HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 21, 1973

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

URBAN LAND (PRICE CONTROL) BILL

At 2.8 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to amendments Nos. 1 *to* 4:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

As to amendment No. 5:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but makes the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 5, page 3, line 14—Leave out "16th May, 1973" and insert "20th November, 1973"

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 6 *to* 14:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

As to amendments Nos. 15 *and* 16:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments but makes the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 15, page 8—After line 21 insert paragraph as follows:

"(*ja*) any transaction for the sale and purchase of an allotment where—

(i) the allotment has been created by subdivision or resubdivision of a parcel of land not exceeding one-half of a hectare in area and the allotment has not been previously sold as a separate allotment; and

(ii) the vendor held a proprietary interest in the allotment prior to the commencement of the control period."

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 17 *and* 18:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

As to amendment No. 19:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to amendments Nos. 20 *and* 21:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments but make the following amendments in lieu thereof:

Clause 15, page 8, lines 37 and 38—Leave out "rate of 7 per cent per annum" and insert in lieu thereof "prescribed rate of interest (as in force when the contract is executed by the purchaser)".

page 9—After Line 12 insert subclause as follows:

"(4) In this section—"the prescribed rate of interest" means the rate (expressed as a percentage per annum) fixed by the Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia as the maximum rate of interest that may be charged by trading banks upon bank overdrafts."

As to amendments Nos. 22 *and* 23:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

As to amendment No. 24:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Clause 17, page 9, lines 36 to 41—Leave out subclause (3) and insert subclause as follows:

"(3) In imposing any condition limiting the consideration in any transaction involving any interest in an allotment that has been newly created by subdivision or resubdivision the Commissioner—

(*a*) shall have regard to the consideration obtained in transactions relating to comparable land to which this Act applies: and

(*b*) where a party to the transaction—

(i) has held a proprietary interest in the land for more than five years, shall fix a consideration that is fair in comparison with the consideration obtained in those transactions; or

(ii) has held a proprietary interest in the land for a period of five years or less, shall fix a consideration that allows a fair margin of profit."

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

to amendment No. 25:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to amendments Nos. 26 *to* 28:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

As to amendment No. 29:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to amendments Nos. 30 *to* 33:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

As to amendments Nos. 34 *and* 35:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

As to amendment No. 36:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out from new clause 34 the figures "1974" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "1976"

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

That the Legislative Council make the following further amendment to the Bill:

The schedule:

Page 16—After paragraph (c) insert paragraph as follows

"(*ca*) Section 53 is amended by striking out the proviso;''

Leave out the passage—"section 53" from paragraph (*d*).

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to:

The first group, Nos. 1 to 4, relate to two matters. The first relates to the substitution in clause 3 of "regulation" for "proclamation", which is of no great consequence and which the managers for the Legislative Council agreed to accept. The conference extended over a period of eight hours, as one might have expected from a situation in which there was a strong and radical conflict of opinion between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. However, agreement was reached. I believe that, as a result of that agreement, unfortunately the effectiveness of the measure has been reduced. One hopes that its effectiveness has not been reduced, but experience alone will tell otherwise. The managers for the House of Assembly were, nevertheless satisfied that the Bill as amended and agreed to by the managers was a workable measure that could be used for the benefit of the people of South Australia in limiting increases in the price of building allotments.

The second point relates to new houses. I recommend with some misgivings that the Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments, because the Government believes these provisions are desirable, if not necessary, to ensure that there is no circumvention of the system of land sales price control that is set up by the Bill. Nevertheless, the Council was quite insistent on this matter, and its managers pointed out that if the Government's fears proved to be well founded and the effectiveness of the Bill was destroyed by developers using the method of an integrated building of houses on the allotments and marketing them in a way which circumvented the principles of the Bill, it was open

to this House to put a further proposition to the Council to be reconsidered in the light of the then experience. In these circumstances, I recommend that the managers' agreement be endorsed and that the amendments be not further insisted on.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I think it is unfortunate that there should be even a suggestion that the best result was not obtained. As a result of a true compromise in the attitudes of the managers, we now have a series of amendments giving effect to the various desires expressed at the conference and enabling the Government to proceed to implement a measure that is obnoxious to many. I point out that the amendments do not destroy the Government's original aim. Certainly, amendment No. 5, which provides that the measure will take effect as from yesterday, represents a much more reasonable approach. The recommendations are the result of goodwill existing on both sides, and I do not accept that the Government should have any more qualms about the result of the conference than the Opposition should have. The recommendations, which represent a consensus of opinion, will benefit the community.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The effect of the recommendation regarding amendment No. 5 is to delete the retrospective provisions of the Bill, and this point is stressed by the managers for the Legislative Council. Regrettably, some people who ignored the announcement concerning the retrospective operation of the Bill will now be able to retain their ill-gotten gains but, nevertheless, the Legislative Council felt strongly about this matter and, as a matter of compromise, the Assembly managers decided to agree to the recommendation.

Regarding the recommendation as to amendments Nos. 6 to 14, I point out that amendment No. 6 was simply a drafting amendment and not of great importance, and the same might be said of amendment No. 7. Amendments Nos. 8 and 9 substitute "regulation" for "proclamation", and amendment No. 10 is consequential on that. Amendment No. 11 is consequential on the deletion of the new house provisions, as is amendment No. 12; and amendments Nos. 13 and 14 simply delete the maximum period of tenure of office in relation to members of the tribunal.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16 were inserted as a result of a point made in relation to new developments. The Legislative Council agreed that it would not insist on its amendments to delete the provisions of the Bill that applied to new subdivisional allotments but drew attention to the fact that it was the policy of the Bill not to affect the situation concerning the first sale of an allotment by a person who owned the allotment at the commencement of the control period. The Legislative Council pointed out that there could be situations in which the land, although perhaps only a small area surrounding a house, had been owned for some considerable time by the one owner but had not been subdivided, so that a person in that situation would be in a worse position than would a person in a situation where the actual subdivision had taken place. The managers for the House of Assembly agreed to accommodate that situation by exempting subdivisions not exceeding one-half of a hectare, where the vendor had been the proprietor of that area prior to the beginning of the control period.

The recommendation regarding amendments Nos. 17 and 18 is that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments. Amendment No. 17 was merely a technical point that had been raised on whether "order" should not be inserted after "writ" in that clause. With some reluctance, I ask members to agree to amendment No. 18. This exempts mortgagee sales from the provisions of the Bill. Amendment No. 19, which relates to new allotments, is not insisted on by the Legislative Council. Amendments Nos. 20 and 21 involve the rate of interest, and the compromise reached was that the rate that should apply for the purpose of determining whether land was exempt from the provisions of the Bill was the current bank overdraft rate of interest. The recommendation regarding amendments Nos. 22 and 23 is that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Amendment No. 22 involves a fairly technical matter: it is simply a question of whether the application form submitted to the Commissioner should be determined by him or by regulation, and we have agreed to its being determined by regulation. I do not think that amendment No. 23 is of any importance; it omits the words "preventing or", thereby restricting the objective to limiting price increases in land, and I suppose one would be a super optimist to imagine that they would be entirely prevented, anyway. Amendment No. 24 dealt with how the permitted price was to be determined where the land had been in the ownership of the same person for some time. It was submitted that the concept of reasonable profit embodied in the Bill as it left this place was not appropriate in that situation because profit cannot be calculated, as there is no acquisition price, and the compromise arrived at was that, where the land had been in the ownership of the same person for more than five years, the price that should be determined would be a price that was fair compared to the consideration obtained in transactions subject to the control.

The Council does not further insist on its amendment No. 25. This relates to clause 18, which is the provision enabling a purchaser to recover from the vendor the excess consideration over the permitted amount. The managers from the Assembly regarded this as an important provision, striking out the emergence of black marketing in land transactions. Amendments Nos. 26 to 28 are consequential on the deletion of the provisions relating to new houses. With regard to amendment No. 29, the Council agreed not to insist on its desire to have a further appeal to the Supreme Court from the decisions of the tribunal set up in the Bill. Amendments Nos. 30 to 33 are consequential on the deletion of the provisions relating to new houses. The Council decided not to insist on amendments Nos. 34 and 35, which would have included a licensed land broker in the provisions of the Bill.

Amendment No. 36 related to the expiry date of the legislation. This matter occasioned great concern to the Assembly managers. Indeed, I am concerned at present, for the reasons which I have explained previously and which I do not intend to repeat now. Suffice to say that a compromise was arrived at providing for an expiry date of December 31, 1976. The last amendment overcame a drafting slip which could have had unexpected consequences.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept the virtue of the decisions made. With regard to amendment No. 5, the retrospective provision has been removed from the Bill. On several occasions, it has been dearly said in this place that Opposition members will not accept retrospectivity in legislation unless the most extreme circumstances exist. The recommendation that yesterday's date be included in the legislation is realistic. I congratulate the Government on changing its mind about this provision. By another recommendation, the interest rate will now be tied right back to the Governor of the

Reserve Bank. Therefore, the decision in this case will not be made by the Government or officers of various departments; the rate involved will be related to the total economic position in Australia al a given time. There will certainly be a degree of certainty in transactions in this important industry. Regarding amendment No. 24, the humanity of the recommendations can be seen, as the Government now accepts a more realistic basis than that which applied previously with regard to land held in one family for several generations. Such farming land may have been built around, with the value escalating as a result of actions taken by other people. Regard has now been had to the fact that rates and taxes have been paid and should be taken into account when people finally come to sell such land.

With regard to amendment No. 36, the date of expiry of the legislation will now be at the end of 1976. Several dates were suggested. One suggestion was that the operation of this legislation should be similar to that of the Prices Act, which is renewed annually. However, the Attorney argued that long delays were associated with the development of land, and this argument prevailed. Although the extension of the legislation until 1976 means that it will operate for longer than some members of the community would want and rather longer than desired by members on this side, it is a realistic dale. The Government will have the opportunity to extend the legislation for a longer period, and the industry can operate with relative certainty from now until 1976. In effect, there will be three years in which development problems can be sorted out. It is to be hoped that, as a result of this Bill and another Bill passed recently, more land will soon be available to people in South Australia. As I have said before, I believe that making more land available will have the greatest effect on land prices. This is a situation of supply and demand. Unless the Government makes large parcels of land available, people hungry for land will continue to cause prices to spiral. I support the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am disgusted with what i have heard. Once again the Liberal and Country League has been the junior partner to the Government. When I hear the Leader congratulating the Government, I realize just what a pass the L.C.L. has come to. The Leader congratulated the Government on its good sense. I will make my position clear. I would like to have seen this Bill thrown out altogether as I would like to have seen the Land Commission Bill thrown out. By force of numbers, the Government passed this Bill in this Chamber, as inevitably must happen, despite any arguments to the contrary. However, at present the L.C.L. has a majority of members in the Legislative Council. I do not know whether members do not realize, or are too dumb to realize, that in every Bill brought in that is likely to be controversial the Government asks for much more than it can possibly get; then it has something to give away at the inevitable conference. That is precisely what happened in this case. Really, the Government has not given away anything that matters much. Retrospectivity was an outrageous suggestion and could easily be given away, as it has been. Because of the very announcement that there would be retrospectivity, there had been an effect felt anyway.

The date at which the legislation will expire is now December 31, 1976. I point out to L.C.L. members that that will be after the next election for the Legislative Council. By that time, the L.C.L. will certainly have ceased to control that place. This means that, so long as the date inserted is after the next election, it does not matter to the Government when it is; indeed, it could have been the day after the election, if the Government had wanted it. The Government hopes it will be able to continue this legislation indefinitely, because it will then have the numbers in both Houses to have it passed. I hope that that is not so. However, one thing that will be so is that after the next elections the L.C.L. will not be in any position to block the renewal of this Bill, so that means absolutely nothing at all. As it has given way on the date and allowed it to apply after the next election, the Government is obviously happy.

I do not like to see the L.C.L., even though I am now completely divorced from it, acting as the junior partner of the Government and going along with whatever the Government suggests. However, I suppose a bit of flattery of the L.C.L. managers at the conference did the trick. Indeed, I have no doubt that the Government was shrewd enough to do this. Then we have had this pusillanimous display this afternoon of the Leader of the Opposition congratulating the Government on the fine job it did, or something like that. However, if the L.C.L. had any guts it would have stood out against this Bill and seen it defeated.

Mr. EVANS: As one of the managers, I have no hesitation in saying that compromise was reached. Indeed, I do not take any notice of the dog-in-the-manger attitude of the member for Mitcham. He makes such comments every time he can, yet he seldom stops in the Chamber to speak in debates. I do not believe that the result of the conference is satisfactory to either side: it is not what either side really wants. However, if democracy is to work there must be some compromise. The disadvantage I see in the final outcome of the conference is the inclusion of new subdivisions. I believe the Government is adopting the attitude that it can retain the confidence of developers and financiers so that they will stay in South Australia and operate within the price control provisions that will apply.

I hope that my theory is right because, if it is not, the problem facing the Government will be more serious than the problems that have previously been experienced. Indeed, the blame will lie on the Government's shoulders, and even then the member for Mitcham will not be happy, because the L.C.L. will get the credit in this matter, and he would not want that to happen at all. The other point to which I refer concerns the problem of price control itself if it is forced to unsatisfactory limits by policing. The one thing that the Government and the people of this State want is more allotments available on the market. Indeed, any move that frightens developers, both large and small, away from building is detrimental to the overall cause of potential house builders, be they speculators or young couples setting out to build their own houses.

I am satisfied that the Government still has problems in this area. Further, no-one can say that people are not concerned about the escalation in the price of blocks in South Australia. If the Government can achieve its slated objective through this legislation, a satisfactory result will be obtained. However, the State Government does not have the resources to carry out all the development that we wish to see carried out, and this would apply even if the Land Commission were in operation. If the Land Commission can soon become operative and if private developers are encouraged to continue at a more rapid pace than in the past, we shall have enough allotments on the market.

I believe there arc more than 30 000 allotments currently in the pipeline. With those allotments on the market we

would have three years supply, and this can be done within 12 months. The member for Mitcham referred to a date applying after 1976, after the next State elections. However, if every member concerned himself with the outcome of his own personal or Party situation as it could be influenced by elections, no legislation would be passed by this House.

Mr. Millhouse: Wake up!

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member is concerned only about his own Party. However, the L.C.L. (and I hope I speak for the Country Party and the Government) is not concerned with that aspect.

Members interjecting:

Mr. EVANS: There is no doubt about the honourable member's attitude. I am satisfied that a good compromise was reached, and that the managers acted in a responsible manner. There is no suggestion in my mind that anyone bent too much either way.

Mr. HALL: The member for Fisher may not be concerned about the date applying at the next election, but some other members are. I can inform the honourable member that the Liberal Movement, as the balance of power in another place, will look after his interests, about which he does not seem to be concerned at this time. I am intrigued that the L.C.L. supports the Bill in this way, because this support is at complete variance with the advertisements appearing in yesterday's and today's press saying that "price control means wage control". The advertisement continues to give a short but definite opinion on why there should be complete opposition at the coming referendum. Strangely, I agree about this, because it just happens to be right. In the advertisements the L.C.L. is saying definitely and publicly that there should be no price control. The advertisement is emphatic. The advertisement portrays a thumbs-down attitude of "no price control of any sort to be allowed by referendum on December 8", yet in respect of this Bill the L.C.L. supports price control in this House. How ludicrous can this Party be? I have never seen such a mixed-up bunch.

Mr. Millhouse: They don't know whether they are Arthur or Martha.

Mr. HALL: L.C.L. members do not know where they are: they do not operate on one recognized constant principle. I am as astounded as was the member for Mitcham when he spoke so eloquently. The member for Fisher follows no recognized principle, but we will take care of his interests in another place when the time comes.

Motion carried.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard.*

BANK POLICY

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (November 13).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The General Manager of the State Bank of South Australia has reported as follows:

I have ascertained that in one recent case the bank approved of a loan from the Home Builders Fund for erection of a dwelling subject to the issue of a new Crown lease in respect of the land offered as security, and such loan was accepted by the applicants concerned on this basis. The circumstances which applied in this instance are extremely rare but, in the light of delays which occur in the availability of new leases on subdivision of Crown lands, it is appreciated that a borrower could be inconvenienced. The bank's procedures have now been amended to permit approved housing loans to be made available upon confirmation of compliance with the requirements of the Lands Department relative to the subdivision, execution of the mortgage security, and other relevant documents required by the bank, and approval of the Minister of Lands to the mortgage of the lease to be issued.

INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE

In reply to Dr. EASTICK (November 14).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An examination of the statement made by the Australian Minister for Labour in the House of Representatives on November 12, 1973, shows that the purpose of the tripartite industrial peace conference is to discuss proposals that mainly affect the working of the Commonwealth system of conciliation and arbitration. Subsequently, the Australian Minister announced that the conference will be presided over by His Honour Mr. Justice Moore, the President of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. In these circumstances it would be inappropriate for representatives of a State Government to seek to participate in a conference under the chairmanship of the President of the Commonwealth Commission to which national representatives of employer organizations and trade unions have been invited for the specific purpose of discussing matters that relate to the Commonwealth arbitration system.

WHEAT QUOTAS

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (November 1).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The General Manager of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited (the authority charged with the cost of administration of wheat delivery quotas in this State pursuant to the provisions of the Wheat Delivery Quotas Act, 1969-1973) reports that the cost paid by the company for salaries, office rental, stationery, telephone, postages, and sundry expenses in connection with the wheat quota committees in South Australia were as follows:

For year ending October 31, 1971—$33 653

For year ending October 31, 1972—$32 478.

The General Manager states that all accounts for the year ending October 31, 1973, have not yet been finalized.

LEGAL AID

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (November 1).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Superintendent of Yatala Labour Prison has spoken to the prisoners MacDonald and Farnsworth, and has been told that an application by Farnsworth for legal assistance was refused by the Law Society. However, Mr. Gun of Gun & Davies has been engaged privately by his sister. In the case of MacDonald, an application for legal assistance was refused by the Law Society. Subsequently assistance was granted for Martin and Company to represent him, but this firm refused to act. Mr. Hume of Griffin, Hume and Company was subsequently appointed.

FRUIT INDUSTRY

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (September 27).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: An examination of *Hansard* of the Commonwealth Parliament on the matter referred to by the honourable member shows that the Minister for Primary Industry was not reported completely in the *Murray Pioneer.* In fact, the heading of the press item "Minister says S A. to blame for fruit ills" conveyed a completely erroneous impression of the Minister's actual remarks. The revaluation problem is but one of several difficulties in which the canned fruit industry finds itself, and the adjustment of the Australian dollar merely aggravated a pre-existing condition.

IRRIGATION LICENCES

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (November 8).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A booklet was produced and distributed to all private divertees from the Murray River and other interested persons in May, 1973. This booklet sets out the policy regarding irrigation diversion,

and there has been no change since its issue. For over five years it has been the policy to differentiate between agricultural and horticultural usage, and where agriculture is changed to horticulture there is a reduction in allowed water. This is explained in the booklet and, even after the change-over to metered supply in June, 1974, the same principle will apply.

CORNY POINT WATER SUPPLY

In reply to Mr. HALL (November 8).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Various petitions received over the years seeking a reticulated water supply from the Carribie basin to Southern Yorke Peninsula, including Corny Point, have promoted considerable investigation work by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the Mines Department with respect to the capacity of the basin. Early information to hand indicated that water in the quantity required could not be drawn off from the basin without permanent adverse effect to it, due to the likelihood of sea water intrusion. However, more recent advice from the Mines Department suggests that the recharge area of the basin is appreciably greater than originally thought, and adequate water may be available. This can be determined only by an extensive long-term programme of pump testing and, with this in mind, the economics of reticulating a restricted area in the hundred of Carribie, including Corny Point, is now being examined. A restricted scheme has been prepared. This is now being estimated and a revenue statement will then be prepared, after which the scheme will be considered.

HOUSEBOATS

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (November 8).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The scheme to be introduced by the Engineering and Water Supply Department will ensure the effective disposal of toilet wastes and domestic refuse from larger craft, to safeguard not only the aesthetics of the Murray River, but more importantly, also the public health aspects of quality of this important water resource. The department will construct the first. 13 of the sanitary disposal stations through 1974. Legislation to require the installation of the necessary sewage-holding tanks and garbage containers on the larger craft is being drafted to be promulgated as regulations under the Control of Waters Act. This legislation is expected to become effective at the end of 1974, and will apply to vessels that are under way, moored, or even resting on the bed of the Murray River.

ST. AGNES SEWERAGE

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (November 14).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The sewering of the area referred to by the honourable member was completed in the 1972-73 financial year.

HAMLEY BRIDGE SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (October 23).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The number of cubicles in the toilets at Hamley Bridge Primary School conform with the accepted standards in a school of this size, and 1 am advised that they have been particularly well maintained, are clean and are in good order. However, there are no separate staff toilets. Last week, arrangements were made for officers of the Education and Public Buildings Departments to visit the school to inspect the toilets in company with the Chairman and a member of the school council and the Headmaster. After the inspection it was agreed that the present toilets could be upgraded to meet the requirements of the school by the provision of extensions to the boys' toilets to provide an additional cubicle replacement of the unsatisfactory urinal and an additional cubicle for male staff. It was also agreed that the girls' toilets should be upgraded and that a cubicle should, be provided for the female staff. A local contractor is willing to begin the work at an early date, so that all new work and the upgrading can be completed early in the new year and possibly before schools resume. The school council and the Headmaster are satisfied with the proposals, and have expressed their gratitude for the prompt action being taken.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (November 7).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: An extended advertising and recruiting campaign for teachers is to be conducted in Australia, England, and the United Slates. This has become possible because of the increased funds from the Australian Government that will enable the Education Department to open a greater number of pre-school classes, to increase the number of teachers working with handicapped children, and to enable a greater number of teachers being released full or part-time from leaching duties to engage in study for higher qualifications. The campaign is directed locally at those teachers who have temporarily retired from teaching for family reasons and may wish to rejoin the department on a full or part-time basis. Advertisements have been placed in *The Times* Educational Supplement for teachers in infants classes and primary classes and for teachers of handicapped and educationally subnormal children. The teachers are required to have a degree or diploma with appropriate professional qualifications. The Agent-General for South Australia will handle inquiries in the first instance. Mr. M. A. O'Brien, Assistant Superintendent, has recently visited London to discuss details of this campaign with officers at South Australia House.

Recruitment in North America will be conducted by interview at the educational placement offices at selected universities. Candidates are required to have a Bachelor or Master degree from an accredited college and to have teacher certification. Mr. O'Brien and Mr. V. G. Eyers (Inspector of Secondary Schools) are conducting the interviews. They are seeking teachers for elementary classes and for certain selected categories in secondary schools, notably those with qualifications and experience in teaching slow learners or children with reading difficulties. Teachers of mathematics, music, physical education, science, and outdoor education will also be recruited. The experience of recruiting in North America in the past three years has shown that these teachers make an excellent contribution to the teaching staff of South Australian schools.

INVESTMENT COMPANY

In reply to Mr. EVANS (November 13).

The Hon. L. J. KING: W.A. Pines Proprietary Limited is a company incorporated in the State of Western Australia and is not registered in South Australia. It has, nevertheless, sought investment by members of the public in South Australia. Offences have therefore undoubtedly been committed against the provisions of the Companies Act of South Australia. The company has undertaken to apply for registration as a foreign company in South Australia and, so far as I am aware, it has ceased its operations in this State. The company will be required to comply with the provisions of the South Australian Companies Act, including the prospectus and other interests sections. It is not my function to advise members of the public as to the soundness of investments, but I would strongly advise any

person contemplating an investment of this kind to consult a competent adviser before entering into any commitment.

BUSINESS SAMPLER CLUB

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (November 1).

The Hon. L. J. KING: I caused inquiries to be made by the Senior Inspector of Companies into the operations of the Business Sampler Club. The inquiries did not disclose any evidence of illegal conduct. A person contemplating payment of the $19.95 requested by the club would, of course, be well advised to scrutinize very carefully the voucher book which they are to receive in exchange. Any proposition which purports to involve the provision of services worth $500 for a consideration of $19.95 obviously requires very careful scrutiny. It will be found, on examination of the voucher book, that many of the services will be of little or no value to the subscriber. Others may be of some value to him. It is for each person to make up his mind whether the services are worth to him the $19.95 which he is required to pay. I would advise members of the public to exercise caution. It is not, however, the Attorney-General's function to advise people as to what these services might be worth to them. Each individual must make his own decision.

NURSES

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (October 23).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health reports that, since the Public Health Department became responsible for the nursing services on Aboriginal reserves and settlements, some improvements have been achieved in salaries and conditions including an increase in annual leave entitlement to five weeks a year. After a short period of induction in Adelaide, the sisters normally travel to the appointed reserve by bus or train, although air travel is approved where this is justified. The matter of provision of free transport for a sister proceeding on recreation leave after 12 months service has. not arisen since the department became responsible for this service, but this privilege is not normally granted to other officers employed in the Public Service.

The following conditions apply to Public Health nurses employed on Aboriginal settlements:

Salary—$5 050 to $5 438 over four years.

Hours of duty—37½ over seven days.

Recreation leave—five weeks a year and up to four days travelling time depending on location.

Locality allowance up to $830 a year depending on location.

Overtime allowance—$750 a year, shared equally by nurses on each reserve.

Accommodation, gas, and electricity supplied without charge, and the officers receive two uniforms on appointment with one replacement a year.

Salaries of nurses employed under the Public Service Act arc at present under consideration following recent Government hospitals award increases, and negotiations are proceeding for other improvements in conditions. The Public Health Department is aware of the difficulties encountered by staff in these remote areas, and is actively engaged in improving conditions, including the provision of better living and working accommodation.

INVESTIGATION COSTS

In reply to Mr. BECKER (September 18).

The Hon. L. I. KING: The costs are as follows:

	$
Taperoo beach murder:	
Crown Law Department:	
Briefing outside counsel	44 100
Department solicitor	6 200
	50 300
Sheriff's office:	
Payment to defence counsel for trials	60 435
Juror fees	24 685
Witness fees	1 450
	86 570
Law Society of South Australia:	
Payment to defence counsel for committal and two appeals	24 880
Police costs:	
Does not include police forensic technicians', detectives', or other police salaries, as items are not costed on a job basis	15 699
Schmidt murder:	
Police costs:	
Does not include police forensic technicians', detectives', or other police salaries as items are not costed on a job basis	2 080
Duncan case:	
Police costs:	
Does not include police forensic technicians', detectives' or other police salaries as items are not costed on a job basis	472
Attorney-General's Department:	
To Mr. R. G. Matheson, Q.C. to appear at inquest	1 562
	2 034

SAFETY HELMETS

In reply to Mr. SIMMONS (September 18).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is accepted that there are safety helmets for motor cyclists on the market that are superior in quality to those approved by the Australian and British Standards Associations' requirements. These helmets, however, are not subject to stringent quality control provision for which the helmets certified by these two associations insist in order to carry their certification mark. There is nothing to prevent a manufacturer claiming his helmet complies with some specification. In fact, many helmets are sold with stickers .on the helmet claiming compliance with the American Standard Z90 and Snell Foundation, which have never been tested by these authorities and for which these authorities claim no contact has been made for authority to use the sticker.

When seat belts were introduced in South Australia, the market was flooded with seat belts from many countries and each manufacturer claimed compliance with the Australian standard. His prototype may have complied, but his production model failed to meet the standard of the prototype. For this reason the certification mark was sought that ensured full compliance throughout production as a consumer-protection measure. The board has no testing facilities for investigating helmets and must rely on organizations, such as the Standards Association of Australia, to carry out the work of testing and maintaining quality control. The present Australian standards have now been revised and updated and it is expected that later this year the new standard will be published. The South Australian legislation will be amended to accord with the new standard. The British standard has also been updated.

It is understood that the new standard will permit the American helmets, which accord with American requirements and the Snell Foundation, to be accepted for endorsement by the S.A.A. in Australia. Arrangements have been made through the Canadian Standards Association for quality control conditions to be supervised in America directly with the manufacturers, rather than here bn importation to Australia. Furthermore, it is intended to introduce regulations to prohibit the sale of substandard helmets rather than just their use on the road, as exists at present.

LOXTON TURN-OFF

In reply to Mr. NANK1VELL (November 8).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As indicated recently, the existing signing at the Loxton turn-off on the new western approach to the Kingston bridge is considered satisfactory. A further study of the situation has revealed that some motorists are mistakenly turning off the Sturt Highway some four miles (6.4 km) further west at the start of the new deviation and where the old road still branches off into Kingston. To correct this situation, reference to Loxton will be added to an advance direction sign west of this point. Similar action will be taken at the actual Loxton turn-off on the new alignment for conformity and further direction.

DRIVING LICENCES

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (October 30).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member for Chaffey has asked me to consider requiring learner-drivers to be accompanied by licensed drivers with at least three years experience, and quoted Western Australia as a State in which this is done. There are various requirements for learner-drivers applying in the various States in Australia and, in order that this matter may be properly examined, I have requested the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to make suggestions on the membership of an *ad-hoc* committee to review and make recommendations on learner-driver licences in this State.

In reply to Dr. TONKIN and Mr. MILLHOUSE (October 4).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: South Australia has five driving licence classifications that are in line with recommendations made on a national basis. The question of distinguishing between eligibility to drive low-powered as against high-powered vehicles would need to apply to motor cars, trucks and omnibuses, as well as motor vehicles. For practical reasons there is a limit to which licences can be divided into classes or subdivided within classes. A system providing for a large number of classes is more difficult to administer, more difficult to police, and is certainly a drain on manpower and money in screening and testing to enable people to be fitted into appropriate categories. The Advisory Committee on Road User Performance and Traffic Codes recently considered the matter of restrictions for high-powered motor cycles, but the matter was deferred because of an in-depth study on motor cycle accident involvement which is at present being conducted by the Commonwealth Department of Transport.

It is expected that the result of this study will be conveyed to the Australian Transport Advisory Council, and the matter could then be considered at a national level. At this stage any action instituted by South Australia alone may be premature. The comment expressed by the Commissioner of Police that people under 20 years of age should not be licensed to ride high-powered motor vehicles was made during a television interview in answer to a direct question, which was out of context with the subject under discussion. However, the view expressed by the Commissioner was a personal one but is shared by other police officers.

M.V. *TROUBRIDGE*

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (November 8).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The income and expenditure statement for year ended June 30, 1973, is as follows:

	$
Income:	
Passengers	53 494
Cars	94 153
Cargo	403 396
Bar	5 767
Sundries	1 766
Total Income:	558 576
Expenditure:	
Ship's crew	370 123
Ship operating expenses	255 417
Management expenses	66 962
Loading and wharf operation	15 391
Wharf labour expenses	72 810
Sundry expenses	3 610
Total Expenditure:	784 313
Loss (excluding depreciation)	225 737
Add depreciation 10 per cent of fixed assets . .	132 826
	$358 563

LOXTON FERRY

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (November 8).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: At present, there are no surplus ferries of any class available to transport equipment from Loxton to Katarapko Island. Spare ferries held are required at all times to ensure uninterrupted service during maintenance and overhaul of other units.

ROSE PARK CROSSING

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (October 30).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The installation of traffic control signals at the junction of Fullarton Road and Grant Avenue, Rose Park, is receiving further consideration in consultation with the Corporation of Burnside.

MASSAGE PARLOURS

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (September 18).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The suggestion by the Corporation of the City of Unley for the provision of powers to enable it to licence and inspect massage parlours has been investigated. The Director-General of Public Health has stated that massage parlours have made only a small contribution to the spread of venereal disease in this State. He has reported that powers already exist to enable these establishments to be inspected for investigation and control of venereal disease. Information available indicates that the licensing and control of massage parlours and similar establishments in other countries has had little marked effect on the incidence of venereal disease. I have referred the question of establishment of massage parlours in residential areas to the Minister of Environment and Conservation for consideration.

FAUNA PROTECTION

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (October 30).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The exercise, which was recently conducted in the Renmark area, to relocate kangaroos that had been trapped on a small island of land by the rapidly rising Murray River must be considered highly successful. Of the 16 kangaroos that, were trapped on the island, nine were successfully captured and removed. In strict conservation terms, kangaroos, which are trapped in such circumstances as a result of purely natural causes, should be left to fend for themselves. A situation such as this is certainly not a recent phenomenon, and can be

considered as one of the means whereby natural selection takes its course. Those that are the fittest or best adapted to meet the new circumstances will survive.

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (August 21).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: On August 21, 1973. I undertook to provide the honourable member with further information on money spent last year in relation to the Hackney redevelopment scheme. The Stale Planning Authority was allocated $500 000 during 1972-73 for the acquisition of properties in Monarto and Hackney. Because of delays in processing the applications for Monarto. only a nominal amount was spent during 1972-73. A change in the Hackney development plan necessitated lesser expenditure on the Hackney scheme: however, the moneys made available in 1972-73 are fully committed for the programme for which they were intended during the 1973-74 financial year.

APPRENTICES

In reply to Mr. MAX BROWN (November 1).

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: For various reasons it is not practical to carry out the survey sought by the honourable member. I understand that the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission and the honourable member have discussed the matter raised by him in a general way. I am now able to provide the following information, which shows the number of employers in Whyalla, other than the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited which employ apprentices in trades nominated by the honourable member.

Trade	Number of employers employing apprentices	Number of apprentices
Boilermaker	6	22
Plumber	8	12
Electrical fitter/mechanic . .	3	4
Fitter and turner	2	8
Motor mechanic	17	32
Panelbeater		10
Carpenters and joiners	4	7
Painters	2	2
Bricklayers	1	1
	49	98

I emphasize that this table does not cover all employers because records of the department relate only to those employers who have notified the employment of apprentices. There would be other firms in the various categories set out above employing tradesmen but not apprentices.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What are the specific assurances in relation to the protection of the environment that have been sought by the Environment and Conservation Department from the petro-chemical consortium of South Australia?

2. Does the Minister intend to make public the environment impact statement?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Much concern over the environmental impact of the petro-chemical industry at Redcliffs has been expressed. The Environment and Conservation Department shares this concern, and I have already stated that no pollution to the gulf waters, air pollution, or serious disturbance to the environment around Redcliffs will be countenanced. The petro-chemical consortium has agreed to this and will undertake detailed Studies to establish the most environmentally satisfactory methods of effluent disposal. The environmental impact of the petro-chemical plant is being carefully studied. Preparation and studies for the environmental impact statement are being carried out by the Environment and Conservation Department and by the petro-chemical consortium. A plan for the environmental impact statement outlining the nature of the studies required to be undertaken, and the relevant authorities which will carry them out. is being prepared by the Environment and Conservation Department. A preliminary study of gulf waters has been carried out by the Fisheries Department and the petro-chemical consortium, and further areas for study defined. Studies of gulf waters over the complete annual variation of conditions will be undertaken. The consortium has undertaken to test the impact of the proposed effluents on the ecology of the gulf.

2. Both the environmental plan and the impact statement will be made public, and I have already stated that interested members of the public are welcome to inspect the working documents of the Environment Division of the department.

FILM CORPORATION

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What are the names of persons employed by the South Australian Film Corporation during the 12 months from November 1 1972, to October 31, 1973?

2. What is the name and address of the writer of the script for the film *Time in Kangaroo Island* and what was the cost of this script, including travelling and all other expenses?

3. What is the contract price and completion date for producing the film *Time in Kangaroo Island?*

4. Does the South Australian Film Corporation allow the normal 10 per cent benefit to South Australian film producers to encourage local industry?

5. What are the names and addresses of all persons brought to South Australia by the South Australian Film Corporation, and the dates of their arrivals and departures?

6. What was the total cost (travel, accommodation, and other expenses) for each such person?

7. What are the names of persons to be sent on oversea trips by the South Australian Film Corporation during the period from October 1, 1973, to December 31, 1974, and what is the expected cost?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Names of persons employed by the South Australian Film Corporation during the 12 months from November 1, 1972, to October 31, 1973 are as follows:

Staff:		
Administrative:	From	To
G. J. Brealey	20.11.72	
J. B. Burke	26.3.73	
J. McIntosh (Mrs.)	3.8.73	31.8.73
K. M. Tonkes	24.9.73	
D. Foreman	19.2.73	30.3.73
G. N. Fisher	9.4.73	
S. Bond (Mrs.)	11.12.72	9.3.73
J. M. Wooding (Mrs.) . . .	2.3.73	
L. P. O'Connell (Miss) . .	28.5.73	
M. A. Silcock (Miss)	26.10.73	
Production:		
J. L. Ellson	12.3.73	
M. J. Carroll	19.2.73	
R. Dalrymple	27.6.73	
T. N. Penton-Ford	4.6.73	
B. A. Davidson (Mrs.) . .	26.3.73	
C. Jones (Miss)	26.2.73	
H. Wouters (Miss)	10.9.73	

Staff: Distribution:	From	To
R. G. Smith	1.9.73	
M. L. Jackman (Mrs.)	9.10.73	
T. P. Jennings	10.9.73	
Film Library:		
G. Wyatt	15.8.73	
P. M. Mattias (Miss)	8.8.73	
S. L. Coad (Mrs.)	8.8.73	
G. Frigo (Miss)	3.9.73	
Contract production staff:		
J. C. Robb (Mrs.), Producer	12.2.73	11.1.74
J. Morris, Producer	10.9.73	9.8.74
B. Kavanagh, Script editor	4.6.73	30.11.73
G. Barker, Script Editor	6.8.73	2.2.74
Contract production crew:		
R. Lowe, Director-cameraman	28.3.73	24.8.73
J. Illingworth, Assistant-cameraman	1.4.73	29.4.73
D. Foreman, camera assistant	30.4.73	3.7.73
D. Plummer, Film editor	7.5.73	24.8.73
R. Hindley, Film editor	18.6.73	20.7.73
A. Trenouth, Assistant editor	28.6.73	20.7.73
A. Trenouth, Cameraman	22.10.73	16.11.73
R. Pendlebury, Sound recordist	22.10.73	16.11.73
A. Smith, Production assistant	29.10.73	16.11.73

2. The name and address of the writer of the script for the film *Time in Kangaroo Island* is Anne Brooksbank, 157 Darling Point Road, Darling Point, N.S.W. The cost of completed script was $550 and travelling expenses were $45.

3. *Time in Kangaroo Island*: Contract price, $18 620, and completion date January 8, 1974.

4. It is the corporation's policy to observe State preference in respect of invitations to tender and assessments of tenders received, all other factors, particularly technical competence, being equal. The honourable member errs in asking whether the normal 10 per cent benefit to South Australian film producers has been allowed. The amount of benefit to local producers has never been published by any Government, on the advice of the Supply and Tender Board.

5. and 6. The names and addresses of all persons brought to South Australia by the corporation, dates of arrival and departure, and total costs (travel, accommodation and other expenses) are as set out hereunder. As the question specifies departure dates, it has been assumed that an answer is required in respect of persons associated directly or indirectly with production.

Names and Addresses	Arrival	Departure	Cost $
Byron Kennedy (Writer), 5 Jepson Street, Yarraville, Vic.	20.3.73	24.3.73	209
Anne Brooksbank (Writer), 157 Darling Point Road, Darling Point, N.S.W.	26.4.73	27.4.73	142
Albert Falzon (Producer), Box 178, P.O., Avalon Beach, N.S.W.	23.3.73	23.3.73	112
Richard Hindley (Editor), 1 Lower Spotforth Street, Cremorne, N.S.W.	17.6.73	10.7.73	281
Brian Kavanagh (Script Editor Producer), c/o Bilcock & Copping, 46-48 High Street, St. Kilda, Vic.	4.6.73	Has not yet returned	96
Jack Gardiner (Print Consultant), Colorfilm Pty. Ltd., 35 Missenden Road. Camperdown, N.S.W.	8.8.73	9.8.73	106
John Morris (Producer), 79 Grosvenor Road, Lindfield, N.S.W.	25.8.73	1.9.73	219
Eddie Scragg (Producer), Scope Films, 99 Walker Street, North Sydney, N.S.W.	10.9.73	10.9.73	106
Don Burrows (Composer), 24 Vista Street, Sans Souci, N.S.W.	15.7.73	16.7.73	150
Richard Hindley (Editor), 1 Lower Stopforth Street, Cremorne, N.S.W.	17.6.73	20.7.73	116
Ron Lowe (Director-Photographer), (now settled permanently in Adelaide)	28.3.73	Has not returned	1 453
John Illingworth (Assistant Cameraman), 86 Wallumutta Road, Newport, N.S.W.	1.4.73	29.4.73	420
David Plummer (Editor), 17 Pacific Highway, Roseville, N.S.W.	6.5.73	19.7.73	877
Barry Brown (Sound Consultant), Sound on Film, 50 Atchison Street, St. Leonards, N.S.W.	5.7.73	7.7.73	106
Anne Brooksbank	(26.4.73	27.4.73	53
	(2.7.73	17.7.73	346
John Morris (Producer), 79 Grosvenor Road. Lindfield, N.S.W.	18.5.73	18.5.73	119
Moya Wood (Seminar Organizer), la Gurner Street, Paddington, N.S.W.	17.5.73	18.5.73	131
Brian Kavanagh (Script Editor-Producer), c/o Bilcock and Copping, 46 High Street, St. Kilda, Vic.	19.5.73	20.5.73	51
John Dingwell (Writer), Church Point. N.S.W.	20.5.73	20.5.73	78
John Dingwell (Writer), Church Point. N.S.W.	10.9.73	10.9.73	53
John Dingwell (Writer), Church Point, N.S.W.	14.4.73	15.4.73	120
Ian Jones (Director), c/o Crawford Productions, Box 93, P.O.. Abbotsford, Vic.	14.4.73	15.5.73	65

7. Names of persons to be sent on oversea trips by the corporation from October 1, 1973, to December 31, 1974, are as follows:

(*a*) November 13, 1973, to December 17, 1973:
G. J. Brealey, at an estimated cost of $3 418.

(*b*) June-July 1974: R. Smith and marketing manager to be appointed, at a budgeted cost of S5 800.

An application has been made in the first case, and an application will be made in the second case to the Commonwealth Film and Television School for a grant-in-aid to cover part of the above costs.

Mr. EVANS (on notice)

1. For what projects has the South Australian Film Corporation called tenders since June 1, 1973, and who was invited to tender for each project?

2. Has an Andrew Trenouth been employed by the South Australian Film Corporation to produce a film and, if so, at what remuneration?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Projects for which the corporation has called tenders since June 1, 1973, and producers invited to tender are as follows:

Client	Film project	Tender opening date	Tenderers
Tourist Bureau.....	*Flinders Ranges:* 10 min. 35 mm colour promotional film	26/7/73	Production Centre Pty. Ltd., 97 Melbourne Street, North Adelaide, S.A. Bosisto Productions, 12 Miller Street, Unley, S.A.
	Adelaide: 10 min. 35 mm colour promotional film	10/8/73	Mastersound, 7 Moger Lane, Adelaide, S.A. Bosisto Productions, Unley, S.A. Production Centre Pty. Ltd., North Adelaide, S.A.
Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch	35 mm animated cartoon film	21/9/73	A.P.I., 60 Bathurst Street, Sydney, N.S.W. Yoram Gross Pty. Ltd., 30 Chandos Street, St. Leonards, N.S.W.
N.B.: No local tender equipped and competent to do a fully animated film.			
Tourist Bureau.....	*Kangaroo Island:* 10 min. 35 mm colour promotional film	24/9/73	Production Centre Pty. Ltd., North Adelaide, S.A. Bosisto Productions, Linley, S.A. Arkaba Films, Heathfield, S.A. Film Makers Australia, Adelaide, S.A. Peter Purvis, Caulfield, Victoria.
Co-operative Bulk. Handling Limited.....	15 min. 16 mm colour promotional film	28/9/73	Production Centre Pty. Ltd., North Adelaide, S.A. Scope Films, 99 Walker Street, Sydney, N.S.W.

2. Mr. Andrew Trenouth has never been employed or contracted by the corporation to produce a film, but the corporation has made use of Mr. Trenouth's services on the following occasions:

	$
June 28, 1973, to July 20, 1973:	
Assistant editor on nine screen film.....	255
October 22, 1973, to November 16, 1973:	
Cameraman on open-plan classroom film, four weeks @ $200 a week (including overtime).	800

In addition, Mr. Trenouth was one of a group from the Adelaide Film Makers Co-operative to whom the corporation awarded a young film-makers grant of $500 as a supplement to the Commonwealth grant of $15 000 to assist in the completion of their film on the Nimbin Festival.

METROPOLITAN SEWERAGE

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What is the name of each subdivided area in the metropolitan electoral districts that is not connected to deep drainage for sewerage purposes?

2. What is the number of houses in each of the unsewered areas of the metropolitan electoral districts?

3. What is the date that each individual unsewered area of metropolitan electoral districts is expected to be sewered?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. to 3. The Engineering and Water Supply Department does not maintain any records on metropolitan district boundaries, nor does it keep a record of houses that have been built but not provided with a full sewerage system as compared with a septic tank system in such areas. The amount of work required to reply to the questions as put by the honourable member would require at least two men working full-time for at least six weeks, and would need a considerable amount of personal inspection. The Sewerage Branch is already heavily loaded and overtime is being worked continuously by the design office staff. Consequently, it is not intended to set aside staff to provide the replies required, as this must result in considerable interference to the sewer construction programme.

ANDAMOOKA LAND

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What plans has the Lands Department to grant freehold titles to occupiers of Crown lands at Andamooka?

2. Are there any plans to remove any such occupiers now living outside the town area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. None.

2. No.

BOOKABIE SCHOOL

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans have been made for the education of the present pupils when the Bookabie school is closed?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The children will be taken by bus to Penong Primary School.

THREAT INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Were investigations carried out by the police into the alleged threat on the life of the honourable member for Goyder, as reported in the press on August 8, 1973?

2. If so, what investigations were carried out and what was the result of these investigations?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

The Police Department did not receive any complaint or conduct any investigation into the alleged threat on the life of the member for Goyder, as reported in the press on August 8, 1973.

BURBRIDGE ROAD LAND

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the address of each of the properties totally acquired by the Government in Burbridge Road, Hilton?

2. On what date were the acquisitions effected, who were the previous owners, and what was the purchase price in each case?

3. What particular feature of each of the acquired properties necessitated complete acquisition, in contradistinction to a limited section from the road frontage for road widening?

4. Who are the lessees of the properties at this time?

5. Were the properties advertised for lease and, if not, why not?

6. When Burbridge Road is widened will the balance of the land be auctioned or offered to the current occupants?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. Nos. 136, 138 and 140 Burbridge Road, Hilton.

2. These properties were acquired on April 23, 1971, from G. S. and K. A. Elston at a total cost of $18 200.

3. The then owners had placed the property on the market for sale.

4. Nos. 136 and 138 arc leased to 62 Regional Theatre Company Incorporated, and No. 140 is leased to Mr. J. Ceruto.

5. The properties were not advertised for leasing, nor is advertising the normal practice unless specific properties are found to be difficult to lease.

6. The disposal of surplus land will be effected in accordance with Government policy applying al that time.

TYRE REEFS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Have the reefs constructed of motor tyres at Henley Beach and Glenelg North proved successful?

2. Has there been any movement of the reefs?

3. Will further reefs be established, and, if so, where, when and at what cost? If not, why not?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes. Subsequent monitoring has shown marine plant growth on the tyres, and reef-dwelling fish have taken up habitation in the tyre reef.

2. The reef, in 30ft. (9.14 m) of water off Henley Beach, was partially scattered and covered with sand scoured from nearby beaches following the worst storm in 20 years during the winter of 1971.

3. The reef off Glenelg, in 60ft. (18.28 m) of water, will be completed later (his year or early next year at a cost of about $4 000 when weather and transport permit, but the establishment of future reefs will depend on availability of suitable sites, finance, research requirements, and personnel. Some voluntary groups have indicated an interest in laying reefs at their own expense and under supervision of the Fisheries Department, and two such projects are already planned al Whyalla and Port Augusta.

ABDUCTIONS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many members of the Police Force were engaged on inquiries into the allegations made publicly by the honourable member for Hanson last week of attempted abductions of children?

2. How long did such inquiries and the preparation of a report on them take?

3. What was the total cost of such inquiries?

The Hon. L J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Details of police officers engaged on the inquiry are as follows:

Friday, November 9, 1973	6
Saturday, November 10, 1973	3
Sunday, November 11, 1973	2
Monday, November 12,1973	1

2. The inquiry and preparation of the report involved 96 man-hours.

3. The wage cost and penalty rates for the time involved amounted to $346.

VAUGHAN HOUSE

Dr. EAST1CK: Will the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will immediately institute an independent inquiry, headed by a judge of the Family Court, into the recent disturbances at and subsequent abscondings from Vaughan House, (he general conditions obtaining at that institution, and the overall results of rehabilitation and of the methods of training and treatment that are at present undertaken there? Considerable public disquiet has resulted from the recent conflicting statements on the abscondings from Vaughan House (shades of the abscondings from the Royal Show). In all areas, there appears to be a distinct lack of communication between the Community Welfare Department and the public, as well as between the Minister and the public and between the Director and the department. Certainly the public is not kept informed on this subject. Therefore, I ask the Deputy Premier, as a matter of Government policy, whether he will institute an independent inquiry under the leadership that I have requested.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The answer is "No"; the Government has every confidence in the ability of the Minister of Community Welfare to handle this matter. It has never questioned his ability to do that and it never will, because in every case in the past when occurrences have arisen the Minister has been able to display, not only to the Government but also to members of the House, in my view more than satisfactorily, that the matter has been handled properly. He has already made public the report he has received on the matter. He has indicated to inquirers and made public statements to the effect that he is considering whether or not an inquiry will be instituted into the happenings at Vaughan House over the weekend. I can only reiterate that the Government is perfectly satisfied with the way in which the matter is being handled by the Minister.

Mr. WELLS: Does the Minister of Community Welfare have confidence in the ability and qualifications of the staff at Vaughan House? When a situation arises, such as that which has arisen at Vaughan House, the staff is the victim of public acrimony and abuse. As member for the district in which Vaughan House is located, I believe that the staff at this institution is competent. Some months ago, when a party of politicians, comprising members of both sides, visited Vaughan House, we found evidence of discipline, the place was spotless, and the girls were reasonably happy, being engaged in activities such as needlework, leatherwork, and so on. I am disturbed, because these public outcries reflect on the ability, integrity and competence of the staff at Vaughan House and other similar institutions, affecting the confidence of staff members. As I entirely disagree with this type of thing, I should like to hear the Minister's opinion with regard to the competence of the staff.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have every confidence in members of the staff of Vaughan House, who are very dedicated people with a most difficult task to perform. They are charged with the responsibility of caring for and providing remedial care for a number of girls who are very, very disturbed. As I have said often, they are the 50 or so most disturbed girls in the State. The problem of caring

for these girls and of providing the sort of rehabilitative treatment they need if they are ever to be equipped to play a useful part in society and lead useful and happy lives is onerous and burdensome indeed. It is a task which the staff of Vaughan House tackles with great dedication and application. In my experience since I have been Minister, the various members of the staff at Vaughan House (the staff has changed during that period) have, by and large, applied themselves most .conscientiously and effectively to this task. As I say, from time to time they are confronted with some most difficult problems. At times, although I pride myself on being of somewhat calm temperament, I get close to anger at some of the foolish and irresponsible comments made about the problems that arise at Vaughan House and similar institutions. Those who criticize generally do so without knowledge, almost always criticizing without any understanding of the problems involved. These people are generally far less qualified than the people who are in charge at Vaughan House and who are best able to assess the type of treatment the girls there need. When an unruly incident occurs and when there is an outbreak of the kind that occurred recently, some members of the public are naturally quick to attach blame to those in charge of the girls or to someone else in respect of this matter.

Few of those people, however, are ever able to point to any methods that would be more successful. Indeed, when I read some of the comments on this matter I wonder whether these people have had any association for many years (if ever) with people under 20 years of age, because some of the suggestions made about handling teenagers so as to equip them properly for future adult life make me wonder whether the people concerned have ever been parents or, at best, have had any dealings at all with teenagers, still less with teenagers who have difficult backgrounds and who are often emotionally disturbed, as are the girls at Vaughan House.

All of this is not to say that errors are not made by the staff at institutions, including Vaughan House. When an incident of the kind that occurred at the weekend occurs, it is obviously the responsibility of the department and of the Minister to ascertain the true facts and to see whether there have been some failures in duty or failures because of errors of judgment on the part of someone concerned. I do not shrink from that responsibility. Departmental inquiries have taken place and full reports from both the supervisor and the Director—

Dr. Eastick: What—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: —have been made. No doubt, members who are interested have acquainted themselves with these reports but, if they have not, I shall be happy to provide them with copies. The police are continuing inquiries to elucidate the precise facts surrounding the outbreak. Of course, that may result in criminal charges against some of the participants, but that remains to be determined. If at the conclusion of those inquiries it seems to me that there is still any ambiguity surrounding the precise circumstances, a further departmental inquiry will take place to ensure that the true facts are ascertained as to whether there has been any failure in duly or any failure in the discharge of responsibility by anyone concerned. If there has been, appropriate measures will be taken.

Members of the staff in charge of the girls at Vaughan House have a difficult task, which they discharge with great responsibility and conscientiousness and I take this opportunity of defending them here and now from some of the wild and irresponsible statements which have been made (almost all of them anonymously) and which have been given great publicity in the press.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: These statements reflect on people who do not deserve such criticism. I have the utmost confidence in members of the staff, from the supervisor downwards, in charge of these girls. They discharge their responsibilities as well as they can and they have my support in doing so. Let it not be thought that, just because something goes wrong and girls under their charge break out, as they have done on this occasion, I intend to snipe at people who are doing their best to. discharge their responsibility.

Mr. COUMBE: Because of the unsatisfactory reply given the Leader, I ask the Minister what steps he intends to take to improve security at Vaughan House, following the recent disturbances at that institution? I ask this question in a positive way. The Minister is reported as saying that a major part of the problem at Vaughan House seems to be caused by intruders entering the property. Further, another person has alleged that a gate in a security fence is often left open, enabling any person to enter the grounds freely. Therefore, I ask what action the Attorney intends to take to ensure that security measures on the fence and gates are improved to prevent unauthorized people from entering the grounds, as this aspect seems to be a contributing factor to the whole problem.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Plans are in hand to substitute for the present relatively low gate a high and more secure gate that will make escape by means of the gate, when it is closed, as difficult as it can reasonably be made. The gate has been left open only because of the problem of intruders. We have had to seek police assistance, and police officers have brought patrol cars into the premises more or less regularly to try to deter intruders from coming there or to detect them when they are there. Of course, when the gate is open the girls are in the building, not in the grounds. The gate is left open so that the police can drive into the premises. This is only a temporary arrangement that will be remedied when a higher and more secure gate is installed and can be closed. We hope that the necessity for the police to drive in will not arise and that the gate will keep intruders out and keep the girls in. The problem in relation to intruders is a big one, as it is at all women's institutions. Young men will try to get into the premises, and they have got in. It is a persistent and worrying problem for members of the staff, and it has occupied their attention very much. The police have cooperated magnificently in trying to minimize the problem. We are investigating other measures, such as the possibility of further security, but I cannot say at present whether they will materialize or whether they will be successful. I want to make clear that the problem of the recent outbreak is by no means one of security in the ordinary sense, because the point from which these girls escaped was the swimming pool area, which is surrounded by a high wall with wire and spikes that have been placed there recently. In this case one of the girls got hold of a knife by means that have been referred to in the report (and further information is needed on this matter) and, by threat, obtained keys from the staff. The girls got into the swimming pool area, which is a security area, surrounded by a high wall with wire and spikes. This proves that no security fencing in a young people's institution will ever be foolproof, because these are fit young ladies who can scale the fence

with the best of them. In fact, they did that. They actually got over the spiked portion of the wall and, as I have said in a public statement, when that sort of situation develops it is really beyond the power of the staff to restrain those concerned unless one is willing to resort to the method of actually shooting at people. Once we accept that that is out, that it is an inhumane and impossible way to prevent escapes, we must accept the problem. We must try to keep intruders out and keep the girls in, and how the position is dealt with is a matter of responsibility and good sense. The swimming pool area, from which the girls escaped, is a security area that has been made as secure as practicable for a children's institution. I suggest that we must accept that and the risks that go with it, unless we are willing to resort to extreme security measures that turn a children's rehabilitative institution into a security prison. Opposition members have to make up their mind where they stand on this problem. If that is where they stand, let them say so, but I want to make my position perfectly clear. I believe my responsibility is to do what I am charged with doing under the Community Welfare Act: to do all in my power to procure the rehabilitation of young people in my care and, as Minister, to give them the maximum chance of leading a full and useful life in society later on. So long as I am Minister, that is the course that will be followed.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister make available to the House details of the results of any departmental inquiry that may be set up into Vaughan House and the recent abscondings there? When defending the integrity and ability of the staff (a defence with which members on this side entirely agree), the Minister said that he was about to set up, if necessary, a departmental inquiry into the whole matter. The evidence given me shows that, while the Minister has the utmost confidence in members of his staff, they do not necessarily have much confidence in him. Certainly, a lack of public confidence has been expressed to me by many people in the community. We have seen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr TONKIN: In the past we have seen a situation in which the Minister has suppressed the publication of other reports relating to juvenile offenders.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is bringing new subject matter into the explanation.

Dr. TONKIN: I trust that this will not occur again regarding any report of an inquiry that may be set up as the Minister has suggested.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think that I cannot let my reply be made without a comment on the innuendo (the snide innuendo) in the honourable member's question, namely, that there is a lack of confidence in the Minister on the part of the staff at Vaughan House. All I can say about that is that there is no evidence of any such lack of confidence: the member for Bragg has produced no evidence of it, and it is contrary to my own contacts and my own information. Indeed, I believe that the members of the staff at Vaughan House are co-operating enthusiastically in the policies that have been promulgated by me, through the department, for the benefit of the girls there. I think it. is deplorable that a comment like that should just be thrown in without collaboration and without anything further to establish it (a mere remark made in some sort of attempt to gain a political advantage out of a very difficult situation).

Concerning any report that comes to me from a departmental inquiry that I direct, I will decide when I have looked at the report whether or not it should be made public. This may depend very much on the sort of comment that is made on the personnel involved in the matter, and it may be destructive of the morale of the institution and of the staff to publish such a report, but I do not know. When the report comes to hand, it may be the sort of report that ought to be published. However, I do not intend to send officers to Vaughan House to conduct an inquiry knowing that any report that they make will necessarily be made public. The Minister and Cabinet have to take the final responsibility for deciding whether it is in the public interest that any report should be made public. That is a responsibility that I am happy to take, as I have taken it on previous occasions, and I am sure that the Cabinet is happy to take it also. We will not impose a responsibility on anyone else to make that decision. It is our responsibility to receive any report, consider it, and then decide whether it is in the public interest that it should be made public.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister say whether all abscondings or absences without leave from Vaughan House are reported to the police; how many such incidents there have been this year; and how many girls have been involved?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot give the figures the honourable member seeks, but I will obtain them for him. Not all abscondings from Vaughan House are reported to the police: it depends entirely on the circumstances. Of course, girls sometimes abscond and are recovered by the staff within a short time. This is a common thing, but it is also common for girls (especially in the open or semi-open sections) to leave these institutions and then to make their own decision to return; this is part of the rehabilitative process. Not all abscondings arc in the same category, but the sort of absconding that occurred at the weekend which was a result of the use of a knife, followed by an escape from the assessment centre, is obviously one that calls for immediate police action. Of course, any escape from the security section, if it occurred, would be in the same category.

However, there are several stages in the process of rehabilitation, stages at which the girls in the pre-release section especially are given responsibility. Physically they can go. They have to be given that responsibility to make their own decision in order to comply with the programme that has been set for them. That is part (and an essential part) of the process of training the girls for the responsibility of adult decision-making when they go out into the community. Where a girl breaks down in regard to that programme and leaves without authority, it is important that she be given the opportunity to make the decision to come back, because often, when the immediate mood that led to the departure is past, the girl changes her mind, realizes the folly of what she has done (her own parents may advise her), and comes back voluntarily. If she succeeds in making that decision, she has taken a long step towards the development of a sense of responsibility and the ability to manage her own life, and this is essential if she is to be a responsible citizen in the community later on.

There are many cases in which no good purpose would be served by an immediate notification to the police and, indeed, such action might even be harmful. Sometimes members of the staff have a pretty good idea where the girl will go (to a home or to a friend's place, or something of that sort), so that in each case a judgment has to be made by the authorities at Vaughan House whether it is a matter that calls for immediate police action. I will

obtain for the honourable member the figures on absconds from Vaughan House during the past year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In any inquiry into conditions at Vaughan House, will the Minister have considered the 16 matters set out in the enclosure that accompanied my letter to him on October 4? From time to time, people contact me about various matters, and on several occasions (probably because I once had the responsibility that the Minister now has) people have contacted me about Vaughan House and other institutions. About a month ago, someone telephoned me and said she was a member of the staff at Vaughan House, and she made several detailed complaints about what was going on there. I told her I would not act on anything unless she either gave her name (which, understandably, she was not willing to do) or put the matters in writing. Subsequently, these matters were put in writing and communicated to me, and they are of a very serious nature indeed, a nature somewhat similar to that of matters set out in the press over the weekend. On October 4, I wrote to the Minister and, after the explanation I have just given, in part the letter states:

I send them to you for inquiry and report and do this by letter rather than by question in the House, as I do not want to draw attention publicly to the complaints, if that can be avoided.

I interpose here that complaints have now been publicly made about the matter. My letter continues:

However, if you are not able to act on the matter without my raising it in the House, I shall have no alternative but to do so. I shall look forward to hearing from you at your early convenience.

On October 29, by letter, I received a detailed reply from the Minister on each of the 16 matters. As that letter is over four pages long, I do not intend to read all of it. However, in part, the first paragraph of the Minister's letter is as follows:

The matters raised in the anonymous letter are in some cases true, in other cases true but misleading due to being placed out of context, and in some cases they are totally inaccurate.

The letter then goes on to deal with them. In view of the replies given by the Minister today, there is only one matter to which I wish to refer before I come to the end of his letter. In dealing with point No. 13, the Minister saw fit to criticize one of the Education Department teachers concerned, in the following terms:

In the case of the teacher mentioned, despite persistent efforts of senior Education Department and Community Welfare Department staff, the teacher has refused to allow many girls to enter her classroom. The teacher in question is regarded as unsatisfactory at this time and moves have been made to remove her from the situation. However, since she will be retiring in December, 1973, it has been decided to continue her employment at Vaughan House until that time but adjusting the school programme in a way that minimizes the disruptive effects of her behaviour.

That leads one to assume that all is not well, at least not among certain members of the staff. Whether this teacher is right or wrong is another matter. The Minister concluded his letter by saying—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's explanation is getting rather long.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have only a couple of lines at the end of the letter to read, as follows:

Mr. Meldrum—

he is the Acting Superintendent—

had developed a comprehensive development plan for Vaughan House which he has subsequently put into effect with considerable success.

I certainly sympathize with the Minister's problems in this regard: anyone who has had responsibility of this type must do so. However, there is no doubt whatever that abscondings and violent incidents are far more prevalent now than they were before, although this has always been a problem and always will be a problem in such an institution.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member seems to be going beyond what is necessary to explain his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Therefore, I ask the Minister whether, now that all this has happened subsequent to his writing to me, because of their seriousness these incidents will be taken into account and looked at again by the inquiry he sets up, particularly in the light of subsequent events.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am afraid I do not see the relevance of the honourable member's last remark, because I do not really see what the subsequent events (namely, the escape of 11 girls as a result of the use of a knife by one of them) really have to do with the series of matters raised in the honourable member's letter. Let me say at once that I pay a tribute to the honourable member's responsible approach in the matter, because I realize the courses of action that were open to him if he wished to. take them when he received that anonymous letter. I think he acted with responsibility and good sense in taking the course that he took, because much of the irresponsible publicity that takes place with regard to juvenile institutions is extremely disruptive of the efforts that members of the staff in this institution are making for the benefit of the girls. In this case, the member for Mitcham took what I believe was a responsible approach to the situation. 1 appreciate that, since these matters have become public, his position has altered; I do not blame him for having raised the matter at this stage. I simply want to say that all the matters raised in the anonymous letter were thoroughly looked at and answered in the letter I sent to the honourable member. I do not really think they fall within the ambit of any inquiry that might be decided on into the circumstances surrounding this absconding, and that is the inquiry I have in mind. However, I will certainly ask that any officers who are directed to inquire into these circumstances be given access to all the information available, including the letter the honourable member has produced.

As for the honourable member's observation that at least one member of the staff appeared to be less than satisfied with the situation, of course it is true that one gets some members of staffs at juvenile institutions who do not agree with the policy of the Administration in relation to the girls. This has been particularly true in the last two or three years, although I suppose it was always true. I can remember long before I took over, reading in newspapers of staff at the institutions complaining that children were being harshly treated, or making some other complaint. We will always get members of staff at institutions who think they know better than the Administration knows how the girls should be handled; that is inevitable. In a situation in which methods of handling juveniles in institutions have undergone radical change, with a shifting of emphasis from an insistence on rigid discipline and conformity to an attempt to develop the resources of each individual to take responsibility for his or her life, there are bound to be some staff members who are trained in the old ways and who find this process of adjustment extremely difficult; indeed, they find it difficult if not impossible even to comprehend the goals being sought after and the methods by which they are sought to be attained. For at least a considerable

time some individual members of staffs will feel unhappy and dissatisfied in such a changing situation. I recognize and appreciate their problems; I sympathize with them. However, it is a gradual process of being able to retrain these people in a better understanding of the situation, or the effluxion of time will solve the problem. What 1 have said previously and now repeat is that by and large the staffs in our institutions (and I refer particularly to Vaughan House because that is the institution about which the question has been asked) are co-operating enthusiastically with the Administration in carrying out the policies designed for the benefit of the girls. The letter that the honourable member forwarded to me has already been fully considered and investigated in the department. Certainly, if any further inquiry is directed into this specific absconding and the circumstances that led to it and surround it, the anonymous letter will be brought to the attention of the officers concerned with that inquiry.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Minister say whether girls are graded into specific units when they are admitted to Vaughan House? On what basis are such placements made? Obviously, there is a need to segregate disturbed and potentially troublesome girls from other girls admitted to Vaughan House for the first time. The Minister has said that assessments are carried out at Vaughan House for segregation purposes. Will he indicate whether he believes the assessment system currently used al Vaughan House is satisfactory?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The process of assessment begins earlier than the time of committal to Vaughan House. The process is that, when a child is charged with an offence, a Juvenile Court judge seeks an assessment of that child. If the child is on bail the assessment is carried out externally. If remanded in custody, a girl is remanded to Vaughan House, where she is held in custody in a remand and assessment area (this, incidentally, was the area from which the abscondings took place at the week-end). The girl is assessed and the judge is provided with a report on the type of approach or treatment that is most likely to help the specific girl. It may result in a release to her home, in a release under recognizance, or in some other form of treatment decided on. The policy of both the department and the court is to resort to institutional treatment only when all else has failed. However, if the girl is committed to the care of the Minister and sent to Vaughan House, she then undergoes further assessment as to what her treatment programme should be at Vaughan House.

That assessment is carried out by a treatment review board. The girl may then be placed in the security section, if there is a danger that she may attempt to abscond and if security is required, or she may be placed in one of the other units. Generally, girls live in units comprising 15 or 16 girls. During her slay at Vaughan House a girl is periodically reviewed by the review board, which reviews the programme through which she has gone, what progress she has made in various areas in which her character and habits are regarded as defective, and how far she has progressed to where it will be considered she has developed a sufficient sense of responsibility to go out into the world and make her own decisions. Of course, this method of treatment and assessment often involves a girl moving from one unit to another where a greater degree of responsibility applies. Finally, there is a pre-release unit where girls are given much liberty and much responsibility in preparation for the full responsibility they have to take once they are free.

Mr. Dean Brown: But are you satisfied with this?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The treatment review board makes these assessments and determines the classifications. In respect of whether I am satisfied with the method by which classifications are made, the answer must be qualified: I am satisfied that we are using the best resources al our disposal to make satisfactory assessments. I do not suppose that anyone would reach perfection in assessing juveniles generally and deciding what treatment was most appropriate for those concerned. Knowledge changes, experience changes, and greater understanding of problems occurs, and knowledge in this area has been increasing dramatically in recent years, and will probably continue to increase.

However, all I am willing to say is that we use in making these assessments the best qualified people at our disposal, and I am satisfied that they use their best endeavours to make satisfactory assessments. True, they will often make mistakes but, if the honourable member just thinks for a moment about the problem of trying to assess a girl coming from a disadvantaged background, emotionally disturbed, sometimes having psychiatric problems and, in instances, even having organic brain damage, he will realize the difficulties involved. The problem of trying to devise what is the most satisfactory programme for such a girl is enormous. Misjudgments will be made: girls will not perform up to the expectations held about them, and revision of their programme must constantly be made. All one can ever say in reply to the sort of question that has been asked by the honourable member is that we bring to the task the best qualified people at our disposal. I am satisfied that these people apply themselves to the task in a most conscientious and satisfactory manner. I do not doubt that improvements in assessment techniques will continue to be made. Further, I do not doubt that, whatever improvements will be made during my lifetime, they will still fall far short of the standard of perfection we would like to see attained in this area.

Mr. WARDLE: The Minister has said that some of the girls are living within units. Will he say whether the girls involved in the disturbance last Friday were members of the same unit and whether they had all been at Vaughan House previously? The Acting Superintendent of Vaughan House (Mr. Meldrum) is reported in today's press as having said that the 11 girls involved in the mass breakout comprised seven who had been awaiting court appearances and four who were in temporary care awaiting alternative placements. I ask the Minister whether all the girls had been detained at Vaughan House previously and, if they had been, whether it was unusual that they should all have been placed in the same unit.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I cannot say whether all the girls had previously been detained at Vaughan House, but all were in the same unit, because that is the remand and assessment unit to which girls go when they are in Vaughan House awaiting a court appearance or for some other temporary purpose. The four girls referred to were awaiting a placement outside, some difficulty having arisen about where they were living arid, until alternative arrangements could be made for them to live out, they came into Vaughan House. All the girls involved in the absconding were either awaiting court appearances or awaiting transfer from one place to another and were in transit, so to speak. There is a big problem about assessing girls and, indeed, assessing boys in the case of a boy's institution because until they are assessed segregation is not a practical proposition. There must be a stage at which the girls are studied. Before Vaughan House was used for remand purposes, Windana Home was used, and when a girl was arrested,

she would be taken to the remand section of Windana Home, whereas now she would be taken to Vaughan House. The girls must be taken to a remand place before they can be assessed and taken before the court. They may not be found guilty of an offence. No assessment can be made, because it is not known when they are arrested whether they are guilty. They are entitled, as any adult is, to be presumed innocent until a court finds otherwise. It is difficult to arrange segregation of girls who are merely there on remand as distinct from girls who are there for treatment and rehabilitation. In the latter case, of course, there could be assessment and segregation. Staff members do the best they can in this matter. Jf they have amongst the remand girls one or two hard types who are likely to be a bad influence on the other girls, they do their best to prevent that influence from being exerted, but it is difficult (and I think it always will be) with the relatively few girls waiting in a remand institution to break them up into further groupings before, as I have said, their guilt or otherwise is determined by a court. The reply to the honourable member is merely that they were all in the same unit. They were there because they were either on remand or, as in four cases, because they were in transit and were in temporary care pending their placement outside. I cannot say whether all the girls had been at Vaughan House previously but, if the honourable member wants that information, I can get it for him.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES

Mr. HALL: Can the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, assure the House that members of the Liberal Movement will be told of any future moves to increase parliamentary salaries and committee allowances, instead of furtively working in co-operation with the Leader of the Opposition and his Liberal and Country League Party to raid the Treasury by fixing inflated and unjustifiable salaries? It has become apparent to us by public reports during the past few days that the Government has tried to raise the salaries of committee members, and the sums placed against these positions have been inflated, indeed. It would appear from the Leader of the Opposition's statement today that the Government told the Opposition of this procedure and that the L.C.L. is considering the matter. Because members of the Liberal Movement consider the increases to be totally unjustified, I ask the Deputy Premier whether the Opposition has agreed to consider these rises.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This matter was referred to the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal, which took evidence on Parliamentary committee members' fees. The tribunal decided, in its wisdom and for reasons best known to it, to refer the matter back to Parliament. The Government obtained a report on the fees from officers of the Public Service Board and, following the receipt of that report, I placed before the Leader of the Opposition a proposal—

Mr. Hall: You didn't place it before us.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was not a decision, it was a proposal.

Mr. Hall: Why didn't you place it before us?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because neither the member for Goyder nor the member for Mitcham is a member of a Parliamentary committee.

Mr. Hall: And we are not members of the Opposition, either?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: But there are Opposition members who sit on Parliamentary committees and who would therefore be affected by any decision the Government might make on this matter. That is why the honourable member and his colleague were not told. Traditionally, this has happened before. We know that a previous Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) always extended the courtesy of informing the Leader of the Opposition on such mailers. It did not necessarily follow—

Mr. Hall: Why didn't you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder has asked one question and that is all that will be answered. If the honourable member persists in disobeying Standing Orders, I shall not hesitate to warn him of the consequences.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It did not necessarily follow that Sir Thomas Playford always accepted the advice or recommendations of the Opposition. In this case the Leader of the Opposition has been given a chance to look at a proposal, not a decision. He discussed it with members of his Party—

Mr. Millhouse: He did not discuss it with us.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member does not happen to be a member of his Party.

Mr. Millhouse: That's right.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Leader of the Opposition, quite properly, discussed this matter with members of his Party. Following those discussions, he spoke to me. I wish to make perfectly clear that no decision has been made by the Government on the matter of an increase in Parliamentary committee fees, and that matter is still being considered by Cabinet. That is not to say that a decision will not be made, because I personally believe that it is time that Parliamentary committee fees were increased as, in fact, in some cases it is 1961 (in another case, 1963) since an alteration was made. Surely even the member for Goyder would appreciate that there was a need for some movement in this regard. However, a decision has. not yet been made but it will be made and, when it has been made, the House will be informed.

HAWTHORNDENE SEWERAGE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works take action to solve the problem that exists at the Engineering and Water Supply Department sewage pumping station at the end of Poplar Avenue, Hawthorndene? I am led to believe that the pumping station is only temporary, having two small pumps and two small electric motors each of about 20 h.p. There is an overflow pipe, so that, when the pumps cannot accommodate the full intake of raw sewage that enters the station, the overflow passes into Hawthorndene creek. Last Saturday evening raw sewage passed into that creek, departmental officers being informed. This has happened on other occasions as well. A heavy disinfectant has been used to nullify any serious effects the raw sewage might have on people living in the area or farther down Sturt River. Residents are concerned lest any small fish or other water life in the area be killed. At present, when the pumps cut in, there is a voltage drop that affects the power supply of neighbouring property holders. The department intends to install a 90 h.p. motor and a bigger pump, but there will be even a bigger voltage drop when this occurs. Local residents are concerned, their main concern relating to the health hazard created by raw sewage entering a stream that passes through a residential area.

The Hon. J. D CORCORAN: Although I will have the matter examined, I do not know whether I can give the honourable member an assurance that the matter will be

rectified immediately, because, as he has said, there are problems associated with this matter. If an additional pump is installed, for instance, there will be difficulty in respect of the voltage. However, I will have the matter checked out.

FLINT COMMITTEE

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the Flint committee has completed the task for which it was established? Further, how were members of the committee paid for their services? The committee has reported to the Minister and legislation based on the report has been passed by this House.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The committee has not finished its work, although it presented its report on vehicle performance. This legislation has not yet been passed by the Legislative Council, although I had hoped that it would be. However, until the Bill is passed, the committee certainly will not be free to feel that its task in that area has been completed. Further, the committee has another task to perform, and this work will commence as soon as the current task is completed. There is no payment to committee members: they have freely and voluntarily given their knowledge for the benefit of this Parliament and the people of South Australia generally.

PATAWALONGA BASIN

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether drilling tests have been undertaken at the end of the groyne at the. entrance to the Patawalonga Basin? Boat owners are concerned about a sand bar near this point. Further, I understand the formation of the sea-bed there could be causing additional problems. Has the Coast Protection Board undertaken any drilling or obtained any core samples from the sea-bed to determine the best way to solve this problem?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Coast Protection Board is undertaking several tests in this area to try to find a long-term solution to the problem of the build-up of sand. I cannot say whether it has undertaken any drill tests in the area to establish the depth of sand or to find any other oddity associated with the area. I will certainly check the position and let the honourable member know.

STARTING PRICE BETTING

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary how many persons have been convicted of starting price bookmaking in each of the past three years, and will he obtain a report on whether starting price betting is rife in South Australia at present? It has been estimated that tens of thousands of dollars was invested with starting price bookmakers on the 1973 Melbourne Cup, so I am wondering how rife is this form of betting.

The Hon. L. J. KING: We have had experience in the past of wild guesses being made about the sum invested with starting price bookmakers. I do not know how anyone anywhere could ever estimate how much money passed through the hands of illegal bookmakers. I do not know on what information anyone could possibly rely for such details. I assume that persons who make those statements, whether members of this House or otherwise, have not got access to taxation information, and I do not know on what other information they could base the statement. However, I will certainly obtain the information that the honourable member seeks about convictions.

COPPER COAST PLAN

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Deputy Premier say what progress has been made with the Copper Coast plan for Wallaroo that the Premier announced on May 17 last? Will he say whether details of the plan have been finalized and will he say what is the commencement date of the project? At a meeting of the Yorke Peninsula Tourist Development Association at Port Vincent on May 17, the Premier announced proposed plans for a tourist development at Wallaroo, and a report in the *Advertiser* of May 18, headed "Copper Coast plan for Wallaroo", states:

> A $3 000 000 tourist development is planned to promote the Wallaroo area of Yorke Peninsula as the Copper Coast of Australia. Although final details of the plan have yet to be worked out, the Premier (Mr. Dunstan) described it last night as a very significant development.

Such a venture, involving the traditions and past mining interests of the area, would be of the utmost importance and most desirable for the area.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Offhand, I cannot reply to the honourable member. It may well be that the Premier had intended that the casino be the centre of the project and that, as this House rejected the Casino Bill, the whole deal collapsed! However, I say that facetiously, and I do not think that the casino had anything to do with the project to which the member for Gouger has referred. I will check and let the honourable member know.

BUILDING REGULATIONS

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Local Government take immediate action to change the new building regulations so as to provide for safety glass to be fitted in all glass doors? The present building regulations and the new regulations to operate in January next do not provide for safety glass to be fitted in glass doors of dwelling-houses. Regulation 53.4(3) of the new regulations, which deals with the use of safety glass in glass doors and panels, provides:

> Except as provided in subregulation (4) safety glass shall be used in:
> (*a*) every glass door; and
> (*b*) every fixed glass panel that is so located in relation to other parts of the building as to be capable of being mistaken for a doorway or other unimpeded path of travel.

Subregulation (4), which deals with exemptions, provides:

> Subregulation (3) shall not apply to glass doors or glass panels which:
> (*a*) comprise part of a Class 1 building; or
> (*b*) comprise part of a flat; or
> (*c*) are provided with a frame, decoration or other device sufficient to make the glass plainly distinguishable.

Both a flat and a dwellinghouse present problems, particularly for young people, regarding this matter. Further, fatalities have occurred recently.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will have the matter investigated and bring down a suitable reply in due course.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Holidays Act, 1910, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

On July 19, 1973, a proclamation was made under section 4 of the principal Act declaring Saturday December 29. 1973, to be a public holiday. Since that time it has been brought to the attention of the Government that in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory, and probably in Western Australia where legislative steps are in train, December 31 will be a public holiday. Already in Victoria this day is a bank holiday and a holiday in the

Public Service. Because of repeated requests from all sections of industry for a degree of uniformity between the States in relation to the fixing of public and bank holidays, the Government is minded to appoint December 31, 1973, to be a public and bank holiday by substituting it for December 29 already declared to be a public holiday.

However, the Government's legal advisers have indicated that, as the principal Act stands at present, there is no way by which a proclamation appointing a public holiday can be revoked. So while it is possible to appoint the additional public holiday, the Government's intention to substitute that day for December 29 cannot be given effect to. The purpose of this short Bill, at clause 2, is to give a specific power to the Governor to revoke a proclamation appointing a day to be a public or bank holiday, with the result that the day purporting to have been appointed will no longer be a public or bank holiday. If this measure is passed, it will be possible to effect the substitution adverted to above.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. The Government has found itself in a fix because of the need to change the proclamation provided for by the Holidays Act under which it sought to change the date of a public holiday from December 29 to December 31. Having made a proclamation, the Government finds that, under the Holidays Act, it cannot revoke it. Therefore, this Bill is before us to correct this matter by means of legislation. The Deputy Premier, in reply to a question asked last week, said that Wednesday, December 24, was first mooted as a public holiday by one interested party, but I pointed out that a holiday on December 24 could cause difficulty for many families because on that day, although most industries would be closed down, husbands and wives could not shop. Furthermore, difficulties would arise in obtaining fresh food for the Christmas period. It was decided that, instead of December 24, December 31 should be proclaimed a holiday.

In New South Wales, the Australian Capital Territory, and Western Australia, legislation will be passed to make December 31 a public holiday, and this day is also a public holiday in Victoria. Therefore, we are getting uniformity. The latter part of the Christmas holiday break will include Friday, December 28 (which is of particular interest to the member for Hanson); Saturday, December 29 (and I assume no shops would open then, except convenience shops); Sunday, December 30; Monday, December 31; and Tuesday, January 1. In that way, most of those persons who work on the other days of the holiday period will have a valuable five-day break. This new provision is being inserted in the Holidays Act, which was introduced in 1910, but the wording of the present provision is a little difficult to understand because the provision is long-winded.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I think the member for Torrens has missed an important point, and the Minister did not mention it in his second reading explanation. The explanation states:

> Because of repeated requests from alt sections of industry for a degree of uniformity between the States in relation to the fixing of public and bank holidays, the Government is minded to appoint December 31, 1973, to be a public and bank holiday by substituting it for December 29, already declared to be a public holiday.

I suppose one can take it that that is what the Government will do. The first that I knew of this matter was last week, when a wholesale fruit and vegetable merchant complained bitterly to me about Monday, December 31, being a public holiday. He said that this would jeopardize many consignments of fruit and vegetables from Adelaide to country areas. The Government has not mentioned this matter and the member for Torrens, so far as I could follow him, did not mention it. However, the point should not be overlooked and it would be wrong to push this Bill through this House and another place today as I understand the Government intends to do.

It is wrong that people will not have an opportunity to react to a measure like this. No notice was given of the introduction of the Bill, the Deputy Premier having introduced it this afternoon after obtaining the suspension of Standing Orders. I refer again to producers of primary products, especially fruit and vegetables, and I point out that Friday, December 28, will be a holiday. My recollection is that that day (Proclamation Day) must be a statutory holiday in South Australia.

The suggestion is that the Saturday should not be a holiday, but that day is, at best, only half a working day and time is not sufficient for many people to do what must be done. Of course, Sunday is a day of rest. The .Monday now will be a holiday, and Tuesday is a holiday, being New Year's Day. Except for a few hours on Saturday morning, businesses in this State will not be open from Thursday, December 27, until Wednesday, January 2, and that is a long break.

Mr. Hall: There'll be no markets.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There will be no markets, as the member for Goyder, who is a primary producer, has reminded me. As the position was explained to me, it will not be possible for a grower of, say, tomatoes to keep his produce over that period.

Mr. Hail: Or bunched vegetables.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I suppose the honourable member is referring to carrots.

Mr. McAnaney: The tomato-growers on the Adelaide Plains won't be concerned about the legislation, because, as a result of strikes, they can't dispose of their produce.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take it from that interjection that the member for Heysen does not care about the tomato-growers.

Mr. McAnaney: They're concerned lest they cannot dispose of their tomatoes.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That was not the purport of the interjection, as the honourable member knows. He was not defending the tomato-growers. Now let him please be quiet. How will a grower be able to keep his produce for five days, with no opportunity to sell it? That is what we are imposing on primary producers in this Bill. It is not good enough and the Bill should not be passed today. There may be an answer to what I have said and there may not be reaction in the community, but the position was put to me in great distress by a man whom I consider to be a senior member of that calling.

We should not continue the debate today. I hope that members will have a chance, even within 24 hours, to get a reaction to the Bill and to get information on associated problems. I understand from what the member for Torrens has said that he is pleased about the measure, and I suppose his Party is pleased about its being passed today. However, I hope my former friends in the Liberal and Country League will have second thoughts and support any move to delay the debate so as to prevent anyone from being jeopardized.

Mr. HALL (Goyder) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (5)—Messrs. Blacker, Hall (teller), McAnaney, Millhouse, and Venning.

Noes (35)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Chapman, Corcoran (teller), Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Mathwin, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 30 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I do hot wish to antagonize people nor do I believe in depriving anyone of another holiday, but, as has been outlined briefly by the member for Mitcham, the position concerns primary producers. The remarks of the member for Mitcham about market gardeners and their produce are valid, and I speak for grain producers: With another holiday there will be a 10-day period during which there will be only two days of grain receivals. Members will appreciate that we will be in the thick of the harvest, that much grain will be on the stalk, and that the period is good reaping weather; so the granting of an additional holiday will create almost insurmountable problems.

At present we arc facing problems caused by weevil in grain and, if grain cannot be received on this additional holiday, many more problems will be created. I support the member for Mitcham, because this is a matter of practicability and of necessity for primary producers. Market gardeners who supply perishable products to the metropolitan area will be grossly affected, as will housewives who will not be able to obtain good-quality produce during this long period. From the day before Christmas Day until January 2 there will be only two working days on which grain can be received. For the reasons I have given I oppose the Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I am somewhat dubious about the need to proceed with this Bill today.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you support us, then?

Mr. BECKER: However, I realize that the Bill gives the Government power to revoke a holiday previously granted for December 29. I should have thought that December 31 would not be proclaimed a public holiday. We may wish to have uniformity in public holidays but that is not possible, because we celebrate December 28 as our Proclamation Day. whereas I believe other States recognize December 26, which is Boxing Day. I thought the Government would consider proclaiming December 24 a holiday, because many people work in the city but normally reside in the country, and many city people are employed in country areas, particularly in banks, insurance companies, one or two trustee companies, and stock and station agencies. Many white collar workers will be inconvenienced if this holiday is granted. They will have one day in which to travel great distances in order to be al home on Christmas Day, and then will have to return to their place of residence. This matter has always been discussed by the Bank Officials Association and other white collar organizations with the Government. The haste with which this legislation is being considered does not give these people the chance to consider the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Yet you don't want to give it to them.

Mr. BECKER: The Government has the right to make this alteration, because the second reading explanation states:

The purpose of this short Bill, at clause 2, is to give a specific power to the Government to revoke a proclamation appointing a day to be a public or bank holiday, with the result that the day purporting to have been appointed will no longer be a public or bank holiday.

Mr. Millhouse: You talk one way and vote the other.

Mr. BECKER: As the matter can be reconsidered, it is not too late for the Government to take this action. No matter what happens, the workers in this Slate will benefit from the additional holiday, but it seems to me that Monday, December 24 (rather than December 31), 1973, should be proclaimed a public and bank holiday.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I am never happy when extra public holidays arc announced, because I believe it places an extra cost burden in respect of every article bought. I was the only person who spoke against the proclamation of the public holiday for the Adelaide Cup. However, the situation is different when it applies to a once-only holiday. There is a misconception about the market gardener because he does not have to rely entirely upon the wholesale market being open for the sale of his products. Having had nearly 20 years experience in the market-gardening business, I know that on public holidays the people concerned take their goods to the East Terrace market, where those resellers wishing to purchase goods are present.

Some of them have placed their orders in advance; they come to collect them from the market, and the goods are delivered whether it be Good Friday, Easter Sunday, Easter Monday or any other public holiday. Vegetables are exempt under the early closing legislation and greengrocers may operate on the days in question, whereas the large supermarkets may not. The small operator (whom many of us claim to help) has an opportunity to recoup something at this time and members of the public are not denied the opportunity to buy fresh fruit and vegetables, which are perishable.

Mr. Millhouse: What about the commodities consigned by rail?

Mr. EVANS: Most of the fresh fruit and vegetables is carried by road, because it is faster and the merchandise is handled less often than it is when consigned by rail, as anyone who has a knowledge of market-gardening methods realizes The average market gardener knows how to operate during a holiday period and he has the chance of receiving extra for his merchandise if he has the enterprise to take it to the market. I cannot speak on behalf of the grain producers, because I do not know their problem.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): When I voted for the adjournment a few moments ago, I was voting against the principle of rushing through the House Bills that an inept Government cannot introduce in sufficient time for us to think about them before we speak. I agree with the principle of having a longer break, and the member for Fisher has cleared up the problem relating to market gardeners. I believe that what he has said is correct. In addition, most of the harvesting in South Australia will be completed before the Christmas break. As a former trade unionist and bank employee. I know that we always had a break and that we worked on only two days over this period. This Bill is adjusting an awkward situation that has arisen this year concerning the period between Christmas day and new year's day. The member for Hanson has intimated that the present situation in regard to travelling would be awkward for many bank employees. I think it is better to have a holiday period of four or five days than to have two shorter breaks. What is being done here is the most practical way of solving the problem.

Bill read a second lime and taken through Committee without amendment.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

It was only a week ago that the Government announced that December 31 would be a public holiday, and this received reasonably wide publicity in the press and on radio and television.

Mr. Millhouse: That is why no-one got in touch with me, I suppose!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The announcement received wide publicity, and no-one has complained to the Government about it, nor has anyone praised the Government for it. If the complaint was valid, I wonder why the people concerned did not seek the help of someone in authority, rather than have the member for Mitcham lodge a complaint, because someone in authority might have been able to deal with it more effectively.

Mr. Millhouse: You mean because it comes from me you won't have anything to do with it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That is not a bad guess. If this Bill does not pass, we shall have two holidays because we have already proclaimed December 29 and the Government has committed itself to December 31. The Government intends to revoke one and replace it with the other. The reason for the haste, as the member for Heysen described it, is that the matter was brought to my attention only at about 9.30 this morning, and the Crown Solicitor considered that it was necessary to do this in order that tomorrow Executive Council could proclaim December 31 a holiday, allowing those people subject to a Commonwealth award time to apply to the court, if necessary, for a holiday on the same day as applying to other people in South Australia.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

COMMUNITY WELFARE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Community Welfare Act, 1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I should say that I have sought the indulgence of the House in relation to this Bill because it relates to the transfer of responsibility for Aboriginal affairs to the Commonwealth Government and, as the date of transfer is December I, 1973. it is desirable that this Act should be amended before that date. This Bill is designed to implement the Commonwealth Government's decision to take over from the States the whole area of Aboriginal affairs and welfare (so far as it specifically deals with Aborigines), other than the establishment and management of Aboriginal reserves which will remain a State function. An undertaking has been given to the Commonwealth to pass the legislation necessary for this purpose with as little delay as possible.

Commencement of the Bill will naturally be delayed so as to coincide with the commencement of the Commonwealth legislation on the matter. The agreed dale for the operation is December 1, 1973. I shall now deal with the Bill in detail. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the Bill. Clauses 3 and 4 amend the relevant headings of the principal Act so as to speak only of Aboriginal reserves. Clause 5 repeals section 83 of the principal Act which sets out the powers and functions of the Minister in relation to Aboriginal affairs and welfare.

Clause 6 repeals section 86 of the principal Act which provides the Minister with power to acquire land for Aborigines. Clause 7 repeals section 90 of the principal Act which deals with the legal representation of an Aboriginal before the court on an indictable offence. Clause 8 repeals section 91 of the principal Act which gives the Minister power to act as an agent for an Aboriginal. Clause 9 repeals that paragraph of the regulation-making power contained in section 251 of the principal Act and deals with the establishment of certain Aboriginal organizations.

Mr. ALLEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUILDERS LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister Assisting the Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Builders Licensing Act, 1967-1971. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: *I move:*

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank the House for its indulgence in allowing Standing Orders to be suspended so as to enable me to introduce and explain this Bill without giving notice of my intention to do so. The Bill implements an undertaking given by the Government before the last elections. At present, the Builders Licensing Act provides for the registration as general builders of three main categories of person, namely, those who have professional qualifications in architecture, engineering or building and who have had not less than three years practical experience in general building work; those who possess prescribed qualifications; and those who do not hold formal qualifications but have had very extensive experience in general building work. However, there is a further category for which the Act does not at present adequately cater: men who have qualified as tradesmen and have worked hard and well in their trades, who are continually broadening their experience of building work generally, but do not have at present the formal qualifications or (he necessary experience to qualify as general builders and work without supervision.

The Government believes that there should be some means by which these people may obtain the necessary experience to work as general builders. Of course there must be adequate safeguards both to the public and to the building industry. The work done must be subject to stringent inspections, so that a high quality of workmanship will be maintained. The holder of a provisional licence must not be permitted to compete on a completely equal footing with general builders nor, unless he happens to hold a restricted licence as well, with qualified tradesmen in their respective activities. The Bill therefore limits the holder of a provisional licence to the performance of speculative building work, that is to say, work that is commenced on his own initiative and is not offered for sale or lease until it is completed, and final certificates as to the quality of workmanship have been given.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the definition section of the principal Act. A new definition of a provisional general builder's licence is inserted. Speculative building work is defined in a manner that is designed to confine the provisional licensee to working on projects that he himself initiates. Clause 4 provides for the holder of a provisional licence to obtain a general builder's licence after a period of three years or more in which he has carried out a substantial amount of speculative building. Clause 5 deals with the grant of a provisional licence. It will be granted subject to conditions requiring inspection of the work carried out and to other conditions stipulated by the board.

Clause 6 pi ovides for the revocation of a provisional licence where the licensee fails to comply with its conditions. Clause 7 establishes certain offences in relation to a provisional licence. All work undertaken must be carried out under the personal supervision and control of the licensee. The provisional licensee cannot offer buildings for sale or lease until after a final certificate of inspection has been given. It is an offence for an inspector to give a false or misleading certificate. Clause 8 protects the board and officers of the board from liability that could result from inspections under the principal Act.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act, 1946-1971; the South Australian Electric Light and Motive Power Company's Act, 1897; and the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act, 1922. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The purpose of this Bill is to make amendments to the Electricity Trust of South Australia Act (referred to as the principal Act) and the old private Acts under which the Electricity Trust of South Australia operates. The amendments deal with superannuation, the acquisition of land and safety clearances in relation to the trust's installations.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 repeals section 18 of the principal Act dealing with pensions and similar matters and enacts a new section 18. Apart from life assurance schemes continued by the trust following the taking over by the trust of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company Limited's undertaking, the trust conducts a pensions scheme and subsidized savings scheme (together with a special saving account scheme) for staff and a wages gratuities scheme for wages employees. In certain circumstances the trust also from time to time pays gratuities to wages employees. Moneys of the various schemes are placed on deposit with the trust at interest. The principal purpose of the new section is to provide a State Government guarantee of the deposits and interest.

Under section 19 of the principal Act, the trust is authorized to borrow money with the consent of the Treasurer and to issue debentures, and under section 20 a debenture issued by the trust is guaranteed by the State Government. These provisions arc not readily applicable to deposits held by the trust under superannuation schemes, and the purpose of subsections (3) and (4) of new section 18 is to provide specifically that the State Government guarantee applies to such deposits. The Government believes that sums deposited with the trust under the trust's superannuation schemes should have the same security of a State Government guarantee as money borrowed by the trust from the public. At the same time, the opportunity has been taken to reframe section 18 in broader terms so that it clearly embraces all aspects of the various schemes run by the trust for the benefit of employees and their dependants. New section 18 is deemed to apply as from the commencement of the principal Act. This will take authority for all that has been done in the past clearly back to the commencement of the trust's operation, and in particular will attach the State Government guarantee to moneys currently held by the trust under the various schemes.

Clauses 3 and 4 amend the principal Act to give the trust a general power of compulsory acquisition such as that enjoyed by other instrumentalities of government, and clause 7 deletes from the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act, 1922 (which applies to the trust), limited powers of compulsory acquisition. When the trust was established it inherited under the principal Act the legislation applying to the Adelaide Electric Supply Company Limited, namely, the Acts known as the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act, 1897 to 1931, which consists of two private Acts, the South Australian Electric Light and Motive Power Company's Act, 1897, and the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act, 1922, and a public Act, the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act, 1931, subject to exceptions that are not material for present purposes. The second of the private Acts, the 1922 Act, confers on the trust a limited power to acquire compulsorily easements and similar rights (which it will be convenient to refer to here as easements) subject to various restrictions. An easement cannot be acquired, where its value exceeds $200, without the consent of the Governor, and an easement cannot be acquired over a garden, orchard or plantation attached to a dwellinghouse or a park-planted walk or ground ornamentally planted or the site of any dwellinghouse.

The trust's only other power of compulsory acquisition of land is a power to acquire land for substation purposes. This power was conferred on the trust in 1966, when in addition the restrictions of the 1922 Act were slightly relaxed by the removal of a restriction that the trust could not acquire an casement over the site of any building to the value of more than $200. Thus, the position at present is that the trust cannot compulsorily acquire land except for substation purposes, and its power to acquire easements compulsorily is severely restricted. For many years, the trust did not have to use such limited powers of compulsory acquisition as it had at all. The trust took pride (and still does) in fostering a good relationship with landowners over whose land its instrumentalities pass. Trust policy has always been, and will continue to be, to carry out voluntary negotiations with landowners for any grants of easement and for the purchase of any land required by it. However, the position has changed.

With the enormous expansion of built-up areas in the environs of Adelaide and the greatly increased demand for electric power essential to the functioning of a modern community, the trust has found that it has not been able to obtain all of its requirements by voluntary negotiation: Accordingly, it has had to resort to its power of compulsory acquisition and, indeed, now the Land Acquisition Act requires it to open negotiations with a notice of intention to acquire under that Act. The limited powers appropriate for a private undertaking are not appropriate to the trust, and it is considered that the trust should have the same general power of compulsory acquisition enjoyed by departments such as the Highways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, subject, however, to the adequate protection given to landowners by the Land Acquisition Act.

The requirements of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act in any event fit awkwardly into the machinery of the Land Acquisition Act. Complex problems of timing and unnecessary formal steps are involved and tend to confuse and annoy the landowner rather than clarify the transaction. The Land Acquisition Act provides

a complete code for the acquisition of land. For the trust to be required to comply as well with procedures laid down by a private Act is cumbersome and unnecessarily expensive. Clause 4 (*b*) of the Bill accordingly inserts in the principal Act an appropriate general provision authorizing (he acquisition of land. Clause 4 (*a*) strikes out the present limited power to acquire land for sub-station purposes contained in section 40 of the principal Act, while clause 7 strikes out altogether the power of acquisition contained in the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act, 1922, together with the restrictive provisions relating thereto. Clause 3 deletes from the principal Act the provision enacted in 1966 relaxing the requirements of the provisions of the Adelaide Electric Supply Company's Act, 1922, now proposed to be struck out altogether.

Clauses 5 and 6 deal with clearances to trust mains. At present, clearances from the trust's installations are regulated by sections 6 and 29 of the South Australian Electric Light and Motive Power Company's Act, 1897, an Act which in any event only applies within limited areas of the State. The provisions are archaic, and it is now proposed that these provisions should be replaced by a regulation-making power. Clause 5 amends section 44 of the principal Act accordingly, and also authorizes the making of regulations restricting persons from placing in streets or roads structures in dangerous proximity to the trust's installations.

Clause 6, as well as repealing section 6 of the South Australian Electric Light and Motive Power Company's Act, 1897, repeals section 29 of that Act. Section 29 deals with alterations in a "Government telegraph line" and interference with such lines. The subject matter of section 29 is now covered by the Postmaster-General's requirements, and the section is for practical purposes meaningless. The Bill will give formal security to members of the trust's superannuation schemes as well as clarifying the trust's powers in regard to superannuation: it will give the trust up-to-date machinery for acquisition of land which will avoid cumbersome procedures and fit better within the framework of the Land Acquisition Act, and it will enable practical clearance standards for trust mains to be laid down.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1969, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Members will no doubt be aware that the attitude of the Superannuation Federation to the proposed new superannuation scheme prepared by the joint working parly is still not clear to the Government. There are indications that some members of the federation support the scheme, with reservations, and that others oppose it entirely. However, it is clear that, if a scheme along the lines proposed is to be adopted in accordance with the time table proposed by the Government, certain amendments to the present Superannuation Act are essential, and, what is more, these amendments must be enacted into law before this Parliament rises. The Government considers that, to put it no higher, it would be irresponsible not to ensure that so far as it is in its hands the scheme can come into operation in accordance with the time table proposed.

If and when agreement is reached as to the principles, the Parliamentary Counsel can be instructed to draw a Bill setting up the new scheme. No-one under-estimates the difficulty and complexity of this task and the amount of time that will be needed to accomplish it. In addition, a considerable amount of administrative work will be involved. This Bill, with one exception, sets out the necessary amendments, and this House is asked to enact them accordingly. However, the measure proposed by this Bill will not be brought into operation until it is clear that there is substantial agreement between the Government and the other parties involved as to the proposed new scheme.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 is the exception adverted to above, and merely provides that the expenses allowance payable to the Agent-General under the Agent-General Act are, for superannuation purposes, to be regarded as part of that officer's salary. The appropriateness of such an amendment is, it is suggested, beyond question. Clause 4 provides that no further contribution will be required from contributors for additional units of pension to which they become entitled after the next entitlement day, (October 31, 1973). This amendment relieves the contributors affected of the necessity to make any increased contributions on their payment day which occurs in January of next year. The need for the amendment arises from the fact that this will facilitate proper transitional arrangements being made from the present scheme to the new scheme. However, it should be made clear that these transitional arrangements will take into account the deferred liability of the contributors brought about by this provision. This deferred liability is already taken into account in proposed subsection (2) of the new section, in the case of contributors who retire or die before the new scheme comes into operation.

Whatever form the new scheme takes, it is clear that it will not be a unit-purchase scheme as the present one is. Hence, a system of reserve units provided for by the present Act will not be necessary, and accordingly the amendment effected by clause 5 removes the right to elect to contribute for reserve units after the coming into operation of the Act proposed by this Bill. The new scheme will provide appropriate provisions to deal with reserve units already being contributed for.

I turn now to clause 6. The new scheme, it is proposed, will provide for retirement at age 60 for both males and females with an option to continue in employment until age 65. At present, section 55 of the principal Act gives female employees or contributors the right to elect to retire at age 55 and, while the transitional arrangements will cover such persons who had elections in force before August 27, 1973, it is thought desirable that as from that day this right should no longer be available. That day has been selected because it was the last day on which, under the Education Act, female teachers had the right to elect for early retirement.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which is necessary to take care of the transition period from January 1 next until the new superannuation scheme, which has been promised to the Public Service and which both sides of the House have said they recognize as a necessary improvement, comes into effect. I accept that the provisions of the proposed new Bill will be difficult to implement until contributors to the Superannuation Fund

have indicated clearly their approval or disapproval of the scheme submitted by the working party and of information that Cabinet has submitted to the Public Service.

If the provisions of the Bill to be introduced next year are to be retrospective, it is necessary to take action at this stage. Because members on this side have said clearly that they abhor retrospectivity, it is wise to take the action proposed in the Bill. The objections that the Public Service has made to the superannuation scheme will be settled either to the complete satisfaction of public servants or in terms of an agreement that is reached, and whichever political Party was in office would recognize the need to improve the present inadequate superannuation scheme.

If the new scheme is not agreed to, no-one will suffer under this Bill. The provisions will not affect the final decision, although if there are major changes the necessary adjustments can be made administratively. Until the scheme is implemented, there will be no additional contributions if any are required under the new scheme, but these contributions will be levied on contributors to the fund in due course.

Undoubtedly, there will be a public relations exercise associated with the passage of the measure for the new scheme and contributors to the fund will be advised to keep funds in reserve to meet any increase that applies to them. This will be brought into effect by making contributors responsible for the payment of deferred contributions. Death or retirement during the relevant period is well covered. The rights of contributors will be safeguarded between now and when the scheme is finally accepted. The system of units will be abolished under the new scheme if it is implemented in the way indicated so far, so the reserve units will become an anachronism; hence the cessation of the right to take these units, as provided by clause 5, is reasonable and legitimate.

The fixing of the retiring age for men and women at 60 years, with an option to continue until 65 years, is in line with current pressure for equality in employment and, doubtless, the member for Bragg will accept this, because it bears on the Sex Discrimination Bill that he has been discussing here and as a member of the Select Committee on that Bill. It has been proved that women have a longer life expectancy than have men. and their inherent capability of doing a job is equal to that of men. Therefore, it is illogical to force them to retire five years earlier than men retire, merely because of their sex. This changed approach to the equality of the sexes in job opportunity is clearly outlined in the Bill.

I am concerned about the provisions relating to the Agent-General. I appreciate why a large expense allowance is paid to the Agent-General, rather than a high basic salary. Under the arrangement being made, there is a distinct advantage to the Agent-General and I should like the Deputy Premier to comment on the Agent-General's receiving superannuation benefits that relate not only to his basic salary but also to his total expense allowance. I appreciate that this provision is made for only one person and that that person's total remuneration is determined by Parliament. However, these provisions will place him in a position different from that of any other public servants, and this one officer of the State will have an advantage. Although I do not resist this legislation, it could be the thin edge of the wedge in future, whereby the superannuation entitlement that will accrue to a senior public servant will be based on salary plus expense allowance. If this situation were projected into Parliament, several members would be at a disadvantage compared to other members who receive specific expenses because of their position. Not every Agent-General has been a member of the Public Service and therefore an officer who would normally fit into the superannuation benefit scheme. Apart from that issue, the Agent-General will have an advantage over any other office of the Parliament of South Australia or any person employed by the Government. In accepting this legislation, I do not condone the practice or suggest that later there should be an alteration of this or any other Act to allow this procedure to be considered as normal. This should not be the accepted practice. I would appreciate a comment from the Minister, but with that one proviso, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Certain payments not to be made."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I give the Leader an unqualified assurance that the practice to which he referred will not extend to any other member of the Public Service or to any person who receives superannuation under this Act. The Agent-General is in a unique situation, because there are reasons for his receiving a low salary and a high expense account. His office requires him to entertain far more than does that of any other senior public servant: the Government expects him to do that and it does not expect other public servants to do so. The Agent-General is the shop window of the Stale and he has to entertain people to encourage them to become favourably disposed to this State. We consider this allowance to be part of his salary and that his allowance plus salary should be the basis for his superannuation.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the Minister for his explanation, and I suspected as much. I agree that, as a true ambassador for South Australia, the Agent-General should be able to entertain, but I understand that the money we are discussing is not so much used to entertain on behalf of the State.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It is an extra allowance.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister's assurance that this is a once-only case is satisfactory to me and to my colleagues.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 and 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WEST BEACH RECREATION RESERVE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1954. Read a first lime.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I ask leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It effects a considerable change in the organization and structure of the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust established under the principal Act, the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1954. Members will no doubt recall that this trust is at present comprised of three persons appointed by the Glenelg council and three appointed by the West Torrens council. The members so appointed then appoint a Chairman.

Basically, the principal alteration proposed is that the present Chairman and members will go out of office and that after the commencement of the Act presaged by this

Bill the trust will consist of seven members, all appointed by the Minister but four appointed only after consultation between the Minister and the relevant councils. Up to this Lime, the constituent councils have been obliged to fund the operations of the trust when these operations cannot be financed from revenue. It is proposed that in future the trust will have access to funds borrowed at the semi-government rate of interest, and this will be achieved by means of a Treasury guarantee for the repayment of borrowings.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clauses 3 and 4 provide for a change of name of the trust from the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust to the West Beach Trust. In addition, by proposed new subsection (3) of section 3, general Ministerial control over the operations of the trust is established. Clause 5 amends section 4 of the principal Act and provides for the change in the membership of the trust adverted to above, and I here draw members' attention to the fact that at best two of the members must be officers of the relevant councils and a further two members require consultation with the relevant councils before their appointment. Clause 6 repeals section 5 of the principal Act, this being the section that provided for the appointment of the Chairman of the trust by the members. Since it is now proposed that the Chairman will be appointed by the Minister, this section is no longer necessary.

Clauses 7 and 8 are formal or consequential. Clause 9 provides for staggered terms of office of some of the newly-appointed members so as to ensure some degree of continuity of membership. Clause 10 is formal and consequential on other amendments. Clause 11 provides for the remuneration and allowances of the Chairman and members of the trust to be paid out of the funds of the trust at rates to be fixed by the Governor. Clause 12 provides for audit of the trust's accounts by the Auditor-General. Clause 13. at subsections (4) and (5) of proposed section 20. provides for a Government guarantee for the repayment of borrowings by the trust. Clause 14 is consequential on clause 13.

Clause 15 repeals and re-enacts section 27 of the principal Act which provides exemptions from the charges and taxes mentioned in the proposed new section 27. Clause 16 amends section 32 of the principal Act and recognizes the existence of the Coast Protection Act in its possible application to the foreshore that is under the care and control of the trust. Clause 17 amends section 34 of the principal Act by clarifying the trust's powers in relation to the physical development of the reserve. Clause 18 amends section 35 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (3), which seemed to place an unnecessary limitation on the charges that can be made in connection with the reserve. Clause 19 amends section 36 of the principal Act and provides that the former by-laws of the trust shall, in effect, continue in operation as regulations under this Act. Clause 20 repeals section 37 of the principal Act which provided for the machinery for the entry of the Corporation of the Town of Henley and Grange into the membership of the trust. The means provided for in this section are, all things considered, not really to be recommended for achieving their purported purposes. Any reorganization of the trust in the circumstances contemplated would be better accomplished by formal amendment of the principal Act. Clause 21 provides a regulation-making power, and this form of subordinate legislation seems more appropriate having regard to the new composition of the trust.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROYAL STYLE AND TITLES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 1782.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which is necessary to prevent the confusion and the absurdity that would result if the Commonwealth Government were to use one title and the States another. The matter has been discussed at length by the heads of Government of all political persuasions and each Government has accepted that this action should be taken. If it were not taken, people in other countries might believe that the Commonwealth was not united under the one head

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Opposition may be prepared to let this Bill go through as quickly and as formally as that, but I am not. I am reminded of the occasion in 1956 when the Royal Style and Titles were last changed. At that time, the member for Norwood, who is now the Premier, simply got up at the same juncture and said, "Mr. Speaker, I support the Bill", and then sat down. On that occasion, too, I had to get quickly to my feet to participate in the debate. The Leader of the Opposition certainly has not said anything more effective than that today, although he used rather more words. This debate gives us one of the rare chances in this Parliament of speaking of our constitutional arrangements in this country. As a rule, any reference here to the Sovereign is out of place. I support this Bill, as I supported the change in 1956. In view of what has happened in the intervening 17 years, it is quite proper that the monarch's style and title should be changed and that she should be recognized as Queen of Australia; it is merely a recognition of an existing situation.

I want to make clear, in view of the growing talk of republicanism in this country, that I personally support the type and style of constitutional monarchy that we have in Australia. I take this opportunity (and I hope other members on this side, if not on the other side, will also take the opportunity) of saying so. I support it because I like it. It is a system which has worked well and which continues to work well, and I have never heard of an alternative that would be more satisfactory or less expensive to this country. There, rolled into a few words, are all the reasons (of sentiment, loyally and practice) that go to support the present system.

Many things have been said and done, particularly by members on the other side (or by members of the same Party as that of members on the other side) that I do not like. At the moment we have in the community a controversy about the National Anthem. A survey is to be undertaken by the Commonwealth colleagues of members opposite to decide between three songs I hope the member for Alexandra, who is looking at me so perkily, no doubt in an attempt to distract me from what I am saying, will support my views. There will be a choice of three tunes: *Advance Australia Fair, Song of Australia* or *Waltzing Matilda.*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must link up his remarks with the Bill under discussion; that Bill refers only to certain specified titles.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right, and I am saying that I support the position of the Queen in our constitutional system. I was going to make the point, when you called me to order, that I think it is a disgrace that the National Anthem is not to be considered in (he survey. I do not

know that it would win, but at least it should be considered. It is quite disgraceful that the Commonwealth Government proposes to omit it entirely from the survey. One other thing concerns me, and it relates to the business of this House. I was twitted about it on Thursday last during a division. This House sat on Wednesday night during the time when the Royal wedding was being shown on television. It is ironical that, a week or so previously, it was good enough for us to get up to see the Melbourne Cup on television, but it was not good enough to adjourn to sec the Royal wedding film.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham must confine his remarks to the Bill under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

The SPEAKER: If the member for Mitcham interrupts while the Speaker is explaining what he will do, I will refuse to allow him to continue. The member for Mitcham will confine his remarks to the Bill under discussion, or he will not discuss anything at all. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think I had sufficiently made that point, anyway.

The SPEAKER: I rule the point out of order. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I make a protest about it. Finally, I make my protest at the cavalier rudeness shown by the Commonwealth Government in not allowing the Governor-General to attend that wedding. That was a deliberate snub to the Sovereign.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member persistently disregards the authority of the Chair, I will discontinue allowing him the latitude to speak to the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would have thought, with great respect, that every member in this House had a right to speak to any business before it.

The SPEAKER: To the Bill under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and the Bill under discussion is the Royal Style and Titles Bill: that is what I am speaking about. I am speaking about Her Majesty the Queen and about what I believe was a deliberate snub to Her Majesty by the Commonwealth Government in not allowing her representative in Australia to attend the wedding of her only daughter. That was a bad thing; I have had an opportunity in this debate to say so, and I do not regret having taken that opportunity. There is not enough discussion in this Parliament about these matters and, let me say in all fairness, not much opportunity for it. However, this is an opportunity to say these things, and whether you, Mr. Speaker, like it or not, whether any other member likes it or not, or whether the community likes it or not, I propose to take the opportunity to say them.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the Bill. I would have supported all the remarks of the member for Mitcham except that he digressed in his usual and typical manner.

The SPEAKER: Many of the remarks of the member for Mitcham were ruled out of order, and any reference to them by any other member will be dealt with accordingly.

Mr. BECKER: He made what I thought were some valid points. Like the Leader of the Opposition, I believe we are in a situation where we accept the change in title and recognize Her Majesty as the Queen of Australia. We will have a Royal visit to South Australia in March next year, and I know this is a matter of some embarrassment to the Government, because certain members have promoted the Royal visit in connection with various events, including the Festival of Arts. I agree with other members who have spoken, and I, too, endorse the system of accepting as head of our State Her Majesty the Queen. I, too, am a Royalist, and proud of it. As I am also proud of the Australian flag and the Australian National Anthem, I hope that no action will ever be taken by this Parliament or any other Australian Parliament to change them.

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

WHEAT DELIVERY QUOTAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from November 14. Page 1806.)

Clause 16 passed.

New clause 16a—"Right of appeal."

Dr. TONKIN: I move to insert the following new clause:

16a. (1) Any person who is aggrieved by a decision of the board under this Act may appeal to the Supreme Court against that decision.

(2) An appeal against a decision of the board under this section must be instituted within one month after the decision is taken, or such longer time as may be allowed by the Supreme Court.

(3) Upon the hearing of an appeal under this section the Supreme Court may reverse or vary a decision of the board as it thinks fit.

(4) An appeal under this section shall be heard and determined by the Full Court.

The new clause provides for a right of appeal to the Supreme Court against decisions made by the board, the relevant clauses affected being clause 14 and clause 19 *(h)*. There has been much disquiet in the community in the last few days, following an article in the *Sunday Mail* about the Bill. It has been suggested that the Bill will remove all right of appeal, opening up the possibility for pornography without restriction in this State. I do not believe that this is the true position. Certain measures in the Bill are worth supporting. I will support the Bill, provided that the right of appeal to the Supreme Court is clearly written in. It is wrong to provide that the board must always be right in its decisions. At present, action can be taken by the Premier under the Police Offences Act in relation to these matters, although action has not been taken often in the past. Only if a right of appeal, under the common law, to the Supreme Court is written into the Bill will I support the third reading, and I believe that that is the attitude of other members on this side.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I support the new clause. I believe that a board should be set up to classify the literature available in this State, but that board must operate within the common law. It would be ridiculous to establish a board without there being some right of appeal, as is provided in other legislation. Therefore, I will support the Bill if the new clause is accepted. A large number of people in my district have expressed to me a similar point of view.

Mr. Payne: How many?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: About 25 to 30.

Mr. Payne: You have a different idea from me about what is a large number.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: This legislation must be subject to the common law. If there were no right of appeal, it would be against the principles of democracy and of the Liberal Party.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the new clause. It is only right that there should be a right of appeal. So

often the rights of minorities are disregarded by the Government. This is an opportunity for the Government to show that it is willing to accept the position of a minority, by allowing a right of appeal.

Mr. BECKER: A right of appeal will enable people to express their opinion about the type of classification placed on literature. If the Bill were accepted without this new clause, people could be subjected to the worst type of pornography this State has ever seen. People overseas are preparing to Hood Australia with pornography. What we have seen so far is nothing, and it is now a matter of whether we arc willing to allow such rubbish to be brought into the country and to be sold subsequently to adults, and then finding it being sold on the black market and circulating in schools. As this new clause provides the only way in which the people of this State can register their protest, I urge all members to support it.

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the new clause, and I endorse the remarks made by previous speakers in support of it. Clause 12 (1) provides, in part:

. . . the board shall have regard to standards of morality, decency and propriety that are generally accepted by reasonable adult persons.

How is this defined? Who are "reasonable adult persons"? What standards will be accepted and adopted by the board?

Mr. Millhouse: Do you consider that you are a reasonable adult person?

Mr. RUSSACK: Naturally, I do.

Mr. Payne: Well, what are you worried about?

Mr. RUSSACK: I should like to know what would be the board's opinion in this matter. So that there will be no doubt, and so that there will be means whereby any person can appeal against a classification, it is imperative that the new clause be accepted. If it is not, I will vote against the third reading.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I had hoped that the Attorney-General would bother to reply.

The Hon. L. J. King: I will, when you've all had your say.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Obviously he was waiting to see whether the new clause would be dealt with without his having to speak. If the Attorney would like to speak, I should like to hear what he had to say.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitcham has the call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the new clause moved by my old friend the member for Bragg. It is only right and proper that there should be some appeal from the decision of the board. Members of the Liberal and Country League cannot say this, but it is the policy of my Party that a board be established to oversee such matters. Indeed, the member for Bragg, when he was a member of the Liberal Movement, took part in the debate on the formulation of our policy on this matter, and I am glad that, as a member of the shadow Liberal Movement, he has sponsored this new clause, which is in line with the explicit policy of the Liberal Movement.

The Hon. L. J. King: Which portfolios do you hold?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I can do anything, and I frequently have to. I support this new clause, which has come from the L.C.L., because I do not believe it is right that there should be no appeal whatever by anyone from a decision of the board. One of the protections in our democratic system is that the citizen can go to court for redress, and I regret that the Bill as it is framed cuts that out.

The Hon. L. J. King: Do you think he could do that under this amendment?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that he can. However, I have only had a quick look at the terms of the new clause. If it is ineffective, it should be changed. However, on a quick look, I thought it was all right; in any case, I support the principle behind it. If all the Attorney is going to do is argue about its terms, we can cease the debate. I hope that is all he will point out, because it is wrong that the right of appeal should be cut out in the same way as in another Bill it was wrong that a right of appeal was not provided against the classification of the Commonwealth film censors. I hope the Government will accept this new clause. It is in line with our traditions of allowing citizens to go to the court to exercise their rights and to allow the court, and not some Government official or even a Government body, to make a decision which is final and binding.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The debate has taken a turn which has surprised me, because when 1 read the new clause it seemed to me that the mover was seeking to give booksellers, authors or publishers who might be aggrieved by a decision of the classification board a right to appeal against a decision of that board. New subclause (1) provides:

Any person who is aggrieved by a decision of the board under this Act may appeal to the Supreme Court against that decision.

It has been frequently held in many contexts that, to answer a description of a person aggrieved by a decision, a person must have some special interest in that situation or decision. From my recollection there have been recent decisions in respect of the Planning and Development Act on this question, but I say that from memory rather than having closely examined the matter. However, I assume that was the reason for the new clause. Certainly, there is no doubt that an ordinary citizen, having no interest in the matter beyond his opinions as to what should be subject to restriction and what should not, would not answer the description of a person aggrieved by a decision. It does not mean that any person who does not like a decision, whether he is a party to the proceedings or whether he has a special interest in them, can describe himself as a "person aggrieved" for the purpose of appealing against a decision to which he is not a party at all. An ordinary member of the public would not be a party to a decision in proceedings before the board.

Mr. Coumbe: He could be affected.

The Hon. L. J. KING: He would not be a person aggrieved by the decision. There cannot be any real question of appeal. It may be possible in completely general terms to frame an amendment to the effect that any person may apply to a court to reverse a decision of the board, but that is not what the amendment seeks to do.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you support it if it did?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, I would not; it would be absurd. This board is being established by this legislation just as boards have been established in Queensland and New South Wales, and certainly as one will be established in Victoria where legislation has just been passed. These boards are designed to keep in touch with community standards, to develop experience and an expertise in assessing what restrictions will be effective in preventing offence to the public and in preventing the exposure of minors to explicit material involving sex and violence which, at the same time, will give the maximum degree of freedom to adults to make their own decisions in these matters.

These boards are expected to develop the experience and expertise necessary to make satisfactory determinations. I believe it is inappropriate to vest in courts of law a

supervisory jurisdiction over judgments as to what publications should be subject to restrictions and what should not, and as to what the nature of those restrictions should be. The function of this board is essentially administrative. It involves a judgment not only about whether there should be any restriction but also about the kind of restriction that should be imposed, and the board is given power to impose one or more of a series of restrictions set out in the Bill. None of those matters is within the competence of a court. It is not the sort of thing courts of law arc established to deal with and, if we had appeals from this type of administrative board to courts of law, we would be converting courts of law into administrative bodies, changing their functions, and asking them to discharge functions quite inappropriate to courts of law.

Of course, it is not true as has been suggested that in some way members of the public are deprived of some rights that they had, because members of the public can never take general action in the courts in relation to these matters. That has been pointed out previously. The sort of civil proceedings, at any rale, in which members of the public would interest themselves can only be instituted with the *fiat* of the Attorney-General, and that is because it has always been understood that it would be an impossible situation if every member of the public who had some individual opinion about a matter could institute proceedings to prevent other persons from reading material or doing things to which that individual objected.

Booksellers, publishers, authors, and so on, have a means of getting to the court if they so desire, because if they wish they can merely disregard the restriction, leaving it to the Minister in charge of the legislation to decide to prosecute, and thereby have the opinion of the court on whether the material is obscene. That is a judgment that the court can make, because in deciding whether an offence has been committed against, say, section 33 of the Police Offences Act the court has the criteria to test obscenity and can apply that criteria.

To ask courts to assume the administrative function of determining whether restrictions should be imposed as to display, sale to minors, advertising, or the other sorts of restriction in this Bill and, if so, to decide what restrictions should be applied would be to ask the courts to go into this whole administrative business. This board will have to acquaint itself with the trade, the industry, and how publications are handled, sold and marketed, in order to devise satisfactory restrictions (hat can operate in the trade. It is a specialist function of an administrative nature that will be committed to a board equipped for that purpose by qualification and, ultimately, experience. It would be wrong and, indeed, absurd to have a review of that sort of administrative decision by a court.

In Queensland and New South Wales, where boards of this type exist, there is no such right, and I am certain that there will be no such right under the Victorian legislation. The officer from the Premier's Department who has returned recently from a conference of Commonwealth and Slate officers on this matter has indicated that the unanimous opinion of those officers is that there should be no appeal to the courts in this matter, and I have not the slightest doubt that all the other State Governments will take that view. To do otherwise would stultify the whole legislation.

I consider that the Bill serves an extremely important purpose in ensuring that effective restrictions are imposed upon publications so that members of the public are not offended by being exposed to those publications and so that minors are protected. The only effective way in which that can be done is by establishing an expert board and giving it sufficient authority to do the job. I ask the Committee to take that view of the matter, because the new clause would seriously affect the operation of the Bill. Indeed, it would make it extremely difficult for a board to operate.

If the ideas put forward by the member for Bragg were written in, the Bill would be worthless, and, certainly, this view will also be taken in all the other States. I know that members opposite have been exposed to something of an organized campaign on this topic, put forward by people who, I am afraid, either have not read the Bill or have not understood it and who seem to have got the idea (and the member for Hanson has echoed their sentiments) that somehow or other this Bill will have the effect of changing the law regarding obscenity. That will not be the case. The Bill creates administrative machinery that will enable effective restrictions to be placed on publications.

For those reasons, I stress to the Committee that this type of administrative operation is suited to be administered by an administrative board and is unsuited for administration by courts of law. If the appeal by a person aggrieved, such as a bookseller or publisher, were extended to every member of the public, that would result in chaos, and the authority for making restrictions and framing the type of restriction needed for the protection of the public would be transferred from a board equipped to discharge the function to a court of law which, through character, constitution and nature, is not equipped for that purpose.

Dr. TONKIN: I moved to insert the new clause intending that not only booksellers, publishers and authors but also members of the public would be able to appeal against decisions of the board. As I have said, how this legislation will be implemented depends on the membership of the board in some respects, and the Government appointees will reflect the views of the Government. I cannot see any objection to allowing a member of the public to appeal against what he considers to be a wrong decision by the board. If he cannot appeal to the Supreme Court, where can he appeal? The Minister has no right under the Bill to set aside decisions by the board.

The board could fall into the hands of extremists: it could fall into the hands of people who will publish anything or people who will publish nothing. In those circumstances, wrong decisions could be made. As the Attorney has pointed out in relation to another matter, it is entirely a matter of judgment, although the Bill sets down clear guidelines. I am disappointed that the Attorney, having said that the wording of the new clause is not satisfactory, will not accept it, anyway, and will not accept any other change.

If the expert members of the Book Publications Classification Board wrongly classify a publication as being fit for unrestricted circulation and if members of the public are offended by the display, sale or reading of that material, what action can those aggrieved members of the public take to have set aside what in that case must be a wrong decision by the board? We on this side support freedom of the individual, but not if it impinges on the freedom of others. Those in a minority should have their point of view listened to and considered, and it seems that their only course is to take action under common law in the court. I agree with the Attorney-General that a court should not be turned into a censorship authority, but the real point is that that is the only avenue open. I now seek leave to amend my new clause 16a by striking out subclause (1) and inserting the following subclause:

(1) Any person may appeal to the Supreme Court against a decision of the Board under this Act.

Leave granted.

Dr. TONKIN: This may not be perfectly satisfactory, but its purpose is to test the Attorney-General and the Government about what they intend to do. If the new clause is not passed, we are taking away some degree of common law rights available to people, and I believe they should have this avenue of appeal.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am disappointed that the Attorney-General will not accept the amendment. Tomorrow I will present a petition from 76 constituents supporting the amendment of the member for Bragg. Therefore, the member for Mitchell will appreciate my comment that many people had expressed an opinion on this amendment.

The Committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold and Rodda. Noes—Messrs. Dunstan and Hudson.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Power to seize restricted publications."

Mr. BECKER: If literature is seized by the police from a retailer, does he receive compensation for the books taken? He may not know that the literature is not acceptable.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The retailer will know because provision is contained in regulation-making powers for regulations covering the marking of publications. If a classification is restricted it will be marked with the appropriate symbol denoting the restriction imposed on it. Some system of symbols will be worked out so that, when the retailer gets the material, if it is subject to restriction it will be marked accordingly. If he commits an offence, or if a member of the Police Force has reason to believe that an offence has been committed, authority is contained in clause 18 for the seizure of the material. It is seized to prevent the continuance of the assumed offence until the matter is determined, but it is also seized to be used as evidence. If the retailer is convicted the court may forfeit the material to the Crown. If he is not convicted he will get the material back. In either case no compensation is payable. If he is convicted, there can be no question of compensation; if he is not, he is in the same position as any person charged with an offence and acquitted, suffering inconvenience and even loss as a result. The inconvenience is unavoidable and part of the general administration of the law.

Clause passed.

Clause 19—"Certain actions not to constitute offences."

Dr. TONKIN: The clause disturbs me because of its statement that it shall not be an offence to sell, distribute, deliver, exhibit or display a publication that has been classified as suitable for unrestricted distribution. If a member of the public believes an injustice has been committed or an error made, what steps should he take?

The Hon. L. J. KING: He should make representations to the board, asking it to reconsider the decision. Such decisions are not irrevocable. The board is the authority set up by law to make the decision, so obviously its decision is binding. If a person found that a licence had been granted to a builder, and if he considered that the board had made a mistake, he could only make representations to the authority (with evidence to support such representations) for the revocation of the licence. The opinion of the individual citizen cannot be substituted for the opinion of a properly constituted board. The same position obtains in respect of all administrative tribunals set up to fulfil certain functions under the law. Parliament sets up the authority charged with statutory functions, and it is required to fulfil those functions. If they are fulfilled badly, the matter must be dealt with by those making the appointment, or the Parliament must decide whether to repeal the whole of the legislation.

This board is no different from any other of the myriad of licensing authorities in existence. In the case of the Credit Tribunal, if a member of the public wonders why a licence has been issued to a certain person as a moneylender that member of the public cannot do anything about it. Why should he be able to do anything about it? He is not set up as the appropriate authority to deal with the situation. He can make representations to the board and produce what evidence or argument he can to induce the board to change its decision.

The provision concerning the law relating to obscenity not applying where the board classifies the material is most important. Very often there is uncertainty in the minds of booksellers as to what they can sell. Under this legislation everyone in the trade will know if the board says certain material is suitable for distribution. Those concerned with the handling of material will know they are not running the risk of being branded as criminals without intent or cause on their part. If they choose to disregard the restrictions they can be prosecuted and the matter can be tested in court. If there is a breach of the restrictions imposed, the offence is constituted by the breach of restrictions. If, however, there is a refusal to classify, the author or the publisher has the right to test the position by publishing and running the risk of prosecution for obscenity. He could then defend himself and his publication in court, if he so wished.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I find the Minister's argument singularly unconvincing. Although he draws a parallel with the decision to be made by a credit tribunal. I find no similarity between the type of evidence to be assessed in that case and the evidence to be put before a board set up under this legislation. We are dealing with a grey area, depending on the personal outlook of the people concerned. The Minister is not being realistic in seeking to give absolute discretion to a board set up in the terms of this legislation. The board is given total discretion; the normal laws of the land will not apply once the board has made a determination.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (20 and 21) passed.

Clause 13—"Classification of publications"—reconsidered.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

In subclause (3) to strike out "do so" and insert "assign a classification to the publication".

This is merely a drafting amendment. As drafted, the wording was obscure, but the meaning is made clear by the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That this Bill he now read a third time.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I am disappointed that the Bill has come out of Committee in this form. I believe it sets

out some worthwhile principles and standards that could work well indeed, but I cannot countenance legislation that has no provision for an appeal. The arguments have been covered in the second reading debate and elsewhere.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not refer to any matter not relating to the Bill as it came out of Committee.

Dr. TONKIN: I was about to say that I would be out of order in referring to those arguments.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member would indeed be out of order.

Dr. TONKIN: I am disappointed indeed that I will have to vote against the third reading.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Russack, Tonkin (teller), Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Hudson. Noes—Messrs. Arnold and Rodda.

Majority of 9 for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

Bill passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST AND HOUSING IMPROVEMENT) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 15. Page 1832.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the second reading. I have a doubt about one point in particular. The main function of the Bill is to consolidate the legislation. I am concerned that section 26 is to be amended to allow houses to be rented for a longer period than five years. I wonder why this change is considered necessary. I believe that the main purpose of the Housing Trust is to provide houses at a low rental for those who do not have accommodation and who are financially unable to afford to buy a house or to pay high rents. I cannot see why the period of rental should be for longer than five years. There is no reason why, after five years, the trust cannot enter into another agreement with a tenant for an extended period. I prefer to have the term of five years specified so that the position can be reviewed at the end of that time. Perhaps the Minister will explain the purpose of this provision.

Clause 17 (e) amends paragraph (c) of section 27 (1) by striking out the following proviso:

> Provided that the aggregate of the rentals charged in any financial year by the trust for all houses of group A, whether built within or outside the metropolitan area as defined by section 28a of this Act, shall not exceed an amount equal to eight pounds per centum of the total capital cost to the trust of those houses.

I do not object to this amendment, as I believe it will make the Minister's task a little easier in reviewing rentals. I hope the Minister will correct me if I am wrong in that assumption. As I have said often, I think it is unfair for some people to receive a concessional rent from the trust when they can well afford to pay the normal rent. When the trust has a three-year waiting list for homes for single-parent families (people who do not receive a high salary), I believe it is unjust, ludicrous, and unfair. However, this is the situation applying in this State, although people on high salaries may live in low-cost rental houses. I refer to letters in the press and other accusations against certain individuals, although I do not level such charges. I know of persons who vote for my Party, conduct their own business, and pay more than $5 000 annually in income tax, yet they live in trust homes and pay no more than $14 a week rent.

Mr. Jennings: They would be silly to vote for you.

Mr. EVANS: I said "for my Party". The minimum price such a house would bring on the market is $15 000, and the current rate of interest on money for housing is 9½ per cent per annum. I refer to a measure which we considered earlier today and which provided an interest rate of 9½ per cent set by Commonwealth authorities. The interest on $15 000 at 9½ per cent annually is $27 a week. I do not say that we should charge this sum to low-income earners. However, where a person or family receives an above-average income (and I refer to people receiving twice or three times the average income), such a person or family should pay at least the interest on the money invested in the house on present-day values. If such people will not pay this rate, let them go and build or buy their own house, thereby increasing the number of rental homes that can be made available at low rentals to the underprivileged. This situation has continued for a long period under Liberal and Country League and Labor Governments, but I believe it should no longer be accepted in this society.

Some people will argue that land for the house to which I refer may have cost only $2 000 or even as little as $1 000 when the trust first started to build houses, and the house itself may have cost only $5 000 or $6 000 to build. However, the total investment in a house is not what the trust spent on its construction: it is its value today, because the value of money has been reduced by inflation. Consideration of the original cost of a house involves a false assumption. I know that the Premier is concerned about this, and I hope that the Minister responsible for housing will seriously consider reviewing rentals on a means-test basis.

I refer to the situation of a husband and wife and two teenage children all working. In this instance there are four incomes coming into the home. The family may own a speed boat and several motor cars and hold investments in other property, yet it may pay only $14 a week in rent. Such low rents must stop, and the opportunity for the Government to show it is willing to do this is now in the Minister's hands in this debate. The State Government and the Commonwealth Government are short of money, and the housing industry is behind with production. Indeed, the Minister can substantiate the statement that the supply of trust rental-purchase houses is up to three years behind the demand, and the supply of rental houses is also up to three years behind demand.

I know of two single-parent families that have been told there is no hope of the trust's looking at their applications for houses for over two years. That is not much consolation, and even less consolation is given those people who know that in the suburb in which they should be able to obtain accommodation there are people on high incomes bludging on the rest of society. Generally, the people to whom I refer vote for my Party and, being enterprising, they have used their own initiative to prosper financially. However, some of them have adopted a dishonest approach by staying in a trust home and saving money at the expense of the rest of society, while investing their savings at high interest rates.

It is possible to invest money now at over 10 per cent annually. Yet these people can rent a house at less than

four per cent of the market price of that house. In other words, the State is providing these people with up to 6 per cent on the investment in the house in which they live. That is the situation we face. If a person wants to go to a cheaper house, I point out that interest on $10 000 is $19 a week. The interest on $12 000 is $22 a week, and that is without taking account of maintenance or any of the other costs involved.

Judgment day is here in this regard. We now have a new Minister with new ideas, responsible for this matter, and I hope he has an enterprising attitude. I also hope he understands how unfairly we are treating the underprivileged people in our community by not having the courage to review rentals on a means basis in respect of those people bludging on the present system. I hope that the Minister will take note of that.

The Bill also allows the Housing Trust to borrow money at an interest rate approved by the Treasurer, whereas in the past the trust has not been able to do this. I consider that this change is satisfactory. The responsibility will be on Cabinet. A similar provision has been made regarding investments by the trust. My only concern about the Bill is in regard to the five-year period. Action should have been taken on many of these matters long ago, and I refer particularly to section 25 (1) of the principal Act, which provides:

> The average cost per house of all houses of group A at any time built under this Act within the metropolitan area as defined by section 28a of this Act (including the cost of the sites of houses, the fences, and the sewerage) shall not exceed the sum of £550.

I do not know how long ago that provision was inserted, and the Minister has deleted or amended many other provisions. Another section of the principal Act sets the aggregate fees to be paid to members of the trust at $400, and that provision, too, is outdated. I support the second reading and will raise some matters in Committee, particularly regarding rentals. I hope the Minister will give an assurance that the Government will review the rentals on a means basis, even though some supporters of my Party may be occupying trust houses and living partly on the earnings of other members of society.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support the remarks made by the member for Fisher. He has raised a point that is not dealt with in the second reading explanation, namely, that regarding the rental charged for Housing Trust houses. Our Party considers that to be an important matter. The Housing Trust, which the Playford Administration established, was the envy of housing authorities in other States. There has been a social service aspect to its operations, because it has tried to provide accommodation for people whose circumstances would not allow them to pay normal rentals. Pensioners and other persons in my district receive concession rates of rental for trust accommodation, and this is a real social service aspect. It seems to us unfair that persons who can reasonably afford to pay the kinds of rental demanded in the private sector should be able to occupy trust accommodation, thus depriving those in real need of accommodation. The Government would do well to consider this matter.

The Bill is fairly straightforward. It tries to consolidate and simplify the housing legislation in this State. The Minister, in his explanation, referred to a provision that makes a more realistic approach to the fees to be paid to members of the trust. If one considers the present provision in this regard, one realizes that it is not reasonable. When I read the Bill I did not have the Minister's second reading explanation, but I have found that there is no reference in that explanation to group A houses and group B houses. Apparently, the group B houses were not built and so it was useless to retain this provision. I should be pleased if the Minister would explain what was to be the distinction between the two groups.

I think it reasonable that the trust should have power to invest money. Government authorities should operate in a businesslike way wherever possible and it seems unrealistic to place restrictions on the investment of money. The trust will be able to invest money, subject to the general oversight of the Treasurer, and I think that is eminently reasonable. The public is becoming used to an idea that Government instrumentalities must always lose money, and some Governments seem to accept this point of view. Governments do undertake some enterprises that have been unprofitable for private enterprise, and this is done in the public interest. However, I have more than a sneaking suspicion that private enterprise could do many of these things more efficiently than do Government instrumentalities.

Mr. Chapman: It's willing to give them a go, anyway.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am convinced that greater efficiency could be obtained by having the stringent controls that must apply in private industry.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will address the Chair, not a member sitting out of his place.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Certainly, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to address the Chair and I apologize if I seemed not to be doing so. Many Government enterprises lose money, and the South Australian Railways is a real thorn in the flesh of the Minister of Transport at present.

Mr. Coumbe: And also of the member for Heysen.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a source of continuing concern for the member for Heysen.

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

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support generally the concept of the trust's being able to invest money in desirable investments with the approval of the Treasurer. However, clause 16 removes the prohibition that the trust may let a house for periods in excess of five years. It seems to me desirable that the letting of houses should be reviewed (particularly because of the remarks of the member for Fisher), as it is our view that people renting premises who can afford to pay higher rents should do so. The waiting time for a trust house extends up to two years, and in many instances this involves needy families. Perhaps the Minister could explain the deletion of that prohibition on the trust. Generally, we agree with the provisions of the Bill, and our queries can be explained if the Minister replies or in Committee.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the measure, much of which is formal, particularly regarding metrication, and some of which involves a consolidation of certain sections. We are speaking of two Bills, both of which are important. Metropolitan area members would know how the Housing Improvement Act works: I have found it operating strongly in parts of my district in which many older houses are let. Under the provisions of this Act, a notice is served on a landlord in cases of older houses needing repair, indicating that he must effect repairs, and the rent for the house is reduced until the repairs are completed. This is an important aspect of the legislation and should be continued. I think it is logical, particularly having regard to other legislation now before the House or on the Statute Book, that interest and charges are fixed by the Treasurer from time to time.

I could cite many instances in which this practice is necessary, and it is particularly pertinent at present because of the fluctuation in interest rates. It would be silly to stipulate certain rates, as amendments would have to be

introduced every few months because of the movement in such rates. This provision has my complete support. As an illustration, under provisions of the South Australian Gas Company Act, the Gas Company (together with the Electricity Trust) is a trustee investment, and the rate of interest on bonds is set by the Treasurer from time to Lime, as is the rate of interest paid on shares. As this measure is in line with that procedure, I support it.

Clause 15 repeals section 25 of the principal Act, which deals with the cost of a house and the rent that can be charged for it It was amended in 1942. when it set out the average cost of a house in groups A and B. We can forget these groups, because group B has never applied. Several members live in Housing Trust houses, as, by an alteration of the Statute some years ago, this practice was allowed. Those who live in such houses should be well aware of the provisions of this section and its origin. The principle was laid down when the original Act was introduced. I pay a tribute to Mr. Horace Hogben, a former member, who was regarded as the father of this legislation, later became a member of the Board of the Housing Trust, and was a member of the Co-operative Building Society. He was well versed in this type of housing.

Dr. Eastick: He is very highly regarded.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. His concept was to provide houses for those in a lower-income group who could not afford the type of housing that was available otherwise at that time. Sir Richard Buller (who was the Premier at that time) sponsored the Bill, but it was the brainchild of Mr. Hogben. South Australia led Australia (and I believe it still does) in providing these special houses. Also, credit must be given to the successive members of the board of the trust and to Mr. Ramsay (General Manager) for the administration of the trust. The original section 25 set out the relationship between what a man earned each week and what he should pay for a house erected by the trust. That was an underlying principle, the very nub, of the legislation. Figures shown in the old Act are now out of date, and group B houses were never built.

Today, this section is being deleted. I recall the Minister saying, perhaps three or four weeks ago, that he was interested in reviewing rentals that were being charged for trust houses. This is a most important aspect for the House to consider. There is no doubt that, for houses built and occupied on a rental basis many years ago, the rentals are now quite out of touch with reality when compared with rentals charged for Housing Trust houses being built and occupied today. The Minister should look most carefully at this matter, although not to cause hardship for those who have been tenants for many years and who have had the advantage of living in these houses. This is a social type of housing essential in any country. In all fairness, rentals should be reviewed periodically. As we know, the trust has long wailing lists at the moment for people wishing to rent accommodation. A review of rentals would be to the advantage of those who have just moved in or are about to move into rental homes. If the rentals were adjusted (and such an adjustment could only be upwards, of course) it would be to the advantage of the trust and of the potential tenant. After all, this legislation was introduced as social housing legislation.

Credit must be given to the Liberal Government that introduced this legislation and to the successive Governments that have carried it on. When this legislation was first introduced in 1936, it was quite a departure. South Australia pioneered this legislation, or al least was one of the first States to introduce it. We must give credit to those who had the foresight and the courage to promote this concept. When he replies to the second reading debate, 1 hope the Minister will explain more fully clause 15, which seeks to repeal section 25. I ask this on behalf of thousands of people who have benefited from the introduction o£ this scheme and many hundreds who are waiting to occupy such houses. I pay a tribute to the organization of the trust, its board, and its staff. All members, especially metropolitan members, at times have grave problems in trying to find houses for constituents. On many occasions, unfortunately, the trust is not able to assist, although not through any fault on its part. In such cases we must look elsewhere, often without success. Perhaps the Minister, in reply, will give the latest details of wailing times for rental houses, for rental-purchase houses, and for purchase houses. I have not received the latest figures available and I hope the Minister will be able to provide that information.

The Hon. D. .1. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): I thank members for the consideration they have given this Bill. I did not quite expect the broad range of discussion on housing policies that the Bill has generated, because it is largely a formal measure for the consolidation of these Acts. The member for Kavel invited me to deliver a history lesson. That is always a dangerous invitation to give me, because it is one I have great difficulty in resisting. The member for Torrens, of course, has largely spared the House my reply, because he has largely covered it. For example, he made the point that it was the Butler rather than the Playford Administration that introduced this measure in the first place.

The member for Kavel expressed some interest in the historical origin of the concept of group A and B houses: sections 22 and 23 of the principal Act make clear that, when the framers of this measure were talking about group, A and B houses, they were referring not to different standards of housing or different regions in which the houses would be built, but rather to different sources of money. There would be two funds: the Housing Trust Fund No. 1 and the Housing Trust Fund No. 2. Group A houses would be built with money from the No. 1 fund, and group B houses with money from No. 2 fund. I will not read out section 23, which stipulates the difference between the two sources of money. The honourable member can do that for himself, as can other members. It is available in the printed volumes of the Statutes of this State. That is the historical origin of the distinction between the houses of each group.

Two basic points have been raised in relation to this measure, and both can be related to the aim of this Bill only in a roundabout way. One is to do with the concept of renewing a rental agreement every five years, which we are seeking to amend in this measure, and the other is the whole concept of rentals and the class of persons for whom Housing Trust accommodation should be made available. Taking the second point first, I believe two questions are being asked. The first is whether the Housing Trust should be constructing houses for people across the whole broad spectrum of incomes, and the second is whether the Housing Trust should be regularly reviewing the rentals it levies against its tenants.

As to the first matter, I do not think I should go any further than refer members to clauses 16 and 17 of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, which is the schedule to Bill No. 29 passed by this House earlier in the year. That was the Act to authorize the execution by or on behalf of the Slate of an agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and States of Australia in

relation to housing and for other purposes. If members read those clauses carefully, they will see that the allocation of dwellings involves a needs test. This is a test that is being phased in.

Mr. Coumbe: Which clause relates to the needs test?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Clause 16 is important in relation to the needs test, with reference being made to 85 per cent of the average weekly earnings per employed male unit in the State. Certain considerations have been given to this State because of the traditional broader range of income for which our housing authority has built. In addition, there is machinery within the agreement for the variation of this needs test in certain areas and under certain conditions. I can already foresee the necessity for this occurring in relation to one or two projects with which the Government is closely associated. I simply make the point that, under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, we are required to phase in a sort of system which has, in effect, been hinted al by members opposite.

With regard to the review of rents, the member for Torrens said that he could recall a statement I had made recently. This arose out of my tabling in this place the Housing Trust report, which raised this question of the review of rentals that had been fixed many years ago. As I can see some necessity for a review, I am considering this at present. However, I make clear that, as no final decision has been made, I must disappoint the member for Fisher, who invited me to make some declaration al this Lime. I do not think this is the time to do so. In fact, technically such action might be against the provisions of Standing Orders, in view of the rather free-ranging nature of the debate and the fact that perhaps one or two matters raised were rather wide of the Bill. Al this stage, I am unable to say more than that L am continuing to look at this matter, as I can recognize the problem. I note the interest that members opposite, including the member for Fisher, have displayed in the matter over a considerable time.

Mr. Coumbe: Will a decision be made fairly shortly?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not even able to say that at this stage. Another point raised was in relation to clause 16. which deals with the five-year period. In fact, it was fell simply that the new provision would be easier to administer. If the member for Torrens wants a regular review of rents, that can still occur without its being provided in the legislation. It is still possible to have this written into a tenancy agreement that runs for a longer period. The point made was that there be a regular review al a five-year period or indeed at a one-year period. I do not really think that by striking out this provision we weaken our ability to bring in that type of tenancy agreement if we want to do so. Some people may appreciate the possibility of being able to have a much longer agreement than this. We simply want the administrative flexibility to be able to do that sort of thing.

Those were the main points raised with regard to the Bill. Certain noises were made about the relative efficiency of the public and private sectors. I remind members opposite that whatever the relative merits of the arguments they pul forward the private sector is, by way of contract, closely involved in all the building operations of the trust.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the waiting list?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The waiting list is still a source of considerable concern to the Government and to me, as the relevant Minister. It is still true that certain categories of people who wish to go into trust accommodation in certain parts of Adelaide will have to wait, on present indications, for up to 2½ years for that accommodation. Again, it depends entirely on where a person wants to live. In the older parts of the city, where there is less trust accommodation available, a person will obviously have to wait much longer.

Mr. Evans: What's the shortest time?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: That was the point I was intending to make. There is no hard and fast rule, because we have a priority housing committee that looks at urgent cases. It may well be that, where the sorts of conditions set down by the committee are involved (and that may include something as extreme as eviction), a person may be able to get accommodation in less than a month.

Mr. Coumbe: What about purchase houses?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There is still a considerable waiting time for these; again, it varies according to where a person wants to live. My recollection of the last figure I saw is that the shortest time would be for a house in the Elizabeth area. With regard to the southern areas, it would depend on whether a person was an area worker or whether he worked outside the area. Even in the case of an area worker, in some of these districts there could easily be a wait of up to six months or longer.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Remuneration of the trust."

Mr. EVANS: Although I know this will be in the Auditor-General's Report, can the Minister say what remuneration is paid to members of the trust at present and whether that sum will be increased or is considered to be sufficient?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): I do not have information with me about the present fees. The whole point is simply that, as the provision is presently worded, the fees are unrealistic. I do not have any information about a review of the fees. I can get for the honourable member information about the present fees.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"General powers of the trust."

Mr. EVANS: What change in the rate is envisaged by this provision?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Again, this is a flexibility provision. Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, moneys to be made available to the State are fixed at 4 per cent interest. Before that agreement, the interest rate extended to us varied according to the general variation of interest rates. The new agreement has been fairly generous to us. For that period, the interest rates were at variance with what was actually laid down in the South Australian Housing Trust Act. We are now moving to a 4 per cent situation in connection with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, but that does not mean that we would not want to move into other areas in the future in relation to making Loan money available to the trust. For example, if the moneys available under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement prove to be insufficient for our purposes, and we want to use other loan moneys where available, it is a possibility that should be kept in mind. We are up-dating the Act to allow for this. Obviously, this further Loan money would be at a higher interest rate than that obtained from the Commonwealth at present.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Repeal of s. 22 of principal Act."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister say what are group B houses?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I refer to sections 22 and 23 of the principal Act. The distinction between the two groups lies in the source of the money rather than in the class of house or the location of the house. I can only assume that section 23 (3) (*a*) was never operative and, since subsections (3) (*b*) and (3) (*c*) are consequential, they were never operative; hence fund No. 2 was never operative; hence group B houses were never built.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 15 passed.

Clause 16—"Letting of houses."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: What is the reason for removing the prohibition on the trust's letting a house for more than five years?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As I said previously, it is administratively easier. There could be a regular review of rental, even on a 12-monthly basis, and this could be incorporated in an agreement covering 15 years. What we do administratively arising from that is another matter. This gives us more flexibility.

Mr. EVANS: Does the trust let houses over a long term? Is it intended to provide such leases as an attraction to industry, whose personnel may need accommodation? If so, provisions should be made for regular review of the rental.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: There are longer-term leases from time to time. If executive personnel were involved, and if the Commonwealth agreement allowed the building of such houses, we would be providing them on a sale rather than on a rental basis. That may not be possible in respect of executives who are constantly moving but, despite the fears of the honourable member, I can see situations arising where we may enter into such an agreement.

Mr. Evans: With fixed payments?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Not necessarily. We would certainly look at the possibility of a regular review.

Clause passed.

Clause 17—"Restrictions on letting of houses."

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister say how serious are the considerations in respect of a regular review of rentals, so that people will know, when they take initial residency in a trust house, that if their financial situation improves they may have to pay a more appropriate rental?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I cannot add much more to what I have said in the second reading debate. Any investigation by the Government is serious. We arc serious-minded people and we take our job seriously. When I say we are considering the matter. I mean that we are considering it seriously. As to the intensity of that consideration, I do not know how the honourable member measures it, but it is under consideration.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (18 to 23) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PYRAMID SALES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 7, line 28 (Clause 8)—After "payment" insert "(other than an approved payment)".

No. 2. Page 7 (Clause 8)—After line 33 insert new subclauses (6) and (7) as follow:

(6) In this section "approved payment" means—

(*a*) A payment that was, at the time that it was made, declared to be an approved payment for the purposes of section 7 of this Act;

or

(*b*) a payment, being a payment that was made before the commencement of this Act, that is an approved payment for the purposes of this section.

(7) In relation to a payment that was made before the commencement of this Act and that was made for sales demonstration equipment or for any other thing or purpose that the Minister may approve, the Minister may from time to time by notice published in the *Gazette* declare—

(*a*) any such payment;

or

(*b*) any such payment of a class or kind,

to be an "approved payment for the purposes of this section".

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

These amendments were moved in the Legislative Council by the Minister and very wisely agreed to by that Council. Their purpose is to make effective the provisions to exempt from the operations of the legislation certain legitimate payments. The Bill, as it left this place, prohibited the making of certain payments for the purpose of joining a pyramid sales scheme, as defined in the Bill. The purpose of these amendments is to make effective the provisions which enable certain payments to be made for such things as sales demonstration equipment and other legitimate payments which are not really payments exacted for the purpose of enabling a participant to take part in a scheme and which therefore do not enable a person to partake of the vice aimed at by the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion and accept the information provided by the Attorney-General. Although some of my colleagues would rather review the matter further, I do not think that is necessary. The amendments have been inserted by the Attorney on the advice of his officers in this most complex matter associated with pyramid selling, but more especially with direct selling, which is parallel with pyramid selling but is recognized and accepted as a legitimate form of trading. When the Bill was first before the House I said that the net was very wide, and I thought it possible that certain aspects of this matter would require changes in the legislation. Provision was made to allow for such alteration to be made by regulation should that be considered necessary. The original provisions of the Bill would have affected the legitimate livelihood of as many as 6 000 people in South Australia. It is clear that members of this House are against the type of trading some people have entered into under the general heading of pyramid sales. The provisions now in the Bill are the best that can be determined until the legislation has been put into practice, and they will safeguard those people in the community from pyramid selling without upsetting legitimate and perfectly reasonable direct selling practices. Opposition members would be quick to associate themselves with any amendments which might become necessary to correct any deficiency in the legislation that might show up in practice.

Motion carried.

ROSEWORTHY AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BOARD)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 8. Page 1689.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): Although only a short measure, the Bill contains some important aspects. It needs more elaboration than is contained in the bare bones

before the House. The Fire Brigades Board in South Australia plays an important part in the community, especially in relation to safety, in which the Minister of Local Government is most interested. Apart from some formal aspects, the main feature of the Bill is to change the present constitution of the board. At present, the board consists of five members. It must not, of course, be confused in any way with the Emergency Fire Services or any other organization. The Fire Brigades Board looks after the metropolitan area, Port Pirie and one or two other areas. It has five members, headed by a Chairman who is appointed by the Governor. One of the remaining four is a representative of the Adelaide City Council (and one can understand that because of the fire risk in the city and the rates paid by the Adelaide City Council); one is a representative of all the other municipalities in the metropolitan area; and two are representatives of the underwriters or the contributing companies in relation to fire insurance in South Australia.

We have four members, and a Chairman appointed by the Governor, but it is now intended to add to the board a sixth member who, under the terms of the Bill, shall be an employee of the board. My Party supports the principle of worker participation in industry. The Bill deals with a semi-government or statutory body. There are several precedents for appointing to such organizations employee representatives or people who put the point of view of employees. That great Liberal, Sir Thomas Playford, started this practice when he appointed Mr. Jock Trevorrow (a member of the Electrical Trades Union) to the board of the Electricity Trust. Until his retirement, Mr. Trevorrow played a worthwhile and significant part in the deliberations of that board. Sir Thomas also appointed Mr. Alby Thompson (with whom I have been associated for many years) to the State Bank board. Mr. Thompson served on that board with distinction. I can refer to other statutory bodies on which employees are represented. I suppose the latest case is that of the South Australian Meat Corporation.

Clause 5 inserts new section 10a in the Act, providing for a sixth member to be appointed to the board. It describes in detail who is an employee for the purposes of this legislation and sets out how the ballot for the selection of this member will be carried out. This means that the union concerned will be directly represented on the board, and not necessarily by the union secretary, who will be eligible for election only if he happens to be an employee as defined. This means that the employees could be directly represented by an employee of the board, as defined in the legislation. However, we now come to a rather anomalous position. For the first time we will now have representatives on the board who are not direct contributors. The Government, the councils and the insurance underwriters all contribute. Part VI of the Act, commencing at section 53, deals with contributions paid to the board.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's remarks are a little wide of the Bill. We are not dealing with the original Act: we are dealing only with amendments to that Act as set out in this Bill. There should be no direct reference to other matters.

Mr. COUMBE: This Bill deals with the appointment of an additional member to the board. I believe that I am entitled to talk about other representatives of the board.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not refer to contributions paid to the board, because they are not referred to in the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE: For the first time, someone who does not represent contributors will be appointed to the board. The Bill provides that a Chairman shall be appointed by the Governor. The Government is obligated to pay two-ninths of the funds for the board. The legislation provides that five other members shall be appointed, two of whom shall be nominated by local councils, which are required to contribute two-ninths of the funds, the other members to be nominated by the insurance companies, which must contribute five-ninths of the funds. As the fees of a member of the board are $950 a year, the appointment of a new member adds $950 to the cost of the board. In fact, the allowance is increased to this sum by clause 6.

According to the latest Auditor-General's Report, last year the Government contributed 16 per cent of the funds of the board, councils contributed 23 per cent, and insurance companies contributed 60 per cent. The deficit last year was $1 14 600, compared to a surplus for the previous year of $111 600. One effect of the Bill is that each group of contributors is having its representation reduced in proportion to its obligatory contributions. I had hoped that this Bill would go further than it does and would deal with a reappraisal of contributions to be made by councils.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not allow the honourable member to debate the original Act. All honourable members must confine their remarks to the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE: I suggest that it will be in the interests of the Government and the people of the State if, after this Bill has been passed, a further Bill is introduced shortly to provide for a more equitable distribution of costs between councils and to remove many anomalies and inequalities.

The SPEAKER: Order! Once again I must ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the Bill. If I allow him to introduce matters outside the Bill, other honourable members will want the same right. Therefore, at the outset I direct honourable members to refer to the Bill. All remarks relating to contributions, which are not referred to in the Bill, are out of order.

Mr. COUMBE: The point is well taken, Sir. The Bill provides for a sixth member of the board. As I have said, my Party supports the principle of worker participation in statutory bodies. Within your ruling, Sir, I believe that I can say that the Government should introduce another Bill to overcome some of the anomalies contained in the present Act. This is a stop-gap measure which does not go far enough. However, I believe certain committees are considering this matter. Having said all that, and being strictly confined in my comments, I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. In respect of clause 5, at page 1689 of *Hansard* the Minister said:

Clause 5 inserts a new section 10a in the principal Act and provides for the election of a person to be nominated as the additional member. Il is felt that the substance of this clause is reasonably self-explanatory.

The clause provides for an additional member of the board. Section 9 of the principal Act provides:

The board shall consist of—

(*a*) a Chairman appointed by the Governor without nomination; and

(*b*) four other members appointed by the Governor after nomination.

Section 10 (1) provides:

The members to be appointed after nomination shall be nominated as follows:

(1) One by the Council of the municipality of the City of Adelaide

(2) One by the councils of the other municipalities and districts in which, or in parts of which, this Act applies:

The principal Act provides for members to be appointed by the Governor. Clause 4 of the Bill provides:

Section 10 of the principal Act is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph 11 in subsection 1 the following paragraph:

11a. One by the Minister, being the person elected under section 10a of this Act:

This is how the Minister becomes involved. Previously, the Governor was responsible for appointments, but now this Labor Government has brought the Minister into the act in respect of the appointment of the extra board member. Previously, members were voted onto the board by local councils. Indeed, some years ago I was nominated by a metropolitan council, but unfortunately I did not receive sufficient votes, so I was not elected to the board. The Adelaide City Council provides a member of the board. In his explanation of the Bill the Attorney referred to worker participation. Clause 5 deals with the election of employees' representative. However, this is not new policy, because this policy has been in operation in Germany for about 100 years. After the First World War, in 1921, an Act was passed in Germany to provide the first worker-participation scheme. This Act operated until the National Socialists came into office and suspended worker participation in industry. It was not until 1952 that provision was made for an organization employing more than 500 people to provide for the election of an employee to the board as part of worker participation.

I accept worker participation, but I believe there is a proper way for it to be implemented. I prefer the constitution of a supervisory board and the provision for election of members. This election should not be automatic. such as is the case in the election of a union secretary, organizer or shop steward. The worker should have the opportunity of electing the person who will become a board member. Such worker participation has several names. In Yugoslavia such schemes are known as worker co-operatives. In other parts of the world such names as co-partnerships, employee involvement, industrial democracy, and economic democracy are common. These arc good, because they all call for the involvement of employees far beyond their specific job in an enterprise. I support worker participation, especially if it is carried out in a democratic way. More and more demands have been placed on local government in respect of the fire services levy.

The SPEAKER: Order! Levies and contributions are not contained in the Bill and will not be discussed in relation to the Bill under consideration.

Mr. MATHWIN: Local government is represented on the board, as are other people connected with this matter. Clauses 5 (3) provides:

Subject to this section an election for the purpose of this section shall be conducted by the Returning Officer for the State—

(*a*) by post;
and
(*b*) in such manner as the Returning Officer for the State deems proper.

I should like further information from the Attorney-General on this matter. What is meant by that subclause? I am concerned about the burden placed on local government in respect of the contributions—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have ruled that all references to contributions by local government are out of order. The honourable member for Glenelg is not going to pul them back. That matter is out of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Bill. I believe that there is a wide field open for worker participation in Australia, provided that it is practised democratically and does not mean the automatic election of a certain person as it does in the election of union secretaries and shop stewards. The method provided here is a good method, and I hope the Government remembers that it has provided for this method in the Bill. I hope no pressure will be brought to bear so that there is an automatic finger pointing in respect of the election of a certain person to the board. It is up to the workers of an organization to elect their member of the board and, if that happens, we will be taking great steps forward in this country.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): 1, too, support the Bill. I endorse and support strongly the remarks of the member for Torrens and the member for Glenelg, especially the remarks of the member for Glenelg in respect of—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Contributions?

Mr. GUNN: I will mention them later.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not mention contributions. He will be out of order if he does so.

Mr. GUNN: Before I was rudely interrupted by my good friend and colleague, I was about to elaborate on what the member for Glenelg had said about worker participation in management. I endorse the proposal, provided that the person concerned is a representative of the workers, not the union secretary or organizer. If that was not provided clearly in the Bill, I would not support the measure. If the secretary or organizer nominated for the position, he would be elected, because the nod would be given and the employees would have to vote for him, or else. We know how unions operate, and such an election would not be democratic.

Mr. Payne: Is that what happens in the United Farmers and Graziers, your union?

Mr. GUNN: I would be out of order if I replied to the interjection. However, if the honourable member wants to know anything about that good and enlightened organization, I suggest that he telephone the Secretary.

The SPEAKER: Order! No-one will telephone anyone else.

Mr. GUNN: I support the principle of the appointment of a representative of the employees to the Fire Brigades Board, provided that he is a direct representative of the employees. Like the member for Glenelg, I am pleased that the Government has again adopted a part Of Liberal and Country League policy. The Government will use the services of officers of the Electoral Department to conduct the election. If it is fit and proper to do that in this case, it should be fit and proper to do it for a strike ballot. 1 am concerned about the contributions that councils—

The SPEAKER: Order! Those remarks are out of order and will not be considered.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I want to make a brief contribution to the debate.

The Hon. L. J. King: Contributions aren't in order.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader may contribute to the debate, but he cannot make contributions.

Dr. EASTICK: I was about to contribute to the debate, Mr. Speaker. Members may have seen that I looked up the dictionary a short time ago to make sure that I could make a contribution. Undoubtedly, the crux of the Bill relates to worker participation, and members on this side appreciate and accept that aspect. I know that the industry has considered this matter seriously, thinking it possible that some difficulty might arise in effectively continuing the board's functions. The industry may well have feared a

type of activity similar to what used to occur in the case of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board, when a similar kind of appointment caused difficulties. I accept that, under the new South Australian Meat Corporation arrangement, the contribution by the member who represents the union has been much more realistic, although the present representative is the same person as was a member of the former board.

The number of representatives of the insurance industry, which is the major organization associated with the financial aspects, has not been decreased, although the strength of the representation has been decreased because of the increase in the number of members of the board. Earlier the industry feared, from indications given to it, that its representation would be reduced to make way for the new appointment, and every member appreciates that if that had happened it would have been against the best interests of the measure, in that the insurance industry, because of the money it has contributed, has played a major part in the ability of the Fire Brigades Board to function.

Clause 6, which I consider a sensible provision in the circumstances, solves a problem that arose last year regarding the amendment of the fees provision in the Real Property Act. Fees can be amended by two methods, the first being by regulation under the principal Act and the second being by amendment of the Statutory Salaries and Fees Act. The latter method, which until now has been used under the Fire Brigades Act, is far more cumbersome and has not been totally effective, because automatic textual amendment of the principal Act has not followed. To find the appropriate fees, one had to go beyond the specific Act, and this is where the cumbersome nature of the provision entered the matter.

On the other hand, when regulations are used, textual amendment of the principal Act is automatic. Therefore, L agree that this is the more preferable method from the point of view of convenience to the public and those who are consolidating the Statutes, and I refer particularly to the convenience of the public. One of our biggest problems (and this has been highlighted here many times) is the long delay in having made available to the public a set of Statutes that requires a minimum of fossicking to find the full effect of an Act. The Government is proceeding with this matter and other measures have been introduced consequent on advice from Mr. Ludovici. who is responsible for much of this work. Frequently the public has been at a disadvantage in trying to find pertinent information from regulations under the various Acts. Therefore, I appreciate the change made by clause 6. It will benefit everyone who is concerned with the principal Act. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Nomination for appointment as members.

Mr. MATHWIN: Under provisions of the original Act the Governor appointed members of the board, but this amendment increases the number of members. Why is the new member to be appointed by the Minister?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): It is a matter of machinery and convenience. Appointments are made by the Governor on the advice of his Ministers, and that means they are Cabinet appointments. The new member is to be a representative of employees, and it is a Minister's functions to make this appointment.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is apparent that the Government is determined to get the Minister into the act.

Clause passed.

Clause 5—"Election of employee's representative."

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister explain the provisions of subclause (3)?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Obviously, for every poll there must be regulations about the manner in which it is conducted, and this provision allows the Returning Officer for the State to determine such manner.

Clause passed.

Clause 6—"Fees of chairman and members."

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister say what are the present fees being paid?

The Hon. L. J. KING: As I cannot supply that information, I will obtain it for the honourable member.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 1781.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The provisions of this Bill are supported by Opposition members. This measure has been introduced following suggestions by Mr. Ludovici in connection with consolidating the Statutes. I believe that the information provided in the second reading explanation fully supports these amendments and, that being the case, I see no purpose in unnecessarily delaying the passage of this Bill, although one or two members may want to consider various aspects in Committee.

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

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 1782.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the Bill, which is a measure that I consider would be covered more adequately in Committee. As the Minister so aptly said when the Bill was introduced, it makes several amendments to the Act on a number of unconnected subjects. Some amendments are simply matters involving metric conversion, but two relate to increased fees. The first of these provisions increases from $2 to $5 the fee for registering a vehicle used in trade with other States but, in monetary terms, the worst amendment is the increase from $1 to $4 in the cost of transfer of registration. While it may be argued that these are small amounts, with the current inflationary trend and the temptation to siphon off a little here and there, the Government could quite successfully obtain considerable sums of money by hitting the unsuspecting motorist.

The motorist does not pay this fee every year, for the average motorist does not buy a new car or another vehicle every year. However, a principle is involved. In the next two or three years, something that is increased now from $1 to $4 may be increased to $10, the State Government thus having a successful means of obtaining substantial revenue. I see this as something that will continue in the future. If this Government is allowed to go unchecked and to continue this practice without objection from the Opposition, this will be used as another successful taxation measure, and the Government will use the inflationary trend to capitalize on it. It is a means of getting at the motorist.

The motor vehicle is one of man's most important possessions. Ever since its discovery, man has made full use of the wheel, and nowadays movement is severely

limited without wheels; the most successful version of "wheels", of course, is the motor vehicle. The Opposition strongly objects to the provisions in the Bill (commencing in clause 7) giving the Minister such wide powers. Parliament should have the power to examine the various regulations and amendments introduced from time to time. Part of the legislation provides that a vehicle registered outside the Stale may be driven within the State in certain circumstances, and the Bill provides a formula for determining the power weight of a vehicle propelled by an internal combustion engine that is not a piston engine. I do not object to that provision: such matters should be spelled out in the legislation. Another clause removes the weight limitation that applies where a pensioner seeks registration at a reduced fee. Any legislation that provides a benefit to pensioners is always welcome. Although the question of cost should be borne in mind, I do not believe that any honourable member would object to the amendment. One important provision is that a motor omnibus may be driven in certain circumstances by a person who docs not hold a class 5 licence. There are five different classes of driver's licence. A well-qualified mechanic or his apprentice could be working on such a vehicle that must be road tested between point A and point B but they would not normally be permitted to drive an omnibus. This is a worthwhile amendment, and I believe that those who will benefit by it will not abuse the privilege.

The Bill contains both good and bad features. Another clause provides that examiners shall conduct practical driving tests and that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles shall be authorized to appoint such examiners. As a tremendous amount of work has been placed on the Police Force in examining members of the public who seek drivers' licences, I support any system that will relieve the force of this duty. The appointment of properly qualified authorized examiners to conduct tests for licences is a step in the right direction, because it will relieve the police of this onerous duty. This will benefit not only the motorist but will also help the cause of road safety.

Another clause relates to persons of 70 years of age or more. On reaching 70 years of age a person must have a driving test every year. The amendment simplifies the system of testing by altering the procedure whereby a person applies for the renewal of a licence that is due to expire on June 30. If the applicant will on that day be 69 years of age or over the Registrar may, if the anniversary of the applicant's birth occurs within the period commencing July 1 and ending on September 30, extend the dale of expiry of the licence to the date of the applicant's next birthday without fee. This will spread the system of testing such people so that they will benefit by the appointment of additional examiners. These people have had difficulty in arranging the time and place for the driving lest. Some of them have had to travel considerable distances. In general, I do not object to this amendment.

The Bill also amends the provision in the Act that deals with the points demerit system to cover the situation where a person does not hold a licence when he becomes liable to disqualification under that provision. It also provides for the permanent appointment of a nominal defendant: this is a good provision. Unfortunately, we still experience many hit-and-run accidents in which the owner of the hit-and-run vehicle cannot be identified or traced. The permanent appointment of a nominal defendant will, I hope, speed up insurance claims in this area. The Bill provides that the Minister may revoke the approval of an approved insurer if the insurer fails to satisfy him that he has sufficient financial resources properly to carry on business as an approved insurer; this is a worthwhile protection, but why it should be the Minister rather than the Registrar I do not know.

Then we come to the most important feature of the legislation, namely, the spelling out of the duty of and the placing of the onus on a medical practitioner, registered optician, or registered physiotherapist to notify the Registrar when one of his patients is suffering a menial or physical disability that may seriously impair his capacity to drive a motor vehicle. This is being done to some extent even now. A medical practitioner might examine his patient and say. "I consider that you should not drive a motor vehicle. I cannot order you not to drive, but that is my advice." Under the legislation, the medical practitioner will be obliged to report the matter to the Registrar.

I have come across cases where people had been told by their medical practitioner that they should mark their licence to indicate that they suffer from a serious defect. I know of a recent case in which a young married woman unfortunately had a fit for the first lime in her life. It was unsure whether she was suffering from epilepsy, but she informed the Registrar, on the advice of her medical practitioner, and she was barred from driving a motor vehicle for three years. After 2½ years she had not had another fit. Her husband was transferred out of the Stale for 12 months by his employer, and she had to depend on the motor vehicle to take her children to school and to do her shopping. Try as she did, she was not given permission to drive a motor vehicle until after three years, during which she had not suffered a fit. Present legislation enables medical practitioners to warn their patients, but the legislation now before us will make it mandatory. It will be interesting to see how this relationship develops. The Bill is mainly a Committee Bill, and I think the Committee stage is the best time to deal with it.

Dr TONKIN (Bragg): I support the Bill. Although I will deal with three mam areas. I echo the remarks of the member for Hanson, who said that "in the prescribed form" will be deleted and "in a form determined by the Minister" will be substituted in I think, eight separate clauses of the Bill. This refers to forms of application to register, registration labels and certificates, applications for transfer, notice of transfer, tow-trucks certificates, learner permits, towing authorities and instructors' licences. I look forward with interest to hearing the Minister say exactly why he wants to have the opportunity of designing these forms himself. I do not think he will actually design them himself, but obviously he has something in mind.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I'll let you know what I have in mind regarding these matters.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear the Minister say that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not listen to interjections.

Dr. TONKIN: It becomes difficult for one to hear them, especially when they come across the Chamber at such a low level, their progress being impeded by some problem that the Minister seems momentarily to have. It will be interesting to hear what the Minister has in mind I do not know whether *it* is intended to change the formal of these forms; we will see. I refer to the provision of a panel of civilian driving examiners, a move which is long overdue and which has been supported by my Party for many years. This is an excellent idea. An authorized examiner, be he a police officer or a civilian, will obviously be equally as efficient. The use of civilian officers will, of course, release the police for more satisfactory duties. The whole matter brings up the question

of traffic control generally. It is a matter of some interest that, during the train strike in London early last year, women traffic wardens were used to direct traffic. This could be considered in South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: They are used in Switzerland all the time.

Dr. TONKIN: That is so, and in Wellington, New Zealand, the traffic division is a separate division that is not related to the regular Police Force. This could well be considered, as it has the advantage of maintaining good relations between members of the public and the Police Force, for the simple reason that people are not badgered by the police on minor traffic offences. The testing of elderly persons is to be spread throughout the year and will be related to their birthday. This is a long overdue provision, and I am surprised that it has not been introduced sooner. Towards the middle of each year a spate of people go to doctors and opticians with their blue forms to be completed because they are due for their annual driving lest. Spreading these tests over the year will relieve much of the pressure from the examiners that occurs during that period of the year.

I refer, finally, to the duty of a medical practitioner, registered optician or registered physiotherapist to notify the Registrar if he believes that a patient is unable, for some reason, to drive safely on the road. This provision, which has been the subject of much discussion, had to come. Indeed, the Minister and I have for some years referred to the possibility of its introduction. This is a duly in relation to which medical practitioners will co-operate. They arc only too willing to discharge their duty to the public. It is, however, difficult for medical practitioners to balance their public duty against their duty to their patients. Traditionally, over the centuries, doctors have not in any way divulged details of their patients' illnesses. If this measure passes, as I believe it will, doctors should not have to specify from which disease their patient is suffering. In other words, it should be sufficient for the doctor to certify that his patient is suffering from a disability that makes it impossible for him to drive safely on the roads, without having to specify exactly what is the disease. In this way, the patient's rights will be protected.

I speak personally about those elderly people who are, and have been for many years, extremely good drivers. Indeed, many say that they have driven for many years without having had an accident. Unfortunately, eyesight can fail so gradually, to the extent that glasses will not help the vision to return to a permissible level, that it is difficult for these people sometimes to accept that they are not seeing as well as they should be seeing. It is extremely difficult to persuade them that they should give up driving. However, most doctors have found in the past, and will find again, that most drivers will accept their doctor's advice not to drive and, therefore, stop driving. After all, they have not only themselves to look after (and to consider that they may be involved in an accident) but also their own duty to the public to discharge. These three matters are long overdue. I welcome their introduction, and I support them.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): At first glance one may think that this is a simple measure that does not need to be scrutinized. However, the more one examines it the more one should become concerned about it. If one examines carefully what the Minister has in mind, one sees that he wants to set himself up as a dictator.

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the honourable member for Eyre return to the Bill?

Mr. GUNN: I certainly can, Sir. I do not want in any way to transgress Standing Orders. I merely want to make a contribution that is relevant to the matters before the House. As we are discussing an important matter, 1 should have thought the Government would be represented in the Chamber. However, only three Government back-benchers are now present. The Minister is not present, and I doubt whether a quorum is present. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr. GUNN: The first matter in the Minister's second reading explanation that attracts one's attention is the provision requiring medical practitioners or others engaged in a similar field to report to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles if a person is found to have any defects that will affect his ability to be in charge of a motor vehicle. I support that provision, as we must take all reasonable steps to ensure that people who use our roads are capable of exercising proper control over their vehicles. I refer now to paragraph (c) in the Minister's second reading explanation, which caused me much concern. It states:

> The Bill provides for the various applications to be made in a form determined by the Minister instead of in a form determined by regulation, as at present.

This is completely undemocratic, because the Minister is trying to short-circuit Parliament. He will deny the House the right to scrutinize regulations that will have a serious effect on the people of this State. The Minister seeks to by-pass the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and it is not difficult to know why. We have seen the Minister in operation before. The Subordinate Legislation Committee has already knocked back one or two of the Minister's regulations.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: This is pertinent to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I am referring to the list of items in the second reading explanation of the Bill. You, like me. Mr. Speaker, should be concerned about item (c). The Minister does not want this House or another place to examine the regulations. However, if regulations discriminate against sections of the community, either House should have the opportunity to disallow them. The people to be affected have the right to give evidence to the Subordinate Legislation Committee. This amendment is nothing short of a farce. The Minister claims to be a democrat, yet he introduces an amendment to make him a dictator. This course of action is disgraceful, and the Minister should be ashamed of himself.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will speak to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I hope the Minister gives a full, clear and precise explanation of his intentions, and not go off half-cocked and make further suggestions similar to those he has already made. I refer to another occasion when he tried to use the back-door method to knock road transport off the roads of this State. However, members on this side, and especially the member for Fisher, alerted these people and forced the Minister to change his mind. I hope Parliament rejects this measure if the Minister does not give a full and clear indication of his intentions.

The member for Hanson has pointed out that the opportunity has again been taken to jack up the costs to the motoring community. This group is one of the most highly taxed in the community and has no recourse to any form of protection. On every occasion the Government sets out to increase costs: it does not seem to be interested in taking

steps to save money by improving efficiency. All the Government seeks to do is build up the cost structure of the community. This Government is playing hand in glove with the Commonwealth Government in causing the greatest inflation this country has ever experienced.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about inflation. The honourable member for Eyre will refer to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: Other amendments contained in the Bill are also of concern. However, as the member for Hanson has said, this is a Committee Bill, and I will have more to say during the Committee stage.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Unlike the member for Eyre, I do not intend to oppose every part of this Bill, I refer to the Minister's explanation of the Bill and pay a tribute to the Minister for parts of the Bill with which I agree. I agree with the first paragraph of his explanation. There will be certain obligations on medical practitioners to notify the Registrar, in the interests of the public and motorists generally, of persons who have physical, visual or other disabilities. I refer to the list of amendments on page 1781 of *Hansard,* as follows:

(*a*) The Bill converts existing measurements in the Act to metric measurements.

Like my colleagues, I recognize the need for this, and J accept it. The list continues:

(*b*) The Bill provides for a motor vehicle that is registered outside the State it be driven within the Stale in certain circumstances. This amendment corresponds to the present regulation 38.

I believe that should be automatic. The list continues:

(*c*) The Bill provides for the various applications to be made in a form determined by the Minister instead of in a form determined by regulation, as at present.

I oppose this amendment. The Minister, in attempting to introduce such a classification, is being dictatorial and is attempting, as the member for Eyre pointed out, to exceed his ordinary rights as a Minister. The list continues:

(d) The Bill provides a formula for determining a power weight of a vehicle propelled by an internal combustion engine that is not a piston engine.

I agree with that. It continues:

(*e*) The Bill increases from $2 to S5 a fee for registering a vehicle to be used in interstate trade.

This is a classic opportunity wherein the Minister may make a significant contribution towards curbing inflation. Reference has already been made to this, but the Minister has been responsible through this Bill in allowing a Government department to increase its fees by 150 per cent, yet this department provides no physical contribution to the State. Indeed, the department is arranged purely for keeping records of vehicles on public roads, and it is of no material benefit to the public. I regard the service provided by the department as purely mechanical, on behalf of the Government of the day, making no contribution to the welfare of the people of this State. The Minister should not take this opportunity to jack up fees as he has done in this area. The list continues:

(*f*) The Bill re-enacts the provision dealing with the registration of a prime-mover which is to be used alternatively with two or more semi-trailers.

I observe and appreciate the relevance of that amendment and have no criticism to direct at the Minister or the Government for its insertion. By amendment *(g)* the Bill removes the weight limitation that applies where a pensioner seeks registration at a reduced fee. Here, the Minister has acted responsibly, and I commend him for il. By amendment the Bill provides for payment of a *pro rata* fee where a valueless cheque is given in purported payment of registration fees, I fail to understand or accept at this stage the reason for its inclusion. If a valueless cheque is presented for the purposes of payment of registration fees, I do not believe that the interests of that person should be protected in any way while he replaces the cheque that he has given to that department. I await with interest an explanation by the Minister at the appropriate time.

By amendment (*i*) the Bill increases from $1 to $4 a fee payable upon transfer of registration. That is in the same category as amendment (*e*), where the Minister has not acted responsibly towards the public of this State or implemented the Government's responsibility to the people. To suggest that one should pay $4 instead of $1, a 300 per cent increase, for the purpose of having a registration transferred is ridiculous and unreasonable. I am disappointed that the Minister proposes such an increase. By amendment (*j*) the Bill enacts amendments consequential upon the repeal of the Hire-purchase Act. I do not understand the implication of that amendment and await the Minister's explanation during the Committee, stage so that I can become more aware of its implications before commenting on it. By amendment (*k*) the Bill provides that a motor omnibus may be driven by a person who does not hold a class 5 licence, in certain circumstances. Having already had the opportunity of understanding the various licensing provisions applicable in this Slate to our Motor Vehicles Department. I agree with the Minister in his inclusion of that amendment.

By amendment (*l*) the Bill provides for the appointment of examiners to conduct practical driving tests by the Registrar. I see no need for further instructors or examiners to be appointed in this State. The Police Force and its staff are adequate for examining persons seeking driving licences in this State. By amendment (*m*) the Bill amends the provision of the Act dealing with the points demerit scheme to cover the situation where a person does not hold a licence when he becomes liable to disqualification under that provision. I take this opportunity of criticizing the points demerit scheme in this Stale; it is full of anomalies. Although theoretically it is a good idea, when implemented in its present form it is unworkable and unreasonable. I will not take up lime now to explain these anomalies but look forward to the opportunity of doing so in the future.

By amendment (*n*) the Bill provides for a permanent appointment of a nominal defendant. The member for Bragg kindly explained to me earlier this evening the importance of this amendment; I accept the Minister's reason for including it. Amendment (*o*) is the last of those listed in the second reading explanation. By it, the Bill provides that the Minister may revoke the approval of an approved insurer if the insurer fails to satisfy him that he has sufficient financial resources properly to carry on business as an approved insurer. I agree with this and support the Minister in his efforts to protect the public in this regard by ensuring that the financial resources of those companies with whom people insure are adequate. I support the Bill and am pleased to have had the opportunity of referring to the specific amendments mentioned by the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): It is time the debate was closed after what we have had to listen to. Were it not for the disgraceful outburst of the member for Alexandra, I would not waste the time of the House in replying to the debate. If the member for Alexandra is proud of the fact that he uses this House as a coward's castle to attack the diligent officers of the Motor Vehicles Department, it reflects no credit on him. I rise merely to defend those officers who are not here and

who, even if they were here, would not be able to defend themselves from the scurrilous attack of the member for Alexandra. Not once but twice he said that those officers made no contribution to the welfare of this State. The honourable member can take full responsibility for saying that. I completely reject it and say publicly that I admire the work of those officers in the Motor Vehicles Department. I respect them for what they are doing and, if the member for Alexandra thinks they are playing no part in furthering the interests of the people of this State, I hope he will accept that the money that they collect to sustain the people of Kangaroo Island can be withdrawn completely.

If the honourable member had the courage to stand up and say that, it would be different—but no: he comes into this House and vigorously attacks people who are not able to answer for themselves. He uses the coward's castle to do it, and it brings no credit to him. I admire these officers who have served this State well and, while having served the Slate well, they will continue to do so irrespective of what the honourable member says.

Mr. NANKIVELL: On a point of order, the Minister is reflecting on this House by calling it "coward's castle". I ask him to withdraw that remark.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold that point of order. It is a term used on occasion in this Parliament and many other Parliaments. It has never been withdrawn on the ground that it is unparliamentary.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman, while the House was going into Committee the Minister of Transport reflected on members on this side, particularly the member for Alexandra. The Minister said the honourable member was cheating, and I ask for a withdrawal.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I said the member for Alexandra was cheating with his car registration.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Keneally): That is not a point of order and I will not accept it as such.

Clauses 1 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Application for registration."

Mr. BECKER: Regarding the form of application for registration, can the Minister tell the Committee what is meant by the words "and must be made in a manner and form determined by the Minister"?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): Having the forms determined by regulation has proved cumbersome, and this is merely a matter of streamlining. The Registrar, instead of submitting proposed alterations to me for promulgation by regulation, will submit them to me and this clause will allow me to approve of them.

Mr. BECKER: I doubt the wisdom of not giving Parliament the opportunity, by way of regulation, to examine the forms, as is the normal practice. By circumventing the Parliamentary system, all sorts of things could go on. Whilst I am not reflecting on the officers—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What things could go on?

Mr. BECKER: Further questions could be added to the form and information that we do not know of could be sought in the form. We object to not using the regulation method and I find it difficult to accept what the Minister is advocating.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Registration fee for vehicles used in interstate trade."

Mr. MATHWIN: I register my disapproval of the increase from $2 to $5 and I ask the Minister to say whether the increase was made because inflation is running at such a high level or whether there was some other reason.

Mr. COUMBE: Can we have from the Minister the information sought by the member for Glenelg?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I had no intention of not replying. The Act provides for the registration of a vehicle used wholly and solely on interstate work. It is called a registration fee, but I think that is a misnomer, ft is really a charge for the registration plates. At present a vehicle of any kind that is used wholly and solely on interstate work attracts a fee of $2 a year to operate, whilst members of this Committee probably are paying about $30 or $40 a year for registration of their private cars.

Mr. Coumbe: What about taxi plates?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes. Because of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution, the State cannot levy a normal registration fee on vehicles used wholly and solely for interstate work. We are merely increasing the fee to try to meet the cost of administration. There is no profit (although that is a bad word to use in this instance) to the State from this form of registration. No dividend from it can be used for roadmaking or other purposes as applies with other forms of registration. We do not think the *bona fide* operator in South Australia ought to subsidize the interstate operator. As a matter of interest, the $2 fee was fixed in 1959 and I think it is lime it is increased.

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister say whether there is a corresponding charge regarding vehicles from South Australia going into Victoria, New South Wales, or Western Australia?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain that information, but I think the rate is comparable. All States are prevented from charging a registration fee.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Short payment, etc."

Mr. BECKER: Is the Minister satisfied that this provision will overcome the problem or, if a person pays the fee by cheque, could the registration be held up whilst the cheque is cleared?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would not like a system that held up legistrations pending a cheque being cleared. I have every reason to believe, from the information at our disposal, that this amendment will cover the situation. However, because people try to evade the law, we may have to amend this legislation in future.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 29 passed.

Clause 30—"Practical driving tests."

Mr. BECKER: Will examinations by the Police Department eventually be phased out?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For a considerable time the Police Department has considered that it should not have to perform these duties, and this amendment is designed to phase out police examiners. However, it will be a long process, because the Police Department will not be able to be phased out from this work in remote areas of the State for many years.

Mr. BECKER: The Police Department has done a wonderful job. but often the station at Glenelg is extremely busy on this work. Has consideration been given to appointing permanent examiners al Glenelg or other places to cover a wide area, or could branches of the Motor Vehicles Department be established in regional centres in the suburbs in order to deal with licence applications, transfers, and similar business?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This clause has been drafted in such a way that we will be able to decentralize the activities of the department. This has started in some country areas and, as soon as practicable, it will be extended to the metropolitan area.

Mr. VENNING: Is it expected that such a centre will be established at places like Clare?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot give the actual programme now, but I will bring down a considered reply for the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: Will the Road Safety Instruction Centre at Marion be used as a testing centre, and are there plans for additional instruction centres to be established?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would not expect the centre at Marion to be used for this purpose. The Premier's policy speech referred to this matter and we will carry out that policy.

Clause passed.

Clauses 31 and 32 passed.

Clause 33—"Visiting motorists."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister explain the reason for the severity of the penalty for a driver from another State who does not have his licence with him?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It might appear sleep, but the fact that he is from another State demands a heavy penalty. The penalty of S200, being a maximum, is not unreasonable.

Mr. EVANS: I take it that it is the responsibility of the driver to produce his licence immediately. Has some leniency existed in the past? Has a penalty been imposed on the spot on people from other States or have they been given a certain time in which to produce the licence?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They have to be taken to court.

Mr. EVANS: But the clause does not say so.

Clause passed.

Clauses 34 to 39 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SEX DISCRIMINATION BILL

Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 1: Report of Select Committee to be brought up.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) moved:

That the lime for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be extended until Wednesday, March 6, 1974.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 22, at 2 p.m.