Mr. HALL: In my youth I associated with many people who came from different areas of the State to engage with their families in the recreational sport of net fishing. Although I do not know exactly how many such people there are in this State, at one stage about 1,100 people on Yorke Peninsula held fishing licences, and many of them would own nets varying in size from 80yds. to 110yds. I am therefore speaking on behalf of many hundreds of amateur fishermen. What will happen to these people now? I could not

support any provision that would curtail their activities, although I would agree to a provision prohibiting them from selling their catch.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Clause 29 provides that certain persons shall hold a fishing licence, and clause 30 sets out the qualifications necessary for a person to obtain a licence. Therefore, neither of those provisions would affect the persons about whom the honourable member is concerned. Clause 29 (3) provides that the Governor may declare any device to be a "declared device". Although a net would be a declared device, the Government does not intend to take away from amateur fishermen their right to fish. This provision could merely restrict the number of nets that an amateur fisherman may have. Whereas in the past such a person may have been using, say, 12 nets, he may not be able to use as many in the future. However, he will not be completely denied the use of such a net.

Mr. HALL: I accept the Minister's statement that the persons to whom I have referred will not be denied the right to use such nets in the future. However, the Bill does not contain a definition of "net"; it merely provides that a proclamation in this respect can be made. I should like the Minister to state clearly that the rights of these people will be protected, as "net" could mean anything from a 25yd. gill net to a 110yd. drag net. Indeed, when I fished, the popular size of net was a 90yd. net with two sizes of mesh—the bunt and the two wings. I do not argue with the provision forbidding amateur fishermen, such as those to whom I have referred, to sell their catch. The provision does not stipulate the size of net, for instance, and it could be disastrous if, say, a 50yd. net of 2 1/2 in. mesh were suddenly declared. I certainly would not support the clause if it were intended to exclude the people to whom I have referred.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The purpose of the Bill is not to put to a disadvantage the people to whom the Leader is referring, for this is not a professional fisherman's Bill: it has to cater for the amateur as well. Although I cannot give an assurance on the size of net used, I hope reason will prevail. Parliament, which will have an opportunity to examine this matter, will have its say on whether or not whatever is prescribed is reasonable.

Mr. HALL: As subclause (3) provides that the Governor may make a proclamation in this matter, Parliament will have no direct say in it. I hope we can alter "proclamation" to "regulation". Indeed, what the Minister has

said indicates that the position ought to be changed accordingly. As the Minister did not have the oversight of the framing of this measure, I am sure that he could easily consult with his colleague in another place who had that oversight and find out what is intended.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the Leader looks at the present regulation in force (and I do not intend to get it for him) he will see for himself the size of the net, including the mesh, that can be used.

Mr. HALL: Can I take it that that will not be changed to meet any new definition in the Bill?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The present regulations prescribe the size of the net and the mesh.

Mr. HALL: This clause gives the Government the right, without consulting Parliament, to change that. There might be a change of Administration.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: So what?

Mr. HALL: Do we speak here for ourselves? I am speaking on behalf of the people involved in this matter and, if I do not know what the situation is after the Minister has tried to explain it, how will they know? Many people are involved, and they ought to know the requirements.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At the moment, regulations specify the size and the mesh of nets to be used. What happens in future if there is a conservation problem? Can I give the Leader an unqualified guarantee that things will not change in the future? Of course I cannot, and he knows it. Nor could my colleague give him that assurance. Something might happen next year affecting the management of a fishery which would require a smaller mesh or net. The Leader might then say, "But during the course of the debate on the Fisheries Bill the Minister said this wouldn't happen." It is unfair of the Leader to expect me to say that. I should hope that any Government would act sensibly in this regard, because that is most necessary. The Leader says that many people are involved in this matter. That alone would dictate to the Government that it could not act capriciously in a matter such as this.

Mr. HALL: I accept that the Minister cannot give an assurance. However, he knows that the problem can be dealt with in another way.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Tell us how.

Mr. HALL: No-one will deny the need to protect the fishing grounds and the regeneration

of those areas. The Minister knows that I am not talking about this.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: You're asking me for an assurance in respect of the mesh of the nets.

Mr. HALL: I am not asking the Minister to make an unqualified statement that will bind him forever. All I want is an assurance that, all things being equal, the Government has no intention at present of taking away from people their ability to use the devices that they are at present legally entitled to use.

Mr. COUNBE: Clause 29 (2) (b) provides that crabs may be taken only by a hoop net. I understand that a hoop net was used from a jetty or the beach. I am concerned about the case of those thousands of people who go to St. Kilda beach and nearby beaches and who catch crabs using what is commonly called a dab net or a spear with a fixed handle and three prongs. As I read this provision, crabs can be taken only with a hoop net, so that these people will be unable to catch crabs as they catch them at present. This does not appear to be covered in the definitions of "declared device" or "device". Surely the Government does not wish to affect this healthy and harmless exercise enjoyed by many people.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I must admit that I am not familiar with the taking of crabs. However, I should say that the honourable member is correct in assuming that people will be limited to the use of a hoop net in taking crabs. I am not certain whether they could use anything else.

Mr. BECKER: I am sure the Minister does not appreciate the implications of this unfortunate provision, which will affect young children who enjoy fishing. Did the Minister ever go fishing when he was young?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Never.

Mr. BECKER: Did he ever fish for yabbies?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Never.

Mr. BECKER: Then, buster, you must have had a miserable life.

Amendment carried.

Mr. COUNBE: In relation to fishing for crabs, I have looked at the definition of "declared device". In clause 5 we see these definitions:

"device" means line, net, trap, spear or other implement or equipment for taking fish:

"fish" means—

(a) fish, mollusc, crustacean and aquatic animal of any species.

If the Minister can assure me that those definitions will apply to clause 29 (2) (b) and will not prevent the present practice, enjoyed by so

many people, of using a dab net, I shall be content.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is so. The definition of "fish" includes "crab". Clause 29 (2) (a) provides:

... take fish otherwise than for the purpose of sale by means of a rod and line, hand line, hand fish spear or declared device.

That is included in "device". A crab is a fish under the definition of "fish". I do not see why paragraph (b) is in clause 29 (2), for it permits the use of a hoop net.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

To strike out subclause (3).

The present Act defines "weight" as "length" so I suppose this Bill can define "crabs" as "fish". There seems to be much to be said for such a declaration to be made by regulation instead of by proclamation. Much of Parliament's time over the years has been taken up with arguing whether "proclamation" or "regulation" should be used in various measures. For non-fishermen this may be the most important clause of the Bill, so we should exercise at least some Parliamentary surveillance over it. If the Minister was to say that there was strong practical objection to doing this by regulation instead of by proclamation, I would have an open mind on the matter. Without arguing the point at length, I simply suggest that it may be done better by regulation. If the Minister is happy with it, it is easy; if he is not and can give a good reason, that too will be easy. This amendment, if carried, will mean that clause 5 will have to be recommitted.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have no strong objection to this being done by regulation rather than by proclamation. The Government has nothing to hide in its administration of the provisions of this measure. If Parliament wants to look at what the Government is doing, it makes it a little unwieldy, as the honourable member, as an ex-Minister, knows.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 30—"Qualification for fishing licence."

Mr. RODDA: I move to add the following new subclause:

(3) Where a person satisfies the Director that during the period of twelve months concluding on the thirty-first day of December, 1970, he has been engaged in the business of fishing for profit regularly as a seasonal or part-time business, that person shall, subject to subsection (1) of this section, be entitled to be granted a class B fishing licence.

The purpose of this amendment is to tighten up the granting of class B licences. The industry has been much concerned about who shall be granted a class B licence, and strong representations have been made to those members representing districts containing fishing interests. The Bill should indicate clearly that anyone who has been regularly engaged in fishing for a period of 12 months prior to December 31, 1970, should be entitled to receive a class B licence.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have listened carefully to the honourable member's explanation but I do not understand what he is driving at, although I am interested in what he wants to achieve. I cannot accept the amendment but I should like to know more clearly why he has moved it.

Mr. RODDA: I am sorry if I have not satisfied the Minister. We are concerned lest people who should qualify for a class B licence may not qualify.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why?

Mr. RODDA: This has been spelt out in discussions.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you going to give it to them for life?

Mr. RODDA: No.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's what your amendment provides. Once they get it, they will have it for life.

Mr. RODDA: If the Minister cannot understand the amendment, that is too bad, and it will be too bad for some persons in this industry. This great power the Government is giving the Director—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: This is what we want to hear you speak about.

Mr. RODDA: We are going to clothe the Director with great powers.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You tell me where we do that.

Mr. RODDA: I would be out of order in going back over the matter.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The honourable member certainly would.

Mr. RODDA: This Bill is designed for professional fishermen.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Explain what you said about the Director.

Mr. RODDA: The Director will decide whether a class A licence or a class B licence will be granted, and we have been told that about 4,000 licences will be granted.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who told you?

Mr. RODDA: It has been bandied around.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Who told you?

Mr. RODDA: It is no good the Minister waxing indignant and not facing his responsibility. The Opposition is speaking on behalf of persons who should be entitled to a class B licence. We are not giving the licence to them for life.

Mr. CARNIE: This amendment clarifies what is wanted. What will be the position of a man who has spent \$2,000 to purchase a small boat and has been fishing on a reasonable basis and making money from it, perhaps for two or three years? We want an assurance that this man will be allowed to continue.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Read the Bill.

Mr. CARNIE: I have read it but I cannot see that this man will be assured of getting a class B licence.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Do you want him to have a licence for life?

Mr. CARNIE: There is no question of giving him a licence for life.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Read the amendment. For how long will the amendment give him the licence?

Mr. CARNIE: Until the licence needs renewing at the end of the year.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It will be forever.

Mr. CARNIE: According to the Minister's reasoning, a licence granted in terms of the clause is also granted for life. If I am wrong, I should like the Minister to explain the difference. We are trying to protect the wharf labourer, the railway worker, or the shift worker generally, who has a boat and makes a few dollars from fishing, either to help to pay for his sport or to augment his family income. We are afraid that thousands of such people may not obtain a licence.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why?

Mr. CARNIE: Because there is no assurance that they will be given a licence.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If the conditions laid down are met, licences will be granted.

Mr. CARNIE: The clause does not guarantee that. I should like the Minister to explain what he has against the amendment. Thousands of persons may lose the right they have to catch and sell fish.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Then why don't you move an amendment to see that they get licences, without an assurance? You cannot do it, and you know it.

Mr. CARNIE: The amendment provides that, if a person has been engaged in fishing for profit for a specified period, he shall, subject to subclause (1), have the right to continue.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I want to know the reason behind the amendment, but you won't tell me.

Mr. CARNIE: There is no ulterior motive in this. I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. RODDA: I have no ulterior motive in moving this amendment. I have merely tried to ensure that a person who has done a reasonable amount of part-time fishing will be granted a class B licence. I realize that if a person does not carry out enough part-time fishing, or if he fails to satisfy the Minister about certain things, his licence can be revoked.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Victoria wants to safeguard people who have fished for profit in a small way and to ensure that they have a chance to do so in future. However, it would be impossible to guarantee class B licences to everyone who has been in this category. As it is difficult to detail precisely what must be done, we have to accept the administration of the Act through the Director and the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I oppose the amendment. Does the member for Victoria suspect that, for some reason, if a person has been fishing part-time we will prevent him from being granted a licence? If a person can satisfy the Director about the conditions contained in this clause, it is unlikely that he will be denied a class B licence. I do not know what the result of the Bill will be concerning class B licences, nor does anyone else, including the Director of Fisheries. The Bill will be applied as it reads and, if these provisions are applied, no one will be unjustly denied a class B licence. If there is a dispute, provision is made for the matter to be referred from the Director to the Minister, then to a competent arbitrator. It does not follow that those concerned with the administration of this legislation would capriciously or carelessly disregard an application for a class B licence. I do not think the honourable member need worry about the matter: I am certain it will be all right.

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister say whether people who have full-time jobs and who have been weekend fishermen will be excluded under the class B licence provisions?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Members should be fair. How can I give any honourable member an unqualified assurance that that will happen when in fact the Director, under the Minister, will administer the legislation? I cannot do that. Every case must be treated on its merits in accordance with the

provisions of the legislation. I will not compromise myself: the assurance is not given.

Mr. RODDA: I assure the Committee that there is no ulterior motive or political reasoning behind this amendment. It has been moved in the sincere belief that it will improve the Bill and ensure that fishermen get a fair go. However, the Minister has made it obvious that he will not accept the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.
Clauses 31 and 32 passed.

Clause 33—"Application for licence and fees."

Mr. CARNIE: I move:

In subclause (3) to strike out "sixty-five" and insert "sixty".

The Act being repealed provides that a person aged 60 years may be issued with a fishing licence without fee if, in the Minister's opinion, he is a fisherman of long standing and in necessitous circumstances. This Bill alters that age to 65 years for a reason that I am at a loss to understand.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is the retiring age.

Mr. CARNIE: Yes, but 65 years has been the retiring age for a long time, yet 60 years was the age relevant to the concession. A group of fishermen have asked me to submit that exservicemen over 60 years of age should be granted the concession. I realize that the Minister has foreshadowed an amendment to this subclause, but I believe the provision will be less unwieldy if the concession is granted to all eligible fishermen aged 60 years or more.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member is very generous! He can hand out fishing licences without fee to anyone over 60 years of age if he wants to! I prefer the provision for 65 years except in the case of exservicemen and merchant seamen, who are eligible for a pension at 60 years of age. If pensioners are in necessitous circumstances we are willing to issue licences to them without charge. I cannot accept the amendment but I foreshadow an amendment to cover exservicemen and merchant seamen.

Mr. CARNIE: I accept the Minister's explanation. I moved the amendment partly to prevent the subclause from becoming verbose. The Minister accused me of handing out largesse. Has the Minister any idea how many people have qualified under the present provision, which allows people of 60 years of age in necessitous circumstances to obtain a licence without charge?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Absolutely none.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

In subclause (3) after "sixty-five years" to insert "or being an exserviceman or Australian seaman has attained the age of sixty years,"

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (3) before "fisherman" to insert "commercial".

Commercial fishermen, not amateurs, are involved in this provision, and my amendment puts the provision in order.

Mr. CARNIE: Obviously, I support this amendment, because there is on the file in my name an amendment in exactly the same terms, as there are other amendments occurring later in the Bill.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved to insert the following new subclause:

(6) In this section—

"Australian seaman" means a person who, during any war in which the Commonwealth has been engaged was, while domiciled in a State of the Commonwealth, employed in any capacity in sea-going service on a ship:

"exserviceman" means a person who has been a member of the naval, military or airforce of the Commonwealth, the United Kingdom or any part of the British Commonwealth, during any war in which the Commonwealth has been engaged.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 34 to 36 passed.

Clause 37—"Surrender and revocation of licences and permits."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:
To strike out subclause (3).

The effect of this amendment is to remove a provision that would enable the Minister to suspend the fishing licence or permit of a person charged with an offence, pending the disposing of that charge. An approach was made in this matter by the industry, and I sincerely believe that the present provision is too severe. Where, for instance, a person is charged with a traffic offence, he is not deprived of his licence to drive a vehicle (if it is a case for suspension) until the charge is heard and he has been found guilty. In other words, a man is innocent until he is proven guilty, and I do not see why that should not apply here. I think the request made by the industry is perfectly reasonable,

and I ask the Committee to support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 38 to 40 passed.

Clause 41—"Breach of conditions of licence or permit."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

After "41" to insert "(1)"; and to insert the following new subclause:

(2) A person who is not the holder of a fishing licence shall not sell any fish caught by him. Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

The effect of this amendment is to make it clear that an unlicensed person may not sell fish that he has caught. There was some doubt about the existing provision, and the amendment clarifies it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 42—"Special permits to take and sell fish."

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister say for what purpose special permits may be granted under subclause (1)?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This provision confers on the Minister power to grant a special permit to any person to take fish. It is thought that such permits may be required to facilitate research or for stocking waters. A similar but more limited power is contained in section 7 (1) (d) of the present Act. It relates to special circumstances, and I think it is a reasonable provision. It is under the strict control of the Director.

Clause passed.

Clauses 43 to 47 passed.

Clause 48—"Mutilation of fish subject to size limits."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (4) after "thereon" to insert "or for the purposes of being used for bait in the course of lawful commercial fishing operations".

Under this clause, the mutilation of certain fish on a boat is forbidden. This is an aid to detecting the taking of undersize fish. An inspector would not be able to detect whether the person concerned had undersize fish in his possession if the fish were mutilated. An exception is made in the case of fish used for food, although I suppose one could still get into trouble for taking fish that were undersize. Representations have been made by the industry stating that it would be reasonable also to provide that fish can be mutilated for bait in commercial fishing, and I think that is fair and reasonable. I do not think professional

fishermen are the sort of people who abuse these provisions, anyway.

Mr. CARNIE: Obviously, once again, I support the amendment, because I have an identical amendment standing in my name. Although I might have expected the treatment that I have received in this regard from other Ministers, I did not expect it from the Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Perhaps I should make an explanation here for the honourable member, because he referred to me this afternoon as being rude. I took exception to this because, as a rule, I do not try to be rude to other members. Representations were made to me and, to the best of my knowledge, I was the only person to receive those representations. I do not make it a practice to look at what is on the file. First, I want to explain the position of the Parliamentary Counsel who advises us. It is not his place to tell me or anyone else what another member is doing. Therefore, I was not aware that the amendments of the member for Flinders had been drafted. Secondly, whether by negligence or otherwise, I had not looked at the Bill file, so I had not seen the amendments there. I prided myself on the fact that I was the only person that these people had approached. That turned out not to be the case. I make it clear to the honourable member that I was not being rude.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I can understand what the Minister has said, but I think the member for Flinders has had a rough deal. The Government has had virtually a year to discuss these matters. The member for Flinders met many fishermen, as I did (and no doubt the Minister did), and went to the trouble of making out these amendments. This problem could have been solved easily if the Minister had given his explanation earlier and allowed the honourable member to move his amendment, which was on the file days before the Minister put his amendment there.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 49 passed.

Clause 50—"Limit on devices used without licence."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move: In subclause (1) to strike out "with more than two devices"; and after "time" to insert: with a number of devices more than—

(a) in the case of a device or any particular kind of device, the number prescribed in relation to that kind of device; or

(b) in any case, the number prescribed in relation to devices generally.

At present it is provided that an unlicensed fisherman may fish with only two devices at the same time. The effect of the amendments will be to allow more flexibility in this area. Under the amendments the maximum numbers can be prescribed by regulation in relation to the various kinds of device, together with an overall maximum number. Previously, the Act laid down that only two devices could be used. That meant that, under the current regulations, people who were using three cray pots would be deprived of the use of one pot. It was also provided that they could use only that number of devices at any one time. This meant that if they were using two cray pots they could not use any other device. We believe it would be ludicrous for an amateur fisherman not to be able to set his cray pots and then use a rod or hand line as well.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 51 passed.

Clause 52—"Hindering use of and damaging devices."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

In subclause (3) after "taking fish" to insert "or interfere with or take fish from any receptacle containing fish".

The effect of this amendment will be to create an offence for interfering with fish in a receptacle. It is understood that the commission of such an offence could often result in loss to the consignor of the fish. Also, sometimes, as a result of jealousy or ill-will amongst fishermen, a person may interfere with another person's receptacle, adding to it undersize fish in an effort to get that person into trouble. I have been told that this has happened more than once. The industry has asked for this reasonable provision to be included.

Mr. RODDA: As the member for Flinders had drafted a similar amendment, we must support the Minister's amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 53 to 55 passed.

Clause 56—"Regulations."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

After paragraph (f) to add the following new paragraph:

(fa) regulating, restricting or prohibiting the use of any device, or any device of a class or kind of devices, by the holder of a class B fishing licence;

This amendment will permit appropriate regulations to be made regulating the fishing

activities of part-time commercial fishermen. In other words, by regulation the type of device and number of devices that a part-time or class B fisherman will be able to use will be specified, and I think this is desirable. As this will be done by regulation, Parliament will have the opportunity to draw attention to any inadequacies it believes exist.

Mr. RODDA: Obviously, the Government has some intentions in regard to what a holder of a class B licence can do. The Minister was not very explicit in his explanation. New paragraph (fa) regulates and restricts. What this will do to fishermen with class B fishing licences is topical. The Minister has wide powers here. What does the Government mean by new paragraph (fa)?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It means exactly what it says: we are going to regulate.

Mr. Rodda: Will you expand that?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I am not prepared to do that because the regulation will come before Parliament, and that will be the time to look at it and decide whether or not it is reasonable. Further than that, I cannot say what it means, but the honourable member will have an opportunity to see the regulations, so we are not hiding anything.

Mr. RODDA: As the plan unfolds, what will happen to the holder of a class B licence?

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 57 to 66 passed.

Clause 67—"Fisheries Research and Development Fund."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN I move:

In subclause (2) (a) to strike out "one-third" and insert "one-half".

The effect of this amendment is to increase the amount payable into the Fisheries Research and Development Fund.

Mr. Venning: What does the Government contribute to research?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There is a provision, of course, for the appropriation of any other moneys that Parliament may decide upon. I remind the member for Rocky River that \$10,000 was given by the Government in this current financial year towards research in the South-East of South Australia, to which the industry donated \$13,000.

Mr. Venning: Very good!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The fact that the effort was made is worth something. If the honourable member is asking who will pay for the fund, the answer is that the fishermen will pay for it. Also, there is

some sacrifice on the part of the Government, because in the past all funds collected from this source have gone to the administration of the department, but that will no longer be the case. So the taxpayer will contribute towards the industry as well. The industry is an asset to South Australia, and I know as well as anybody here what an asset it is. It was decided by the Government initially that one-third of the total amount collected in this way would be an appropriate amount to put into the Fisheries Research and Development Fund. I heard some criticism of this during certain speeches in the second reading stage and from comments elsewhere that South Australia will still be paying a smaller amount of money to this fund than any other State pays. I do not know what that suggestion is based on, because nobody knows what fees will be charged and what will be collected from the fishermen. Does the honourable member for Rocky River suggest that that is a warning of events to come?

Mr. Venning: No.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is a fairly generous gesture on the part of the Government. We could follow the practice in Western Australia and collect \$100,000. However, the total catch is much greater there than it is in South Australia. The Western Australian Government takes three-quarters of 1 per cent of the total annual catch. However, it does not matter where the money comes from: in effect, the fishermen pay. The processors in South Australia will pay for it, too, because it is the first time they have been licensed. Half of what they will pay will go towards research. We have been criticized for not doing as much in this State as other States are doing. There are stories abroad that "little Tasmania is putting into the fund much more than South Australia is", but nobody knows the figures. People speak airily of \$20,000, \$30,000 or \$40,000, with nothing to base their assumption on; but they say they have heard it from good sources!

We have to assess a reasonable amount to charge the fishermen and the industry generally. That has not been decided yet: it will be the subject of a regulation to be brought down here, where members will be able to criticize it, if they so wish.

In my view, one half of the amount of all charges collected is a start (I emphasize "is a start") sufficient to earn us recognition on a Commonwealth basis and gradually to enable us to catch up with other States.

Honourable members will say, "Of course, the Commonwealth recently, in 1969, provided a fund whereby it matched \$1 for \$1 any money used by the States for fisheries research", but there is no guarantee that any of that money will be spent in our State. There is an advisory council that decides where that money is spent each year—maybe in Queensland or in Tasmania. Although it is reasonable to assume that, if we take part in that scheme we shall get our turn, it is important to realize that the Government has recognized the need for this fund, and we have made a start. Whilst the industry would like all money collected to be paid into the fund, the Government cannot afford to do that, and I hope honourable members would not expect it to do it. Some money collected from the persons in the industry must go towards administration costs. I hope that the Research and Development Fund will lead to the expansion of the industry in this State, although I think it will be some time before we get the real benefit of the fund.

As I have pointed out to the member for Rocky River, the Government spent about \$23,000 recently on a prawn survey in the South-East. Although that survey did not have a favourable result, until such surveys are made we do not know whether the resources are present. Further, although it was said that no prawns would be found on the West Coast, it has been established that they are there. If the survey in the South-East had been successful, we would have established a prawn fishing industry and also would have relieved the crayfishing industry, which is being overworked at present.

Mr. CARNIE: The establishment of the fund is a good move and I am pleased that the Minister has moved the amendment to increase the amount paid to the fund. I wanted to move an amendment to increase the amount from one-third to two-thirds, but found that a private member could not do so. I am pleased that an alteration is being made, although it is not being altered by as much as I would like. I know the Minister cannot tell me exactly, but can he give me an idea whether, say, \$40,000 or \$100,000 is expected to be paid into the fund? If we know that figure, we will know whether South Australia will be comparable with the other States on research.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To know whether this State will be comparable with other States, we must consider the number of persons in the industry here and in the other

States. This Government does not intend to charge fishermen nearly as much for licences, registration, endorsement or whatever else it may be, as is charged in the other States.

Mr. Carnie: How much do you expect to get?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We do not know how many amateurs will be left out, although we have an idea. That involves an amount of \$4 a year each. We do not know how many class B licences will be issued, although we expect that more will be issued than some honourable members think. I think that at present we charge a class A licence holder about \$12 for a licence, permit, endorsement, and so on, to enable him to go to sea and fish. That charge is apart from the cost of such items as survey. The larger the amount that those in the industry pay, the larger will be the amount in the fund. Every \$1 that we contribute will be matched by the Commonwealth Government, so the amount paid by the fishermen will eventually go towards research. We do not want to charge nearly as much as has been charged in some other States.

Mr. Carnie: How much do you get now?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think it is \$60,000 a year. When the new Act is in operation and regulations are brought down, the figure can be worked out.

Mr. RODDA: It is gratifying that the Government is including this amendment, which will provide for a contribution to the fund of half the amount received. However, we are concerned that the future of the industry will be based on the fund, and we charge the Government with being a little parsimonious on this development factor in the industry.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What did your Government put into it?

Mr. RODDA: We put in more than the present Government has. According to this Government's Budget figures, it intends to contribute \$6,800 to research this year. The Government's record in handling money has not been good and it is the role of the Opposition to criticize the Government for what it is not doing.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We are doing far more than was ever done by your Government.

Mr. RODDA: The Premier gets a little irate. The asset in the fishing industry must be looked after. I commend the Select Committee that was appointed for considering all facets of the industry. However, I remind the member for Whyalla of what is happening on the whiting fields near his district, because of pollution. Only expert consideration of such

matters as this will overcome problems in the industry. Although I support the amendment, I chide the Government for being a little parsimonious.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: For someone to say what has been said by the member for Victoria in his position amazes me. We have been in Government only about 10 months, and I do not think the honourable member should chide the Government for its so-called neglect.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 68 and 69 passed.

New clause 37a—"Assignment of fishing permits."

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

37a. (1) A fishing licence shall not be assignable.

(2) A permit to take fish shall not be assigned except with the consent of the Minister.

(3) The Minister shall not, except for reasonable cause, refuse his consent to the assignment of a permit to take fish.

In the original draft of the Bill by Sir Edgar Bean and Mr. Olsen this clause was included, but it has been excluded from the Bill before us. A prawn trawler is expensive equipment, costing from \$50,000 to \$250,000, and is designed purely to trawl for prawns. The owner of the vessel has a prawn permit, but if he wishes to get out of the industry and sell his boat the boat is worth virtually nothing unless he knows that he can sell the licence with the boat. The buyer will not purchase the vessel unless he knows that he will be allowed to fish for prawns using that vessel. I have moved the amendment at the request of prawn fishermen particularly. I have had no requests from other fishing interests, as I do not think the same situation applies. Can the Minister say why this clause was excluded from the original draft?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It seems that the honourable member wants to treat a fishing licence or a permit as he would a taxi-cab plate.

Clause 38 provides:

A person shall not—

(a) lend or hire out any licence or permit issued to him;

(b) without reasonable excuse have in his possession or under his control any licence or permit not issued to him;

A person holding a fishing licence cannot assign it to another person, and a person not entitled to a licence cannot have in his possession or

under his control any licence or permit not issued to him.

Mr. Becker: What happens if he wants to sell?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He should not be allowed to sell.

Mr. Becker: What if he wants to retire?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: He retires, and the person who purchases his vessel should be competent to hold a licence. These provisions in the original draft were omitted from the Bill because the situation is covered by clause 38, and the Government does not accept the amendment.

Mr. CARNIE: I stress that a prawn trawler costs much money to build and equip. However, that expenditure is useless if the person owning the boat does not have a prawn permit. If he wants to sell the boat to a man who up to that time has not had a boat, can that potential buyer be assured that, if he buys the boat, he will be able to get a prawn permit? He would not want to spend a large sum in buying a boat and then find he was refused a permit. Or, should he first get a permit and then buy a boat? Which comes first?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Can the honourable member visualize a big company coming into the industry and buying up many permits?

Mr. Carnie: It is at the Minister's discretion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Government does not intend to allow a person to establish a proprietary right in a permit. I know people who only recently have established themselves in the prawn industry but they have already tried to sell their boat and permit, and they would have done so at a tremendous profit if they had not been prevented by the regulation. We would be negligent if we allowed that sort of thing to happen. If a person has a vessel valued at, say, \$160,000, and he cannot carry on because he is stricken with an illness, he can get someone to operate that boat on his behalf provided that person is competent to operate the boat. A person who becomes ill does not have to sell his boat, nor does he have to sell it if he retires.

Mr. Carnie: What if he wanted to sell the boat?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If he wanted to sell his boat he would look for a person who was competent to operate it; that person would have to apply to the Minister for a permit. There is no reason to suspect that the permit would be capriciously withheld. However, a person owning a boat must not take the

attitude that the permit is attached to the vessel and that he can hand over the vessel and say, "The permit goes with it." Any potential buyer of a vessel must apply for a permit and the Minister must ensure that that person is a fit and proper person to hold a permit.

New clause negatived.

Schedule and title passed.

Clause 5—"Interpretation"—reconsidered.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN moved:

To strike out the definition of "declared device" and insert the following new definition: "declared device" means any devices or any device of a class or kind for the time being declared by regulation to be a declared device.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

AGE OF MAJORITY (REDUCTION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 7 insert new subclause (5a) as follows:

(5a) This section shall not be construed as conferring any status necessary for the exercise of any electoral or voting rights in this State or the Commonwealth.

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 14 insert new subclause (6a) as follows:

(6a) Where a person died intestate before the commencement of this Act, the administrator of the estate of the intestate shall not be obliged to distribute any portion of the estate to any person entitled to participate in the distribution before that person has attained the age of twenty-one years.

No. 3. Page 5 (The Schedule)—After line 25 insert new Part IVA as follows:

"PART IVA

AMENDMENT OF THE APPRENTICES ACT, 1950-1966

1. Short titles—(1) The Apprentices Act, 1950-1966, as amended by this Act and by all Acts amending the same prior to the commencement of this Act, may be cited as the "Apprentices Act, 1950-1970".

(2) The Apprentices Act, 1950-1966, is hereinafter referred to as "the principal Act".

2. Amendment of principal Act, s. 5—Interpretation—Section 5 of the principal Act is amended by inserting after the definition of "member" in subsection (1) the following definition:

"minor" means a person under the age of twenty-one years."

No. 4. Page 6, lines 9 and 10 (The Schedule)—Leave out all words after "passage" in line 9 and insert "has attained the age of twenty-one years, and".

No. 5. Page 11 (The Schedule)—After line 11 insert new Part XVIII as follows:

"PART XVIII

AMENDMENT OF THE INDUSTRIAL CODE, 1967-1970

1. Short titles—(1) The Industrial Code, 1967-1970, as amended by this Act and by

all Acts amending the same prior to the commencement of this Act, may be cited as the 'Industrial Code, 1967-1970'.

(2) The Industrial Code, 1967-1970, is hereinafter referred to as 'the principal Act'.

2. Amendment of principal Act, s. 5—Interpretation—Section 5 of the principal Act is amended by inserting before the definition of 'agriculture' the following definition: 'adult' means a person of or above the age of twenty-one years."

No. 6. Page 11, lines 12 to 20 (The Schedule)—Leave out Part XIX.

No. 7. Page 12, lines 13 to 15 (The Schedule)—Leave out clause 4.

No. 8. Page 12 (The Schedule)—After line 19 insert new clause 5a as follows:

5a. Amendment of principal Act, s. 132—Duty to display notice—Section 132 of the principal Act is amended by inserting in subsection (1) after the passage "sections 153 and 155" the passage "and the words, 'The minimum fine for the offence of unlawfully obtaining or consuming liquor contrary to section 153 of the Licensing Act is, for a first offence, fifty dollars and for a second or subsequent offence, one hundred dollars'".

No. 9. Page 12 (The Schedule)—After line 41 insert new Part XXIA as follows:

"PART XXIA

AMENDMENT OF THE LONG SERVICE LEAVE ACT, 1967

1. Short titles—(1) The Long Service Leave Act, 1967, as amended by this Act, may be cited as the 'Long Service Leave Act, 1967-1970'.

(2) The Long Service Leave Act, 1967, is hereinafter referred to as 'the principal Act'.

2. Amendment of principal Act, s. 3—Interpretation—Section 3 of the principal Act is amended by inserting before the definition of 'agreement' in subsection (1) the following definition:

'adult' means a person of or above the age of twenty-one years."

No. 10. Page 16, lines 1 to 10 (The Schedule)—Leave out Part XXVI.

No. 11. Page 16, lines 18 and 19 (The Schedule)—Leave out all words after "passage" in line 18 and insert "of or over the age of twenty-one years".

No. 12. Page 16, lines 27 and 28 (The Schedule)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "subsection (2)".

No. 13. Page 17, lines 1 to 12 (The Schedule)—Leave out Part XXIX.

No. 14. Page 18, lines 18 and 19 (The Schedule)—Leave out all words after "passage" in line 18 and insert "has attained the age of twenty-one years, and".

No. 15. Page 19, lines 1 to 16 (The Schedule)—Leave out Part XXXIII.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

This is perhaps an unusual motion for me to move, and I think I should explain the amendments in detail to members. Amendment No.

1. is intended to prevent the Bill from conferring the status of an adult on a person under the age of 21 years in terms of section 41 of the Commonwealth Constitution. The efficacy of the amendment is perhaps doubtful and depends on the interpretation of section 41. It is not clear whether the reference in section 41 to an adult person is intended as a reference to a person above the age of puberty, which is semantically correct, or to a person who is *sui juris*. If the latter interpretation is adopted, the provision might possibly be effective. However, the Legislative Council has chosen to make this amendment, which has been acceded to in conference on another Bill yesterday in negotiations between the managers of this Chamber and another place. Therefore, I recommend that honourable members accede to the amendment.

Amendment No. 2 was a Government amendment. The Bill, in order to protect trustees of existing trusts, provides that a beneficiary who is entitled to call for distribution of trust property when he becomes *sui juris* under the rule of *Saunders v. Vautier* shall not, where the trust arose before the commencement of the new Act, be entitled to exercise that right until he has attained the age of 21 years. Thus a trustee, who has invested trust property for a fixed term upon the assumption that a beneficiary will become *sui juris* at 21 years, is protected. The amendment brings the case of an intestacy into conformity with the Bill as it relates to these trusts arising under wills and other instruments. The administrator is entitled to postpone payment until the beneficiary attains 21 years. Amendment No. 3 was also a Government amendment, and this amendment really reinforces the principle already embodied in the Bill that the measure is not to affect industrial conditions. Amendment No. 4 does not affect the operation of the Bill; it simply removes an age condition entirely, and the Government agrees that that is a sensible amendment. Amendment No. 5 is similar to amendment No. 3.

Amendment No. 6 removes the amendment to the Juries Act. The effect will be that the age for jury service will remain at 25 years, and I strongly disagree with this amendment. In my view, jury service should be a jury service effectively for the peers of those who are tried. Where a man is tried before a jury he puts himself upon his country, and members of the jury are told that they are his country. The jury should be representative of the country, and that includes people of the age of 18 years and older. Since at 18 years a

person may be tried by jury, that jury should be representative of the total opinion of the people who may be tried before a jury. I believe that the principle of providing an older age for jury service is completely wrong and runs entirely counter to the theory of the existence of juries.

Mr. Coumbe: Previously, a person who was 20 could be tried by jury?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. I did not agree with that; I opposed it. When the 25-year-age provision was originally written into the Juries Act I believe it was wrong then and I believe it is wrong now. On the other hand, I do not believe that this amendment is of such importance as to cause a major disagreement between this place and another place, as the general principles of the Bill have been so far acceded to. Amendment No. 7, I believe, is in the same sort of category. This amendment would prevent anyone under the age of 21 years from holding a licence under the Licensing Act. If a person is an adult at the age of 18 years, he should be adult for all competent purposes, and that includes holding a licence under the Licensing Act, if the court found the licensee was a fit and proper person. It is a business like any other. But again, I do not believe that the disagreement is so vital that we ought to delay the passage of the measure on this matter or on a later matter that relates to pistol licences.

Amendment No. 8 requires a licensee to display the penalties for under-age drinking. The amendment is probably pretty harmless but it should be pointed out that in future all offences for under-age drinking will be juvenile offences dealt with by a juvenile court. That court is not bound by minimum penalties. However, it has been put in here, and I do not see any reason to object to it. Amendment No. 9 is similar to amendment No. 3. Amendment No. 10 removes the amendments to the Nurses Registration Act. Thus the qualifying age for midwifery will remain at 21 years, and the qualifying age for a mental deficiency nurse will remain at 20 years. As it is not possible at present to qualify at ages younger than those ages, it is not an amendment of any great substance. Amendment No. 11 removes all references to a qualifying age in the Opticians Act and has no substantive effect on the Bill. Amendment No. 12 is similar to amendment No. 11: it removes all reference in the Pharmacy Act to a qualifying age for pharmacists.

Amendment No. 13 removes the amendments to the Pistol Licence Act, and I disagree with this. The age for holding a pistol licence

will thus remain at 21 years, but I do not concede that there would be many applications for a pistol licence by people under 21 years, anyway, since the granting of these licences is a discretionary matter in the hands of the Commissioner. I do not think this is an amendment of such substance that we should create disagreement between this place and another place. Amendment No. 14 is similar to amendments Nos. 11 and 12: it removes all reference to a qualifying age from the Surveyors Act, and it has no substantive effect on the Bill.

Amendment No. 15 strikes out the amendment to the Veterinary Surgeons Act. A veterinary surgeon could not qualify before he had attained the age of 21 years. The Bill, as it left this Chamber, simply removed the reference to age in order that outdated references to the existing age of majority should not remain. It will not in practice matter whether or not the amendment is made as proposed by the Bill as it left this place. The amendment of the Legislative Council has no real substantive effect in practice. In consequence, I think there has been substantial agreement between this Chamber and another place on the terms of the Bill, and I commend the motion to members.

Motion carried.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from March 31. Page 4605.)

Clauses 7 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Repeal of sections 19 to 27 of principal Act and enactment of sections in their place."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

In new section 21 to insert the following new subsection:

"(4a) On and after the appointed day, no person who, either directly or indirectly, has any financial interest in the business of buying, selling, developing or otherwise dealing with land as proprietor, broker, agent or director of a company, shall be eligible for appointment or re-appointment as a commissioner and, for the purposes of this subsection and section 21d of this Act, "director", in relation to a company, includes a person who owns, or controls the exercise of the voting rights attached to, not less than fifteen per centum in number of the ordinary shares in the issued capital of the company."

I doubted the wisdom of the amendment by the Government to the principal Act to provide that in future those connected with the

land business should not be eligible for appointment to the State Planning Authority. The Labor Party has an insensate hatred of people connected with the land business, and this is an opportunity to take it out on them. That has been done and nothing will save that situation: Messrs. Gaetjens and Roche will now go off the authority. As this has been done, however, we should be consistent. I cannot accept the arguments of the Minister and others that there is such a difference between the functions of the authority and those of the Planning Appeal Board that what applies to one should not apply to the other. If land agents are to be thrown off the authority, it follows that the reasons that exist for doing that also apply with regard to the board. Obviously what the Government is anxious to do is preserve the position of Mr. Ken Tomkinson, who is a member of the board and who is also in the real estate business. Although I bear no ill will towards Mr. Tomkinson (indeed, I have known him for many years and have always got on well with him), I think it is unfair that two other perfectly effective and reputable men should lose their position on the authority and Mr. Tomkinson should retain his on the board. The arguments advanced in an attempt to distinguish the two cases are absolutely specious, as the Minister knows. The Minister has succeeded in regard to the authority; let us now make a similar provision with regard to the board. Members will notice that the terms of the amendment are similar to those used to disqualify people in this line of business from being members of the authority.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister for Conservation): We dealt with this matter when discussing the authority, and I regret that the honourable member has not been convinced on this point. He has said that the reason for his amendment is that there is no real difference between the authority and the board. Yesterday I went to some lengths to show that there was a considerable difference.

Mr. Coumbe: You said one was *in camera* and one was in the open.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes, surely the difference between the authority and the board is explained in that interjection.

Mr. Coumbe: Not at all.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We have excluded from the authority people who have an interest in buying and selling land because they could take advantage of confidential information provided to them. There is no

such problem in respect of the board. Any person interested in buying and selling land could attend all the sessions of the board and, as no confidential material is placed before it, no harm could arise from the fact that he was a member.

Mr. Millhouse: You have confirmed what I have said: the Labor Party has an insensate hatred of people connected with the land business.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member has given no real reason for making that senseless claim. He may be interested to know that I have close friends in this occupation. Also, the fact that I am opposing the amendment is a clear indication that what the member says is absolute nonsense. The honourable member has, by his attitude, made a personal and most unfortunate attack upon an individual.

Mr. Millhouse: How have I attacked him in any way?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Government cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment. We are discriminating against a profession that should be represented on both bodies. If we accept the Government's proposal, we shall be forcing that profession off one of the bodies. I do not know why the Government wants to leave a member of the Real Estate Institute on the board but not on the authority. The Minister says it is because the proceedings before the authority are *in camera* and of the other in the open, and that the information available to a member of the authority could be used by him for his own benefit if he were a member of the institute. But we put people on the authority because we trust them. We should not discriminate between one and the other. If a man is put off one body, he should be put off the other. Many people hate land agents, brokers and salesmen; they suspect them even more than they do Parliamentarians! As people interested in conservation and local government are represented on both bodies, surely we should say to the Real Estate Institute, "You are the agent for the person who owns the land with which we are going to interfere. You sold it originally as a free parcel of land for him to use according to the laws of the land." If there is to be an investigation of the future use of the land, surely the person concerned should have his agent representing him on the board and the authority.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I ask the Committee to reject this mischievous amendment. I will not

deal with the remarks of the member for Fisher, because he did not discuss this clause: he referred to whether or not land agents should be permitted to be on the authority, and that proposal has already been rejected by the Committee. The only argument put forward on this point is that, if we are going to take these people off one body, we should take them off the other as well; but that is no more than a slogan. The member for Mitcham has put up a great cry on behalf of land agents. He has accused us of entertaining hatred for that profession. That is not true. He has pleaded for these people, yet when we decide not to allow them on the authority he wants to go further and refuse them the right to serve on the board. I wonder who has the insensate hate for the land agent.

Mr. WARDLE: It is incredible that the Minister should make such a naive statement that one professional man should be taken off the authority because he might get information that he could use. It is obvious that the man who is on the authority will make sure, to safeguard his position, that he does not break a confidence reposed in him. What the Minister has said is completely naive and illogical and is no argument for taking the person off the authority.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The real reason why land agents are being taken off the authority is that the Government considers that it cannot trust them not to make a quick buck. I do not accept that we cannot trust them or that they should be taken off the authority, but, if the Government cannot trust them on one, it cannot trust them on the other. I challenge any member opposite to deny that what I have said is correct.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill (teller), Brown, Burdon, Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, and Slater.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Dr. EASTICK: The Bill provides that the Chairman, if he so directs, may have the appeal re-heard. If it is, the appellant will have to find additional finance, and in some cases it may be necessary for him to withdraw

his appeal because he cannot pay the extra costs. An appellant placed in such a position should have these costs met by the Crown.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Usually, appeal board hearings are not protracted and the costs that would be incurred, should an appeal be re-heard (for whatever reason), would not be heavy.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister's argument is no defence. A person's case may be placed in jeopardy and his costs increased. I suggest that these provisions are not in the best interests of all parties and should be deleted.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WATERWORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (POLLUTION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 30. Page 4487.)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The other evening I had begun my reply to the points raised in the debate, and I had indicated my appreciation of the responsible attitude of Opposition members to this Bill. Although the powers in this Bill are far reaching, I believe they are necessary, but from time to time discretion will have to be used. During the debate the member for Fisher referred to an article that appeared in a newspaper, and in a debate yesterday the Leader of the Opposition also referred to this matter. I did not reply yesterday, because I realized that I would have the chance this evening to say something about the things that had been said, particularly those concerning my credibility and the statement made concerning the purchase of land at Happy Valley. The member for Fisher followed this up with a series of questions, which were answered in the House, truthfully.

Mr. Millhouse: That should go without saying.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I think the main worry of the member for Fisher was that the Government, or I as Minister, had received credit for something that the Government had not actually done. I think he would acknowledge that his main concern was that in the publicity that had been given to what had been done, whether it had been done in the past or not, we were getting credit for something for which we did not deserve credit. I draw his attention to the articles to which he referred at great length. He neglected to tell the House that on the front page of the *News* on that day there appeared a heading "Happy

Valley Land Bought", and the statement immediately underneath was, "The State Government has completed the purchase of about 320 acres." The question had been put to me by the journalist who wrote the story that the Leader of the Opposition last night more or less claimed was a statement by me. Although he did not say that it was a statement from me, he would not say that it was a story written by a journalist. The question that was put to me was whether or not the purchases had been completed, and the answer I gave was "Yes".

Mr. Millhouse: Two years before.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My answer to the question was that the purchases had been completed and, so far as I was concerned, that was a truthful answer. Following that, this article came out in the press under the name of the journalist, who is well known to all members here. I consider that person to be a very good journalist. Whether or not the story reads as though the present State Government purchased the land is no concern of mine, because I did not design or write the story. Of course, it fitted into a pattern of things that had happened as a result of decisions made by me and by this Government.

When a Government is doing something constructive about a problem as great as pollution, it seems to hurt some people that such a story is written, even though the purchases of land involved, as the member for Mitcham has said, were made two years earlier. I point out that these purchases were made by a previous Labor Government, a fact that the member for Mitcham knows is correct. However, that did not matter! The Leader took me to task last night and claimed that my credibility was at stake. He knows full well that I did not write the story or make the statements that were contained in the story.

Mr. Millhouse: You made statements which appeared in the *Advertiser* the next morning and which gave the same story.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Many funny things appear in newspapers. The Leader of the Opposition may chuckle. I was rather amused about something that I read in a newspaper only today. The Leader probably will deny this statement, but it appears in a newspaper that circulates in my district, and it is relevant to the present subject because we are discussing something which has appeared in the press and to which the member for Fisher referred at great length in his speech.

Mr. Coumbe: We are debating the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes, and I will come back to that in a minute. This report of the proceedings of an open session of the Liberal Party conference held in Mount Gambier states:

Mr. Hall also claimed that some people were saying that he was too much under the influence of Mr. Millhouse, Attorney-General in the Hall Cabinet. He went on to say that any L.C.L. members who made such suggestions were traitors to the Party.

However, I believe that anyone under the influence of Mr. Millhouse would be a traitor to the Party.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, we are debating the Waterworks Act Amendment Bill, and the only reference I made yesterday to a newspaper article referred to waterworks as defined in this Bill, whereas the article from which the Minister is now quoting does not refer to waterworks in any shape or form. The Minister had his opportunity yesterday to answer with this sort of attack if he so desired.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is closing the debate, and he should confine his reference to the article to replying to the statements made by other members.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I make the point that one can use a newspaper in any way one likes. What the Leader would not say yesterday was that I was not the author of the article he was referring to, and he knows it.

Mr. Millhouse: You haven't dealt with the article that appeared on the following day.

Mr. Hall: Yes, read that newspaper.

The SPEAKER: Order! A point of order was taken a short time ago and I upheld it and asked the Minister to confine his reply to the remarks that had been made. Both the Leader and the member for Mitcham have already spoken in this debate, and I ask them to refrain from interjecting. That is a ruling, and I ask them to abide by it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am disappointed; I wanted to have a burst on this tonight because I missed my opportunity last night to do so. I have already expressed my appreciation to the member for Victoria, who led the debate on this matter, for his comments. The honourable member made the observation that no compensation was payable in instances where we had to enforce certain things under the legislation. However, the provisions for zoning in this Bill are similar to those in the Planning and Development Act, which contains no mention of compensation. I think the honourable member would

realize that economically it would be practically impossible for the Government to compensate people for all the effects that flow from any of the controls we might happen to apply under this legislation.

The member for Victoria also referred to watercourses and said that he was a little concerned that the provision in this respect could lead to some confusion. I remind him that the definition of "watercourse" clearly refers to the bed of the creek. I think he then referred to the side of the hill, or something like that. This would come under the definition of "watershed". Therefore, I do not think he has any cause for concern on that matter. In my second reading explanation I said:

The proposals are aimed, as much as possible, at minimum interference with existing activities while still preventing undesirable new activities.

The member for Fisher referred to some matters that were causing concern to people in the Happy Valley area. He said he was worried that the new fire station there might be demolished. Land for the new fire station has been leased to the council and there is no thought that the building will have to be demolished, as it has been sited to suit the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Highways Department and the council. So, the honourable member need have no fears about that matter.

The department has not taken action to acquire the institute building to which the member for Fisher referred, because eventually it will be affected by the proposed new highway to be built by the Highways Department; at that stage the institute trustees will be given the opportunity to discuss with the department the acquisition of the building, and no pressure will be applied by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

No further houses are to be purchased in the Happy Valley acquisition project. Certain substandard houses have been demolished already and the other houses are being leased to private people and departmental employees. There is no intention of demolishing these houses until they become uneconomic to maintain. So, the member for Fisher can be assured that the programme of land acquisition at Happy Valley has been completed. I hope he will pass on that message to his constituents.

Provided that toilet facilities and sanitary arrangements are satisfactory, there is no intention that the activities of church organizations, youth camps, national fitness organizations, the Schutzenfest and the Oakbank race

meetings will be affected. However, I think the honourable member was quite correct in drawing attention to the fact that activities conducted by those organizations create pollution within the watershed and are therefore of concern to the department. We could not treat the pop festival at Myponga in isolation, because other activities such as the Kersbrook rodeo are conducted.

Mr. Coumbe: Does that apply to the lion park?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Regarding township areas in the catchment area, the member for Fisher is fully aware that council representatives and departmental officers have discussed the areas affected and I think general agreement has been reached, perhaps not with great enthusiasm but nevertheless with a sense that this is necessary. I was interested in the statements of the members for Fisher and Heysen that they were not happy with the proposal for 20-acre subdivisions. That policy was formulated when the member for Victoria was Minister of Works, and I have no quarrel with the policy. It was considered then that it would be far too restrictive not to allow any subdivision at all outside a township area and it was therefore decided to allow 20-acre subdivisions, each of which could have one one-acre allotment. I can understand the department's concern about this matter. It had the choice of allowing no subdivision or subdivisions of 20 acres. Whilst the member for Fisher can say that the policy will lead to units that are not economically viable, if the previous Minister of Works had decided to adopt any other policy he would have had a much bigger problem on his hands.

The member for Kavel referred to the use of insecticides and fertilizers and the effect of animal droppings. The department is investigating the extent of the pollution caused by these agents in catchment areas. The investigation will take at least five years before meaningful results can be achieved. In the meantime activities within the catchment areas at or about the present level will not be curtailed; the *status quo* will be maintained during the period required for the investigation.

The member for Light referred to the Darby report. I am sympathetic with the views he expressed about the problems that can occur through requiring people to move from a familiar environment. A report is being prepared by the Public Health Department, and the Engineering and Water Supply Department is involved only in the provision of laboratory services. Consequently, it will be

necessary for me to obtain a report from the Public Health Department on the honourable member's question.

The member for Light also referred to the multi-million dollar winery in a back corner of the Light District. If the honourable member was referring to Wynn's winery, I point out that Mr. Wynn has already had discussions with the department and a certain amount of agreement has been reached on the subject, but I am unaware of the details of that agreement.

The member for Light also referred to the One Tree Hill private water supply, which has been operated with the full knowledge, assistance and approval of the department. No action will be taken to bring that supply under departmental control, because of the definition of "waterworks". In connection with zoning boundaries, the department will take into account the specific problems raised by the member for Light when it discusses with various landholders their activities.

The member for Torrens wanted to know how new section 57 would affect the drainage arrangements into the Torrens River of certain councils. The new section applies only to watercourses within a proclaimed watershed. The Torrens River below the Gorge weir is not within a catchment area and, consequently, councils below the weir will not be affected by this new section.

Mr. Coumbe: What can you tell us about the right of appeal of a person whose property is affected?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I went through the various speeches made and thought I had noted most of the matters raised that needed to be replied to at this stage. I appreciate the attitude of members to the problems that confront the department in this area, and I appreciate also their attitude to the far-reaching controls that we are seeking under this Bill. I hope members will understand that those controls are necessary and will realize that, irrespective of the Minister in whose hands these controls may be, they will not be used unwisely or without discretion.

Dr. Eastick: This relates to the sociological aspects.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was interested in that point, because there is a real problem here. I was most reluctant to take the decision that I took in relation to Chain of Ponds. Not only was I responsible for moving people from the town and from

their homes but also I was actually destroying the town. I was born in a small town, for which I have much affection. I know what my reaction would be to any action taken by the Government to destroy that town. However, I am convinced that the decision taken concerning Chain of Ponds is the correct decision. This problem exists over the whole watershed area, as we are continually dealing with people, whose livelihood must also be considered. The present situation is the result of a lack of planning in the first place, yet who am I to criticize those who could not foresee at the time that this would happen? I suppose that as Minister of Works I should be taking action to ensure that this sort of situation does not arise in the future, but I am assuring members that we cannot catch up with everything. However, I hope members appreciate the need for this measure and that the Bill will receive a speedy passage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Watersheds and zones."

Mr. COURCEL: Disregarding compensation, I should like to know whether a citizen who may be adversely affected, either financially or physically, has a right of appeal to the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): To my knowledge, there is no right of appeal, and I am disappointed that I did not note this point in the second reading debate and have it examined. No right of appeal is provided in the Act, and it evidently is not thought necessary here. However, any person handling this matter would have to be extremely careful not to use his powers arbitrarily or capriciously. As the legislation covers so many matters, it may be thought that the provision of a right of appeal could result in many appeals being lodged, hindering the operation of the Act.

Mr. COURCEL: If the Minister wishes, perhaps we can pass the Bill and, before it passes in another place, he may desire to suggest an amendment to be moved at that stage.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am happy to do that.

Dr. EASTICK: The action taken in respect of new section 9a(1) will in point of fact always be shock action. By its very nature the proclamation involved would not be canvassed other than in the highest Government circles. Interested groups would not be able

to discuss the matter in advance of the proclamation's being made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not think it would be shock action; I do not think any watershed would be proclaimed unless it could be proved decisively that it was part of a watershed. Recently the member for Heysen introduced to me people concerned with establishing a lion park at Kangarilla. Although it is expected that at some future time that area will be declared a watershed (and I made this clear), the Government has no intention of declaring it a watershed until such time as it is to be so used. However, at present we are taking the precaution of warning people that it is a potential watershed.

Dr. Eastick: The announcement is likely to be given without notice after considerable discussions within the department at a high level.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Baker Gully dam is about 10 years away, but already people in the area know that they are likely to be subject to controls under this provision and that this area will be used eventually as a watershed. People from the department have conferred with people in the area, telling them what they will and will not be able to do. We have no power to tell people what they can do now: we are simply pointing out that in eight or 10 years this will be a watershed area and certain restrictions will apply. That is not a shock announcement. Because of the expense involved, catchment areas are planned a long way ahead.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister will recall the Chain of Ponds case. Areas around reservoirs must be controlled if we are to have clean water. To preserve the quality of water, the Minister will probably have to acquire much land near watercourses, and will probably have to fence off areas. Under this clause he has power to do this. Can the Minister say what plans he has in hand to ensure a pure water supply for the city?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: We are dealing with the proclamation of watersheds and not with the general question of what action I intend to take to protect them. The honourable member referred to the purchase of land at Chain of Ponds. We gave 10 years' warning in that case. We were not declaring a watershed there, as it was already a watershed area. I think I have explained how people in the prospective watershed areas are warned. As the member for Heysen knows, not many people in the Clarendon area would not know the extent of the watershed. There should be

no concern about shock announcements, because people will get ample warning.

Mr. McANANEY: I think people have had a fair warning of what will happen in these zones. However, I do not think inspectors have given accurate information or have used the right approach. The department issued a long screed about what would happen in zones 1 and 2. Inspectors who have had no authority have gone around zone 1 telling people that they could not increase their present number of cows and so on, when that was contrary to what was contained in the pamphlet that was issued. This causes uncertainty in the area about what is going to happen, especially when we get the top people in the department saying one thing and other officials saying that something else will be done. Such contradictory statements are not good for public relations. Something definite should be said so that the people concerned will know what will happen.

The Minister has said that the areas with reservoirs in them, zone 1 and zone 2, will be declared watersheds, but Baker Gully reservoir may take 10 years to come. There has been talk for the last five years about the new Clarendon reservoir to be built, but it will be another three years before it is started. In the case of the Baker Gully reservoir, it is more likely to be 20 to 25 years. The Murray Bridge to Hahndorf main has been constructed, but it will not be required for many years to come unless we are unfortunate enough to strike a freak year. I see no point in planning a dam for Ashbourne. We need a definite statement about these things so that people who, for instance, plant apple trees now can be told that there may be a reservoir on that land in time to come and, when it is taken over, whether they will be compensated for any improvements made to their properties in the meantime.

The department must make up its mind what its policy is and give its inspectors a definite policy to announce to the people instead of letting them go around misinforming people at times and telling them not to do this or that when, in some cases, they do not even have the power to do so. The whole position must be straightened out. The department has made some efforts to do this, but so far the results are far from perfect. People in an area are generally reasonable if they are approached in the right way.

Dr. EASTICK: When talking of watersheds, the Minister linked all his remarks to reservoirs

and dams. I think he would accept the replenishment of underground aquifers as a watershed, in the proper sense of the word.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Power to make by-laws."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I see that new paragraph XXII provides:

. . . for regulating, controlling or prohibiting the obstruction or diversion of any stream or watercourse within any watershed or watershed zone.

Will the Minister explain the thinking behind this paragraph? Often, people in the Hills area build dams or pump water from waterholes in streams. In fact, irrigation is a major activity in a watershed area, where the people are growing fruit and vegetables or are dairying. This new paragraph confers wide powers, which could affect the great activity going on in these areas. I do not ask for any undertaking—I know the Minister cannot give that now—but this provision could have a far-reaching effect on the use of water in the watershed areas.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: To deal with this there will be by-laws, which will be just as much subject to scrutiny in Parliament as regulations are: in fact, we can regard these by-laws as regulations. Generally speaking, it would be necessary for the Minister to have this power in case the obstruction of a creek or part of a creek led to its being a source of pollution. I cannot think of a specific example of how this could occur, but no doubt there are such examples. People who live in the Adelaide Hills or in similar areas would probably have a better idea than I of how blocking or partly blocking a stream could lead to its becoming a pollution problem.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The thinking behind this paragraph is not to cause an increase in the flow of water into the reservoirs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The whole basis of our thinking is pollution. Blocking a stream can lead to some sort of pollution, which is what we are aiming to control. We must have controls to try to prevent the trouble. Until now we could not do anything about stopping a source of pollution, even if we found that pollution would occur. We can only correct the trouble when it happens. Now we are providing power to stop a potential source of pollution. That is the real power in the Bill and, if used properly, it is absolutely essential. I shall inquire of the department about the matter the honourable member has raised and give him a reply. I realize that I am asking him

to support something that I have not explained fully.

[Midnight]

Mr. EVANS: I am concerned about this whole provision and should like to know whether the Minister will read the by-laws relating to paragraphs xx, xxi, xxii, xxiii, and xxiv. The Bill does not necessarily provide that a person must convince the Minister and the department that building a dam or altering the course of a stream will not create a pollution problem. A natural spring known as Shields spring, which is just outside the catchment area, gives a flow of about 4,000 gallons an hour into the Sturt River, and I visualize cases like that, where people who are using water from springs after they flow into a stream may wish to increase the size of a dam. The property owners may have been using the water for a generation and they may think that, because there is an added quantity of water available to the department, they cannot continue to use it.

I am not sure about the riparian rights in relation to stopping a natural stream and then pumping the water, but I doubt that a person could do that. I think the Minister could direct, under these regulations, that the water could no longer be used. The Minister and his officers must have wide powers, but we should also consider the matter of compensation. A man may be put right out of business and have the value of his assets halved as a result of one of these by-laws. I think that the Government will have to pay compensation eventually, and it will be a pity if that happens after many people have been affected adversely without receiving compensation.

We are dealing with people, as the Minister has said, and with something that affects their livelihood. The first problem is compensation and the second is whether a man must get the Minister's permission before he varies the method of operation on his property in regard to matters dealt with in the Bill. In the case of a dairy, the department will compel the dairyman to provide two or three dams to control pollution. This is done at present. If there is still pollution present after he does this, will he be required to overcome the problem by having to build additional dams?

I know that the Minister will say that there is no hope in regard to compensation, but he knows that the matter affects many people who have made the Hills their home or place of business. Once the Bill leaves this Chamber, that will be the end of the matter until the

by-laws come into operation. If the Minister does not want to provide for the payment of compensation after an authority has considered the matter, he may go part of the way. Is the Minister willing to read out the proposed by-laws on all these matters?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will not read them, but I will make them available to the honourable member. I emphasize that they are proposed regulations only. As much as I would like to say that it would be right and proper to pay compensation in the case of a person who has to move from his property, it would be impossible for the Government to do this. Perhaps we should consider the proposition of collecting money from people who, as a result of Government action, make tremendous profits in these areas, and use that money to pay compensation.

Mr. EVANS: I did not ask that compensation should be paid. In some cases, where people profit from the Government's action, part of this profit is returned in probate and succession duties. A majority of the community should not gain at the expense of a minority, but under the suggested provisions some people will be adversely affected and others will benefit. I ask the Minister to discuss this matter again in Cabinet.

Mr. McANANEY: These provisions give the Government power to control people living in the watershed areas. Although a dairy farmer may have to spend much money in providing pollution control, people living in urban areas have their pollution problems solved for them by the Government installing sewerage schemes.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It has been stressed many times that the *status quo* will be maintained, but a dairy farmer in my district, who lives in the proposed watershed of the Little Para River, has been required to spend much money on equipment to control pollution. At this stage no-one seems to know whether a reservoir on the Little Para River is to be built, so that in these circumstances the *status quo* is not being maintained. The Minister has publicly stated (and I congratulate him) that people in Chain of Ponds will not be disadvantaged but will be given a resettlement value instead of a market value, which is now depressed in this area. I think that is eminently fair and reasonable. These people should not have to take on debts to set themselves up somewhere else.

A dairy farmer in the Charleston area was told by a watershed inspector that he must have a certain area of concrete and a sump

for the disposal of waste from his dairy. This would involve him in spending a couple of thousand dollars. This is requiring people to spend money in order to take action for the benefit of the majority. I think the rights of the minority are pre-eminent. These people are not doing anything that has not been done on their properties by their fathers and grandfathers. There is practically no subdivision in the Charleston area. I think there is a very strong case for the payment of compensation. Although this would be expensive, it should be considered seriously.

Dr. EASTICK: I hope that the provisions that will be laid down in the by-laws will be binding also on the Crown. Many people in these areas will be strictly controlled in the use of fertilizers, yet they see forestry areas owned by the Crown being top-dressed by air with the same type of fertilizer that they have used for many years and wish to keep on using on their properties. I hope it can be expected that the Crown will not participate in any activities that will be denied the people living adjacent to those forests.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am willing to have my officers look at this matter. The member for Light will appreciate that it has to be proved that aerial spraying of forests causes pollution. If people are growing potatoes on the edge of a reservoir and their heavy use of fertilizers leads to a rapid growth of algae within the reservoir area, preventive steps must be taken. It may be that aerial top-dressing of forests causes only a minimum of pollution of the watershed or no pollution at all, even though psychologically people are affected by it. If it is proved that pollution is taking place, whether it is caused by the Crown or anybody else, steps should be taken to see that such pollution is prevented.

Mr. McANANEY: If it can be shown that a person in this area is not causing any pollution, I take it that he will be allowed to continue with his normal activities. Despite the fact that the department has said it does not like pigs grazing on open country, I take it that if a person keeps a well grassed paddock and can show that no pollution is taking place, he will still be allowed to carry on in the same way.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Penalty for polluting streams, etc."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This very broad provision states that a person shall not bathe in any stream or watercourse within a water-

shed or in any waterworks wherever situated. Dozens of children throughout the Hills area swim in dams or waterholes, and it seems to me that they will be liable to a penalty of \$200.

Mr. McANANEY: Technically, under the definition of "waterworks", people who bathe in the Woodside swimming pool could be liable to a fine of \$200.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: It says "in any stream or watercourse".

Mr. McANANEY: It goes on to say, "or in any waterworks wherever situated". I point out that "waterworks" includes all water storages, reservoirs, wells and bores, pumping stations, water treatment stations, and many other things. As I read the clause, a person who bathes in a swimming pool could be liable to a fine.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have never seen any waterworks that resemble a swimming pool, nor have I ever seen a swimming pool that has been erected for the purpose of supplying water to the metropolitan area or a town.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—"Penalty for allowing foul water to flow into streams."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister say whether the department must prove that a landholder has been causing pollution before he can be compelled to spend money under the provisions of this clause? A man in my district was required to build a sump at a cost of \$1,500 in the watershed of the proposed Little Para reservoir, yet the department has not decided whether it will build the reservoir.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If a person did not do the work that the department required him to do and if the department thought it had a case against him, it would prosecute him. Then, if the court decided the prosecution was justified, the man would be fined. If the prosecution failed, the man would not have to do the work. We must remember that the onus of proof is on the Crown.

Mr. McANANEY: The Engineer-in-Chief has said that there is much pollution in the Adelaide Hills but that he does not know the source of that pollution. Only the Engineering and Water Supply Department can ascertain the source of the pollution, but it has not done so yet. At present it might be possible to prove that half the people in the Hills areas are causing pollution and are therefore liable to the penalty provided in this clause.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the department does not know the source of the pollution, how can it prove that a certain person caused pollution? If the department established the source of pollution it could then prosecute.

Clause passed.

Clause 8—"Penalty for nuisance on a watershed, etc."

Mr. EVANS: There is no provision that the Minister's representatives should notify the landholder before they enter his property. The Minister's representatives must give the landholder notice that he must carry out certain work and, if he does not do that work, the Minister's representatives have the power to send men on to the land to do the necessary work. I am sure the Minister realizes how wide this provision is and that all sorts of things could happen on a person's property, perhaps while he is at a sale. He may not even know that the Minister's representatives will enter his property on a certain day, even though he has been served with a notice that he must carry out certain work and he has not carried it out. Does the Minister believe that his officers should contact the person, or should they ignore him and go on to his land and do whatever is necessary to control pollution?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I sincerely believe that departmental officers always take the greatest care to see that, whether or not it is necessary, landowners are informed before their properties are entered. If there is a source of pollution on a property and the owners are away on holiday in Surfers Paradise, should we wait for them to return before going on to the property because we cannot contact them at the time? Common sense will prevail in this matter.

Although the powers are provided, they are designed to cater for the worst possible circumstances. I think almost identical powers are given to officers of the Electricity Trust so that, in the case of, say, a power failure, an officer may enter a property in order to reach an easement. The department will not march in and crunch these people. The department must give notice to the people concerned and, if they fail to comply within a specified time, it must have the right to go on to the property and to carry out the work required. This power will not be abused.

Mr. EVANS: There have been occasions when officers of various departments have gone on to private property and when, going from one paddock to another, they have unwittingly

entered another person's property. This is a matter of concern to some landowners. I consider that the department should be obliged to give some notice. There should be different types of notice for different circumstances. In the case of a definite source of pollution, immediate action is necessary; but, for carrying out tests, perhaps two or three days' notice should be given.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A notice must be given.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am sorry that tempers may be frayed because the hour is late. This measure represents a big move, and it is a drastic piece of legislation. One could call it the "land use law"; it is controlling the use of land in the catchment area of existing and future metropolitan reservoirs: 600 square miles of land, the use of which can be stringently controlled. I have not asked during the debate any question that I consider to be unreasonable, because, as members who represent the area, we will have many questions asked. The Minister is being given wide powers under the Bill, and I hope those powers are used properly. I think they will be used properly but, if they are not, people may be treated unjustly.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CONSEQUENTIAL)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 25. Page 4410.)

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This Bill is worthy of support, and I support it. It merely makes some amendments which, of course, should have been made at the time but, because of the way in which the Bill was completed after a conference, these points were missed. I wonder whether all the points involved have yet been caught. I shall not be surprised if the profession does find others; I have heard of quite a few. Maybe these are the points that were missed, but I have heard of gaps in the Bill. Of course, the requirement for this Bill points to the absolute and utter foolishness and almost futility of the way in which we transact our business. We are doing it again now, of course, this being almost the end of the session, and the previous

Bill was considered at the end of the earlier part of the session. If people outside were told—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must confine his remarks to the Bill and not reflect on decisions of the House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not reflecting on any decision of the House.

The SPEAKER: The House made a decision in relation to succession duties, and this is an amendment. The honourable member cannot cast a reflection on that decision.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I am out of order, the Minister was out of order—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —when he explained the Bill. This Bill is necessary because of imperfections left in the measure when it was passed before Christmas. If that is a reflection on the decision of the House, I suppose I am now reflecting on that decision, but surely no sensible person would regard that as a reflection on the decision of the House.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must not continue in that vein; if he does, he will be out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If people outside were expected to do their business in this way they would laugh.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must not continue in that vein.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: All right, Mr. Speaker; I do not think it worth my while going on, if you keep interrupting me.

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

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RETIRING AGE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 25. Page 4412.)

Mrs. STEELE (Davenport): This is not a very significant Bill. As the Minister said in his second reading explanation, the need for the legislation arises from the shortage of teachers. The Bill alters the provision that relates to temporary employees in the Education Department and the Railways Department; it refers particularly to temporary employees of the Education Department. It seems to me to have been put forward more as a gesture than in any real expectancy by the Government that it will achieve a significant result. The Minister also said that the provision had the support of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which, after considering the matter, realized that it was in some respects a realization of policy relating to the equality of treatment and opportunity for male and women teachers. That

is probably the most significant part of the Bill and is perhaps the underlying purpose of its introduction. I spoke to both the President of the Teachers Institute and the President of the women teachers association, who confirmed that they supported the Bill.

In saying that I think the Bill is insignificant and that the Minister probably is not terribly expectant of great results from it, I do not criticize in any way any steps he may take or measures he may introduce that will contribute to ameliorating the shortage of teachers in South Australia. Everyone knows that there has been a shortage for a long time. Successive Ministers of Education have taken steps to attract teachers from various sources—from wherever they could be enticed to come to South Australia. In reading past volumes of *Hansard* to see what has been said about the shortage of teachers, I was interested to see that a previous Labor Minister of Education said at one time during his term of office that there was no shortage of teachers. I could not help thinking how lucky he was, because my successor and I did not have all the teachers we needed, and the present Minister has a shortage of teachers, too.

It is apparent that, by the late 1960's, there was a real shortage of teachers in South Australia. As I have said before, this is not peculiar to South Australia: it is Australia-wide and world-wide. Nowhere is this more obvious than in the case of mathematics and science teachers. When I was Minister of Education, Cabinet agreed to the recommendation that we should send a senior member of the Education Department to London on a recruiting job. Although the results of this were not tremendously exciting, by the end of a three-month period that he was in London he had recruited 41 teachers to the service of South Australia. This proved that the move to engage in a recruiting drive was justified. In addition, I authorized the recruiting of teachers from other parts of the world. Contacts were established in the United States of America, and also with the Philippines, Malaya, and Singapore. Just how effective these contacts were I do not know. As far as I can remember, we obtained one teacher from Singapore.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: And a couple from the Philippines.

Mrs. STEELE: That was not known when I was in office. This recruiting drive has since been continued. Senior members of the department who have travelled overseas on various missions or people who have gone overseas on

study leave have followed up leads established in those countries. I know that the Minister's Secretary (Mr. Combe), who was also the Secretary to the member for Torrens and me when we were Ministers, has just gone overseas on long service leave, and I know he will do some work for the Government in following up inquiries with some people who have applied to join the teaching service in South Australia.

We know, too, that the Minister recently appealed for any former teacher, particularly in the fields of mathematics and science, to come forward, even if only for an hour each day, a day each week or in some other part-time capacity, to help relieve the current shortage. I sympathize with the Minister, because this problem has continued to beset Ministers of Education over the last few years. That is the background to the introduction of this Bill. Initially I said that the Bill was a gesture, and I wish to speak about this in two ways. First, it is designed to tap another source of teacher recruitment, however small might be the result of this drive. Only the Minister knows whether he is confident of the outcome. I sympathize with him in this difficult situation in respect of the unavailability of trained teachers. I personally am not greatly optimistic of the results that will flow from the Bill. Naturally, it is the responsibility of all those concerned to try to recruit teachers, because a teacher shortage affects the educational welfare of students. So I do wish him well and hope that this will be successful.

The other gesture, I believe, is that it is another step towards the equality that women teachers have long sought. All members know that for a very long time there has been a small group of women teachers, supported generally by the main body of teachers, who have been striving for equality with their male colleagues. I have supported this because I have thought it to be just. Sir Baden Pattinson, a former Minister of Education, was undoubtedly one of the greatest supporters of the aims of women for equality of opportunity and treatment. Whilst he was Minister of Education, he opened the door to the fulfilment of those two aims because he provided the climate that led to many positions in the Education Department being equally open to women as to men.

At this stage I should like to refer to the Karmel report, which refers to this matter in some way. Before doing so, I take this opportunity of saying one or two things about

the Karmel report, because it looks as though we shall have little opportunity of saying very much about it, and it means so much to South Australian education. The Karmel report was released in a burst of publicity. It had been awaited with the greatest interest by everybody associated with education, not only here in South Australia but throughout the Commonwealth, because people realized that this was probably one of the most comprehensive reports—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not want to be unduly harsh on the member for Davenport, but the Karmel report can be discussed only in relation to the Bill; it must be related to the Bill.

Mrs. STEELE: That is exactly what I am going to do, because I shall quote from the Bill. However, I take this opportunity, because I believe, as a former Minister of Education and as the Minister who appointed the members of the committee, that I should pay a personal and public tribute to the wonderful work they did, to the effort they put into it over a long period of time, and to the excellence of the report and recommendations they presented to us. I should be failing in my duty if I did not refer to the report. I shall refer to it in a moment because it deals with some of the problems which the Minister appreciates and which refer directly to the amendment to the Public Service Act.

I do not know whether this House will be given the opportunity at any time to discuss the Karmel report. That seems to me a great pity, because otherwise it will be lost in the limbo of forgotten things and will only emerge from time to time. The Minister said the other day that, when policy decisions involving matters touched on in the report are made, those decisions will be announced immediately they are made. The report covers the whole range of education and refers in great detail to the teaching services and the supply and training of teachers.

One of the great virtues of the committee was that two of its members, Professor Dunn and Dr. Radford, came from other States and therefore could not be accused of being insular as could the committee had its membership been confined to people from South Australia. Secondly, it was broad in outlook because it contained two people not directly associated with education—the Hon. Justice Mitchell and Mr. Ian Hayward. The distinguished Chairman was Professor Karmel, who welded this group into a body of well informed people whose contribution in the

form of this report and recommendations will influence education in South Australia for many years to come.

That is all I want to say about that for the present, but the report itself is complete justification of the promise that the Hall Government made prior to the 1968 election that it would set up a committee to inquire into education. This report is the result. I hope that at some time we shall be able to discuss it in this House. I was speaking of the positions in the Education Department—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is speaking on a much wider topic than the provisions of the Bill before the House. There are only two clauses in the Bill relating to the alterations to be made. The honourable member cannot use the Bill for the purpose of having a general debate on education; her remarks must be confined to the contents of the Bill, if she can so confine them.

Mrs. STEELE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The way I am relating my remarks to the Bill is to point out that this amendment deals with the shortage of teachers, and the references I want to use in the Karmel report deal directly with this. Shall I be in order in quoting from this report in relation to the shortage of teachers and the position of women teachers and the part they play?

The SPEAKER: In relation to the part they play, yes.

Mrs. STEELE: That is what I intend to do, but I must say this because it is the equality of treatment and opportunity that women get in the teaching service that will decide whether or not they will avail themselves of the opportunities that this amendment to the Public Service Act gives them to go on giving their services to the Education Department after they reach the age of 65, the present age of compulsory retirement for women teachers. This Bill extends to them the opportunity to continue until the age of 70, in a temporary capacity.

On page 107 of the Karmel report, under the heading "Sex Distribution of Teachers", we read:

Women tend to serve for shorter periods than men after completing training, to be less energetic in seeking qualifications and promotion . . . Despite the higher turnover among women teachers, and the permanent loss to teaching after a short period of service of many who have been trained at considerable public expense, the return to the teaching force of older married women is an important source of recruitment, and the maturity and more varied experience of these women are regarded by many as a teaching asset.

I believe that is perfectly true, and that women who leave the service to have a family or assume other responsibilities and come back into it are a great asset to education in South Australia. Those are the women who will take advantage of this amendment to offer their services and to go on beyond the age of 65, the present age of compulsory retirement when they have been employed as temporary teachers. At present, women must retire at the age of 60, but they can be temporarily re-employed until they are 65. This amendment gives them the opportunity, if they so desire, to go on in temporary employment until the age of 70. This is one indication of what some women have been striving for—equality—because at present men can go on in temporary employment until the age of 70 before they must retire compulsorily.

What I am about to say would not apply to all women, but I do not know that some women would want to do this. Many women who are in the teaching service now would elect to retire at 55 years. I consider that it would be comparatively few who, because of financial necessity or because they have an ability to teach and are still in the prime of their teaching careers, would want to go on beyond 65 years. I know several women who, after retiring at 60 years, have returned to work in the Education Department until 65 and have then left and taught in private schools until they are 70 years or more.

Some of these women are first-class teachers. Teaching is their life and they are pleased to be taking advantage of this opportunity. On the other hand, some women, whilst anxious to go on teaching, probably would need to be selected carefully. For instance, I do not think that some women teachers who are nearly 70 years of age should teach extremely young children. I think the span between the ages is too great in some cases and their teaching assignments would have to be chosen carefully. However, that is by the way, and it is the responsibility of those who place teachers to ensure that they are properly placed according to their abilities, but I think that the teaching of young children may be a great harassment to some women of this age.

I see this Bill as a two-sided gesture. One gives women who are willing to go on and teach the opportunity to do so, and also it gives them equality. The other gesture is in trying to get recruits from this age group. I am sorry that you have ruled against me, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Karmel report, because there are many references in it that I

consider pertinent to what I could say about women teachers. However, I do not want you to be ruling me out of order all the time on what is an extremely small Bill. There is really not much in it at all.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member would appreciate that, as the Bill also covers railway employees, if I let the honourable member expand on the Karmel report perhaps other members would want to speak on railways.

Mrs. STEELE: I point out that the Minister did not even refer to the Railways Department in his second reading explanation. He devoted his remarks to the shortage of teachers.

The SPEAKER: The Bill makes provision regarding employees in the Railways Department.

Mrs. STEELE: That is true. I suppose I could speak about the railways too, as the Bill deals with railway employees, but the Minister has chosen to ignore the reference to temporary women employees of the Railways Commissioner and has devoted all his remarks to women employed by the Education Department. There is no doubt that, if sufficient women take advantage of the provisions of the Bill, there will most assuredly be some volunteers, and I suggest that it will give some satisfaction to women teachers to realize that in this small matter they will get equality of opportunity with men.

One of the matters the Karmel report refers to is relevant to this and would probably attract more women to the teaching service. That is that the report recommends a common retiring age, and I hope the Government introduces this. However, I understand that an obstacle is that the Superannuation Act must be amended before that recommendation can be implemented. A common retiring age will encourage women to enter the teaching service and will go some way to help overcome this shortage.

I am frustrated in my efforts, Mr. Speaker. I was going to quote some relevant comments from the Karmel report, but at least saying that I intended to do that gave me the opportunity to make a general reference to it, and for that I am glad. However, you did not allow me to say what I was about to say.

Mr. Coumbe: Your remarks would have been very pertinent.

Mrs. STEELE: They would have been very pertinent to the whole question of women teachers and their progress through their career until retirement. As the hour is late and as you have called me to order once

or twice, I will not say more than that I support the Bill and that I wish the Minister luck in getting recruits as a result of the measure.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I intend to speak in opposition to the Bill. I think it is right to have equality of the sexes. We are not arguing about that, but I do not think that anyone teaching young children should teach after reaching the age of 65 years. I consider that this applies to all professions. Even politicians should be retired compulsorily at 65. I know that there are some cases in which a small section of the community can go on after reaching the age of 65 years, but at that age the average person is ready for retirement, ready to play bowls and indulge in that kind of activity rather than be in employment. I know that the need for teachers is urgent and that there is a shortage, but I consider that 65 years should be the retiring age for both males and females.

Teaching is an exacting task. In some cases in other employment persons can work after reaching 65 years, but the average person who is in a full-time job has reached the limit of his ability at that age. I am approaching that age myself and may be putting in a plug for retiring. I intended to retire at 55 years but then I became a member of Parliament, and I have worked longer hours since then than ever before. I think that even now I am one of the youngest members in my approach to legislation and that I am ahead of some other members. Nevertheless, I think that 65 years is the age to retire and participate in other activities.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I am in the unusual position of not agreeing with the member for Heysen and agreeing with the Minister. The overriding consideration is the desperate shortage of teachers. Of course, this does not justify certain actions, but we find more and more that the staffs, particularly in high schools (which I probably know most about), comprise younger and younger people, with limited experience in the teaching service. In fact, on a staff of 70 or 80 teachers with whom I was associated, 90 per cent were under 30 years of age and many of them had had very little teaching experience.

I think that people in good health at 65 years of age have much to offer in experience in teaching. This is one job in which there is no substitute for experience. I know of men who have been re-employed at 65 years of age who have regretted that they have had to retire at 70 years, but they may be exceptions. As the

job is wearing, most people at 70 years of age are ready to retire, but I know of some people who would have been happy to continue. I think we must consider the fact that there is a desperate shortage of teachers, and this shortage cannot be overcome overnight. It will require long-range planning to improve this situation.

Many people at 65 years of age still retain their health and vigor and, in these circumstances, if they wish to continue as teachers, they should be allowed to. It depends entirely on the individual. This measure is desirable and may help to alleviate, in some small degree, the shortage of teachers. Many people at the age of 70 years are still capable of continuing as teachers. Many people who after an active career retire at 65 years of age pack up more quickly than if they had continued in useful employment. I support the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): I wish to make two points in reply to this debate. First, I thank members particularly the member for Davenport, for their contributions. For the benefit of the member for Heysen, I should like to detail my experience in an independent school in Sydney, where the staff consisted of people under the age of 21 years and those over the age of 65 years. Among those over 65 years of age were two ex-headmasters from the Education Department, an ex-inspector who had been headmaster of a primary school, another ex-inspector from the Education Department, an ex-teacher who was 73 years of age when I knew him, and a woman who was 74 years old and who was the mother of a professor of ancient history. The rest of the staff were under the age of 21 years.

I assure the member for Heysen that this school was three-quarters of a mile from the railway station, with a good bus service to it and that, at 74 years of age, the mother of the professor was the only member of the staff that walked regularly from the station to the school and back again each day. I confirm the remark of the member for Kavel that there are teachers at the age of 65 years to 75 years who have tremendous experience, who still retain tremendous vitality, and who would regret having to retire at the age of 70 years. Members opposite referred to the teacher shortage and its effect in secondary schools. I have the figures for enrolment in secondary schools this year, and they may be of some interest to members.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is out of order in referring to this matter.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was replying to the remarks of the member for Davenport on how this additional employment opportunity for women could help overcome the teacher shortage. I should like to point out certain basic points in that argument.

Mrs. Steele: I should have liked to talk about that, too.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid that I cannot allow new material to be introduced. The member for Davenport supported the Bill, which has only two clauses. The remarks of the Minister should therefore be confined to what the member for Heysen said, because the other speakers supported the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I abide by your ruling, Sir. Concerning secondary schools and the extent to which this measure can solve the problem in those cases, it is worth noting that the increase in enrolments in secondary schools this year is confined almost entirely to the later years and the percentage is highest at fifth-year level. One reason for the shortage of mathematics and science teachers is the specialist needs for teachers of these subject at the higher-year level in secondary schools. Opposition members referred to the shortage of mathematics and science teachers. Each year there is a pressure for additional matriculation classes but, apart from that, in almost every secondary school there is increased retention of pupils in the fifth year. This increases the need at that level for specialist teachers, when we consider the teacher shortage from that angle. It is true that the proposition contained in this Bill will not make a great contribution, but it will make some contribution, and, as the member for Davenport said, it adheres to the important principle of equality of treatment for men and women teachers.

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

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 17. Page 4125.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is inadequate, because it makes only a token attempt to create the impression that it is now more moderate than it was in its first passage through the House and that the Act will be more palatable and not be such an imposition on individuals connected with the building industry. The Bill does several

things that tend to give the impression to anyone who has not studied the Bill and the intricacies it contains that the Premier is answering some of the harsh criticisms of the Bill made in the last few months. We find that several important details have been altered to make the Bill's application more sensible, and the provisions in respect of operating as a company with a manager's licence will make it more convenient for a commercial concern to operate. The new provision with regard to information required of directors of limited companies removes to a degree the objection that personal details irrelevant to the consideration of the board were being required under this legislation.

I approve these measures as far as they go. The problem is that they do not go far enough, and the general outcry, of which the Premier would be well aware by now, from the building industry and from those who are a constituent part of it has not been answered by effective legislation here. I am concerned that we are still to have restricted builders licences, because it is this aspect of builders licensing which has been most objectionable and which will have the greatest economic consequence if it is applied in South Australia to the costs of building and to the attitude the building industry has to the challenge of meeting the needs of building in this State. It is this aspect that will remove the incentive from the building industry.

The Master Builders Association and the Housing Industry Association have been to the fore in informing the Premier of their dislike of this Bill, and a number of items have been published to impress on the public the need to disallow regulations. Thankfully, the regulations in relation to this Act have been disallowed. The general consensus is that in 1967 the building industry saw building licensing as something of a cure for the ailments that affected the industry in this State, and by making more stringent the possibility of entry to the industry, a number of builders saw this as a good thing. I remember approaching a number of builders and saying that this Bill would be restrictive and harmful. However, it was thought that, whatever the problems might be initially, once licensing had been achieved these things could be ironed out. I believe that those members of the industry in their innocence did not understand then what a Labor Government could do in the restrictive attitude that it adopts. They could not countenance in their minds that the Government would stoop to

the form of obnoxious control applied by the regulations. The industry was aghast when these regulations were formulated, although we on this side of the House were not surprised. However, I restrained my inclination in the first instance to say to the building industry representatives, "We told you so in 1967." We did not say that.

Much antagonism to the regulations developed throughout the industry, to such an extent that the Premier and I addressed a meeting at North Adelaide on this subject. The meeting, convened by the Housing Industry Association and attended by more than 300 interested people, voted overwhelmingly to reject the Builders Licensing Act Regulations. Subsequent to that meeting, the Premier foreshadowed amendments to the Act and also to the regulations. Happily, the Legislative Council rejected the regulations, and the industry has had this breathing space to take stock, whilst the Government has no doubt gone ahead in formulating amending regulations. The Housing Industry Association, perhaps the more vocal of the two main building associations, has submitted to the Premier its requirements in relation to action on the Builders Licensing Act. The Premier is well aware of what that association requires. I understand that on March 19 the eight-point letter setting out the action required was sent to the Premier; at least, about that time the association's requests were made known to him.

The first of those requests was that the Government should amend the Act to extend the board to include four practising builders. The excuse for the introduction of this legislation was that it was necessary to protect home builders, yet there were no effective home builders on the board. The board certainly had a builder on it, but not one involved so deeply in the home-building industry as are many other builders in South Australia. So it was through this, I believe, that the real motives of the Government were revealed: it was obviously motivated by the desire to control.

Secondly, the Housing Industry Association wanted an amendment of the Act by the deletion of section 13 relating to the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee. Here, the association hit at the crux of the objections of the industry throughout South Australia—the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee and the restricted builders licences, which followed from this operation. Those two things together are the teeth of the legislation. Those controls are there to take the incentive out of the building industry. There is not the slightest doubt

that the guide issued by the board sets out the very restrictive attitude that is likely to develop if the board continues its administration and the advisory committee goes on. This restrictive attitude must inhibit the number of people in South Australia who can operate in their own right as subcontractors in the building industry.

The third request from the Housing Industry Association was to delete regulation 4 (5); the fourth was to amend section 24 relating to arbitration proceedings; the fifth was to delete regulation 18 (1); the sixth was to amend the Act by the deletion of section 16 regarding a restricted builder's licence; the seventh was to amend the legislation to allow the continuance of selling by licensed land agents; and the eighth was to delete section 29 (j).

I do not intend to argue this matter at great length. Much has been said publicly in this House, and there is now not the slightest doubt of the wishes of those who represent the housing industry and the building industry in South Australia. I believe that most of those in the industry would like to see the Act entirely repealed. Those who remain in favour of licensing or registration do not in any great number represent the support for the restricted trades under the advisory committee.

When this Bill is in Committee I intend to move a series of amendments, the first of which will be taken as a test vote. Provided that the House will give me permission by way of instruction, I intend to move for the deletion of the provisions relating to the advisory committee and the restricted trades categories. In this way, the appeal made to the Premier, to me as Leader of the Opposition, and to all members of the two main associations representing the building industry, would be ventilated and heard in this House. Although I do not object to the Bill's provisions, I say that they do not go nearly far enough in removing the obnoxious teeth that will tear apart the South Australian building industry. I support the Bill as far as it goes.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am disappointed that we have to debate this Bill at this hour. Other Bills could have been dealt with to which very little objection could be taken and then could have been sent to another place. I am concerned that there is disagreement in the building industry about this Bill, and that disagreement will continue if the Bill is passed in its present form. Members will remember that in 1969 I was quoted as saying that the whole measure should be thrown out of the window. At that time the Executive

Director of the Masters Builders Association (Mr. K. C. West) wrote a letter to the *Advertiser* condemning my statement; he concluded his letter by saying that I had made an ill-informed, ill-timed and misleading statement. Fortunately for me, my prediction was correct and most of the people who at one time condemned me are now saying that they did not realize that the legislation would go so far and that they wished they had believed me.

We are now attempting to amend the principal Act after a set of regulations has been disallowed by another place. The legislation provides that a builder must obtain a general builders licence if he wants to construct a complete home or factory. At the same time the legislation provides that, if a subcontractor wants to work for a person with a general builders licence, he must be licensed, too. If we are to have licensing, I strongly object to that provision. There is no need for a person to be a subcontractor if he is working for a general builder, because the licence of the general builder should be enough; he is the one who is liable and he should supervise the construction of the building.

If this Bill has its teeth, we should bear in mind the example of migratory workmen who move from State to State and who could be put in an embarrassing position. When South Australia's building industry is booming, the building industry in other States may be at a low ebb; it is at a relatively low ebb in Western Australia now. In that case workmen move from Western Australia to South Australia, the nearest State. However, because of the provision that makes it obligatory on them to obtain a subcontractor's licence, they may not stop here and we may therefore lose their services to another State. I would prefer to debate this issue at great length but, because members are tired and know that nothing can really be achieved in this House (because of the numbers), that would be unwise.

I make a prediction similar to the one I made in 1969. I predict that, because of this Bill, building costs in this State will be considerably increased. I justify that statement by saying that the Bill will force people into day labour instead of subcontracting, and the incentive to work harder will disappear. As a result, in two years housing costs in this State will increase by 10 per cent more than the increase resulting from wage rises; this will happen as a direct result of this Bill. I am sure my prediction will prove to be correct, and the 10 per cent increase I have referred to will

involve much expenditure for our young people who even today are struggling to acquire homes. We should be proud of our housing in this State; it has no equal in any other State. No other State has better tradesmen than we have. Other people come to South Australia and admire our houses. Some areas in this field need registration, not licensing. That could have been achieved without this Bill, which will increase costs and shackle the industry. I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I regret the necessity to bring on a debate on this Bill at this stage, but I point out that members of another place have requested that the new regulations under the Builders Licensing Act be promulgated and tabled before the end of the session. The regulations are prepared but they depend upon the amendments to the principal Act. I would have liked to bring on this debate earlier but we had to deal with other Bills. I ensured that this Bill reached the top of the Notice Paper at the earliest possible opportunity.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that one should accept the submissions that have been belatedly made by the Housing Industry Association. I point out that, when the regulations were first promulgated and any objections were raised to them, the Housing Industry Association had its representatives attend a meeting in my office with representatives of other sections of the building industry. When the association's representatives were asked whether they had any objections to the regulations, their reply was, "No, none at all."

What is more, in relation to the board, the Government will certainly not accept the proposals now put forward by the Housing Industry Association, which proposals are not supported by any other section of the building industry. The present constitution of the board was arrived at in 1967 after objections by the Housing Industry Association to the constitution of the originally representative board, to which it had previously agreed. The association then raised objections, which were taken into account. A compromise was reached, so that instead of having a representative board we would have an administrative board, not representative of the industry but of people competent to carry out the administrative work of the board, and an advisory committee that would be a channel of communication from every organized section of the industry, including all those who were present at the meetings discussing the measure.

I then agreed to proceed on the new basis, as a result of the Housing Industry Association's objections to the original proposal, on one condition alone: that unequivocal support would be given to the new form of administration and that it would not be withdrawn by any of the organizations attending that meeting. That undertaking was given by the Housing Industry Association as well as by others. For it to come up with this now means that we can have absolutely no confidence whatever that any representation coming forward from the Housing Industry Association in regard to the form of this legislation will in future be supported by that association. I cannot agree to amend now the form of administration under this legislation which was worked out in detail and agreed to by every section of the building industry in 1967.

Let me turn now to the question of subcontracting: the suggestion now made in relation to the licensing of subcontractors is that this will somehow produce day labour in the industry instead of subcontracting. This statement is made broadly, and I am blessed if I know how it will work. Many applications for subcontractors licences have been granted. The only suggestion made by the Housing Industry Association was that we should not have so many categories of subcontractors' licences, and on that score no other section of the building industry supported it. The vote on the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee was nine to one in this matter. A larger number of categories was submitted than the board had originally contemplated. The board has adopted that number of categories but, in fact, has then, in the granting of the licences, in most cases granted more than one category to the licensee; so that, in consequence, the very aims sought by the Housing Industry Association in having a smaller number of categories have been achieved under the regulations.

The things that are now being achieved, in practice, under the regulations are what the Housing Industry Association representatives sought. In these circumstances, the campaign that has been aroused in two associations from entirely different points of view in relation to certain sections of the Act (because the original objections of the Master Builders Association were not supported either by the Housing Industry Association—and never have been supported by that association—or by the Employers Federation) seems to me to have little basis at all. However, in relation to the question of managers' licences this, it seems to me, is a sensible amendment. It allows for

more satisfactory administration. The board has strongly recommended it, and the Government is happy to accept it, and I think this is a sensible way of proceeding.

I do not wish to detain the House but, frankly, at the outset of this debate, I did not consider that we should at this stage of proceedings, after this Bill had been on the Notice Paper for a considerable time, be considering instructions to the Committee. However, if the Leader can undertake that we can deal with the matter shortly and without extended debate, and if he wishes simply to test the view of the Committee on the matter, I shall be willing to accede to the request for an instruction to the Committee.

Mr. Hall: It won't take long.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on the Bill that it have power to consider new clauses relating to the Builders Licensing Advisory Committee.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Licences may be granted subject to endorsement."

Mr. EVANS: I move:

To strike out "section is" and insert "sections are"; and to insert the following new section:

16b. This Act shall not be construed as requiring a subcontractor, acting under the supervision of the holder of a general builder's licence, to be licensed under this Act.

I think the amendment is self-explanatory. As I said in the second reading debate, I do not believe that a subcontractor, who is operating under the supervision of a general builder who has a general builder's licence, needs to be licensed, and I can see no reason for compelling him to be licensed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I regret that I cannot accept the amendment. The view taken by the whole industry at the time this measure was originally promulgated was that the only satisfactory way in which we could deal with licensing was to have subcontractors licensed in their areas of trade. The reasons for this will be obvious. One of the means of gaining redress for unsatisfactory work is the existence of the licence and the threat of its removal; this is in place of what has previously been the haphazard and unsatisfactory way of people getting redress for unsatisfactory work through the courts or, even worse, attempting the enormously expensive business of private arbitration. When there is a licensed subcontractor there will be

many occasions when it is the work of a subcontractor, whatever supervision work is carried out by a general builder, which will be found to be at fault.

Several general builders want to be able to show that, in all the circumstances, carrying out whatever supervision work they like, they cannot always be saddled with total responsibility in the matter. Obviously, there are occasions when, on investigation, it will be found to be the fault of the subcontractor and not the general builder. At the time of the original debate many of the general builders pointed out that they should not be saddled with total responsibility in the matter, because it would be almost impossible for them to accept total responsibility. Such a total responsibility would affect their licence. Builders seeking this kind of responsibility are buying much trouble. I do not believe the majority of those who have gone into the matter support this attitude. I remember clearly the original discussions which led to people who were engaged as contractors seeking the provision that is now in the Bill.

Mr. EVANS: Is the responsibility greater for the general builder who employs subcontractors or for the builder who employs day labour? I believe the area of responsibility is greater on the general builder who employs day labour and must supervise the whole work. The subcontractor is concerned to get future contracts with the builder; his reputation is at stake so he makes sure his men do a good job. A man with a general builder's licence relies on a foreman, who may not be so concerned about gaining continued contracts for work. Does the Premier agree that the latter person has the greater responsibility?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly do not. In fact, contrary to what has been suggested by the Opposition, my personal view is that this system of licensing will lead to a proliferation of subcontracting and a reduction of day labour.

Mr. Evans: You will live to see that that is wrong.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

New clause 1a—"Arrangement."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move to insert the following new clause:

1a. Section 3 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the passage—

"THE BOARD AND THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE—
DIVISION 1.—THE BOARD ss. 5-12
DIVISION 2.—THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE,
s. 13"

and inserting in lieu thereof the passage:
 "THE BOARD, ss. 5-12".

The Premier is relying on what happened in the past. In 1967, the building industry was in the doldrums; it looked desperately for avenues of assistance. It believed that benefit could be derived from raising the standards of those in the industry and keeping some people out of the industry. None of the people to whom I have spoken believed that this regulatory effect would result from the passage of the Builders Licensing Act. They believed they could fix up the position when the time came, little knowing that they would be unable to fix it, because the Premier would be compelled by trade union interests to follow this course. Since these regulations were promulgated, leaders of the industry have had plenty of time to find out what members of the various associations think.

It is no good the Premier's regretting their new awareness of the implications of the Act. People who do not happen to be members of associations are only now becoming aware of these matters. Most members of Parliament have had inquiries from builders who are in the restricted trades and who want to know what this is all about. Until these regulations were promulgated, few in the industry knew about the effect of the legislation. The Premier cannot claim to have a mandate because he claims the support of a few leaders of the industry who looked at this legislation as a cure-all for the ills of the industry in 1967. The two main groups involved in this matter are builders and customers. The great justification for the 1967 Bill was the protection offered to the house purchaser. This seems to be much forgotten now. We do not hear of great mistakes by many builders. We know that the building industry is much more buoyant now and certainly has a great degree of competition in it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! The Leader must confine his remarks to the new clause he has moved, which deals with the arrangement of the principal Act.

New clause negatived.

Mr. HALL: I take it I am in order in referring now, briefly, to the effects of the advisory committee. The next amendment deals with "interpretation".

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I can allow the Leader to discuss only the interpretation, not the merit. It is under new clause 3a that the Leader can pursue his argument.

Mr. HALL: I accept that, although it will rather destroy the logic of my argument. As far as I can see, recently you have been willing to accept the substance of an argument on the basis of the first of a series of amendments to a Bill because they all have the one purpose. If the first amendment is lost, it can undermine the whole argument for the other amendments.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I still cannot allow an open debate on the interpretation clause. The other new clause is not before us at the moment. We can deal with the interpretation only at present. Perhaps the Leader can postpone consideration of the interpretation clause until the other clause has been considered.

Mr. HALL: I ask that the amendment inserting a new clause 3a be taken into consideration before my amendments dealing with clauses 1b, 1c and 2a.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Clause 3a—"Repeal of Division 2 of Part II."

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

3a. Division 2 of Part II of the principal Act is repealed.

There is little more I want to say, except to refer to the *Builders Licensing Act Guide to Applicants* that has been published by the board. Although it is only a guide it must be taken seriously. The board would not enter into explanations running to 18 pages if the guide was meant to be irrelevant to its future intentions. The Premier is right in saying that the board is not now harshly dealing with applicants for restricted licences. With this argument, he defeats his own that there is any need at all for licensing. People are not being refused to any significant extent; all-comers are being provided for. The board has given a fair indication of its future requirements and one cannot ignore the standards it will set.

We have been through these things before so I will not deal with them again. However, I give the Committee the substance of what the board is looking for in the future as requirements. We find, for instance, that a person wishing to have his own bulldozer and go into business levelling blocks will need four years of experience to be allowed to level a block. There are some people in the eight-year categories; carpenters and joiners are seven years; and so on. Eight years' experience is the standard aimed for by the board. There are others just as extreme:

ceramic and glazed walls and floor tiling needs eight years' experience. This is untenable, for it is double the apprenticeship time needed for a person to go into the building trade in his own right as a subcontractor. The Bill imposes a false standard on these people and restricts entry. I am sure that many honourable members have had work done by people who may not have had all that experience but who have done extremely satisfactory work.

Inevitably, these regulations will put a brake on people wanting to enter business on their own behalf in these trades. They will also cause demarcation problems in industry and restrict the general handyman who meets a particular need in the community. An important aspect of country life is being able to get a jack of all trades to do building structure work, repairs, and so on. Without these facilities, costs will increase.

The industry has considered these matters and the Premier and I have made public statements. I genuinely believe that we do not need this control. I should like the industry to deal in its own way with the matter of

standards in the house-building industry. However, if we must have a form of control, it should rest with registration and control of the ethics of persons in the industry, making sure that these people are able to face the consequences of their actions. We do not need restrictive entry into the trade.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin and Wardle.

Noes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, Burdon, Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, and Wells.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 2.24 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 6, at 2 p.m.