LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, October 24, 1963.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

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

Business Agents Act Amendment,
Health Act Amendment,
Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act Amendment.

QUESTION.

PEA LOSSES.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: In the districts adjacent to Gawler the owners of pea crops are suffering considerable loss through attacks by huge flocks of pigeons. So great is the number of pigeons involved that a serious loss of yield will be noticed in these crops when they are harvested. Can the Attorney-General say whether there are any means by which the owners of crops can recover damages from the owners of the pigeons or is there any way by which the owners of the pigeons can be compelled to keep them within the precincts of their own properties?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I listened to the honourable member's question with interest. However, it would not be competent nor would it be wise for me, as Attorney-General, to advise private people as to their rights in connection with this matter. I believe they should seek legal advice. I do not think I can take the matter any further.

PISTOL LICENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

CITY OF WHYALLA COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to make it possible for the Whyalla City Commission and the Housing Trust to make arrangements under which works relating to the construction or drainage of streets, roads and footways in the neighbourhood of land owned by the trust can be financed by prepayment by the trust of rates on ratable property. As honourable members know, the trust is carrying out a large-scale building programme at Whyalla and, in order to keep pace with developments there, this programme must be continued for some years. It is obvious that for the proper development of a large and fast growing city, road construction should keep pace with housing development.

The trust undertakes some financial responsibility for the cost of roads in trust areas, but some part of the costs necessarily falls on the City of Whyalla Commission. In the past the trust has accommodated the commission by prepaying rates spread over a term of years. Recently, however, the Crown Solicitor has advised that, while the trust can legally prepay its rates, the commission cannot lawfully accept such prepayments, since they could be construed to be in the nature of loans made otherwise than in accordance with the Local Government Act. The commission's borrowing powers are at present fully extended and unless the trust is in a position to assist the commission, as it has in the past, road works will be held up until such time as they can be financed from revenue.

The provision of roads is an urgent necessity and it is considered that the method of assisting the commission by the prepayment of rates is beneficial, not only to the trust and the commission but also to the ratepayers. This Bill accordingly inserts in the principal Act express power to enable the commission and the trust to make the necessary arrangements.

In accordance with Joint Standing Orders, the Bill was considered by a Select Committee in another place; the committee after consideration recommended its passage.

The Hon. R. R. WILSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1199.)

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH (Acting Leader of the Opposition): In supporting the Bill, it is not my desire to recount in detail all the respective items. I am cognizant of the fact that the various amounts allocated have been formulated by the heads of Government departments who are skilled in their particular spheres of administration. In that regard the Government is most fortunate in having such capable and competent administrators to advise it on the various items of expenditure. That is different from the position in the United States of America where,

when there is a change of Government, there is also a change of the administrative officers.

I compliment the South Australian officers on their effective work, which makes for efficient administration. It is true that because of these administrative officers the Government maintains its existence as the Government of this State. Every State within the Commonwealth is suffering from a paucity of finance, and that has been brought about by the fact that, when the Loan Council was formed and the States' borrowing powers were transferred to the Commonwealth Government, the borrowing powers of the States were restricted and the moneys transferred back to the States from uniform taxation and from the Loan Council have a tendency to restrict the progressive programmes of advancement of the respective States. When uniform taxation was brought about, the fact remained that it was considered the panacea for all our financial troubles.

I submit this afternoon that a Labor Commonwealth Government did provide the panacea but under another administration, that of the Liberal and Country League in the Commonwealth Parliament, we find that restrictions are placed upon the States with the result that, when the money is not coming from the Commonwealth, the State Governments have to increase their charges to carry on their administration.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: What does "panacea" mean?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: The honourable member would not know. On the other hand, we find that charges have been increasing in some cases by 300 per cent. That has been brought about, too, by the haphazard manner in which assessments have been made, both in local government and by some of the Government departments. I advocated in this Chamber some time ago that there should be a Valuer-General's Department, similar to what New South Wales has, where he is called upon by the respective municipal authorities to make a valuation of the whole of the areas, and that is the basis of valuation upon which taxes and other local government charges are levied.

But, unfortunately, in this State under the existing system assessments are made from year to year and, whilst it may be said that some local government authority has an assessment value of so many hundreds of thousands of pounds, the fact remains that those people who own the properties whose values have been assessed on municipal rating are receiving no increased revenue for the purpose of paying the increased assessment. So that is a question that the Government should look into to prevent, as far as possible, the spiral of inflation that is being fostered by those departments I have mentioned. One thing that comes to mind is the recent increase in water rates. The Chief Secretary said yesterday:

> The largest increase in receipts of public undertakings is expected to be for the Engineering and Water Supply Department, for which receipts from water and sewer charges are estimated at £8,003,000, an increase of £693,000 over receipts last year. Some £300,000 of this increase will arise from expansion of services to meet the needs of housing, commerce, industry and agriculture, and the remaining £393,000 from a revision of valuations, a variation of the basis of rating on high value properties, a small increase in the country lands rating scale, and a small increase in the price of water.

There is a frank admission about the revision of valuations. Honourable members know that the Engineering and Water Supply Department has a schedule by which it can value water and sewerage charges. They also know that in the Adelaide City Council area, with the increased assessment of the Adelaide City Council, the Engineering and Water Supply Department takes these assessments and then makes its own charges at a percentage of the Adelaide City Council's assessments. This means that the higher the assessment goes, the greater is the revenue that comes back to the Engineering and Water Supply Department for water and sewerage services. That fortifies the point I have made about having a Valuer-General appointed in order to have a definite basis upon which these assessments can be made, so that the various rates and taxes can be calculated from them.

I said earlier that it was not my intention to go through the whole Budget. I have picked out certain items on which I desire to make one or two comments. First, I turn to hospitals and pay a tribute to those in charge of them: Dr. Rollison, the Director-General of Medical Services, and the respective Administrators of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, because it is the responsibility of the State to take care of the sick. There again, they have to have certain amounts from the Commonwealth Government to carry out the task of preserving the health of the community. In 1963-64 the proposed expenditure on this line is £545,000 in excess of the actual payments in 1962-63; and £200,000 of this increase is for mental health services, making a total provision for 1963-64

of £1,593,000 for these services. Mental health is now being cared for on a proper basis, for which I give great credit to those responsible for dealing with this all-important matter. It is their personal responsibility and I commend them for their untiring attention to the patients and for bringing them back to normal health and placing them once again back into the community as normal citizens.

I pay a tribute to the nursing staff. Hospitals do not function without medicos with attendants, and particularly the nursing staff. Provision in the Budget, for appropriation, has been made for £2,575,000 for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which is an increase of £179,000 over expenditure at this hospital last year. The Royal Adelaide Hospital was, and I think still ranks now, as one of the major hospitals, with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which is a modern structure. When the Royal Adelaide Hospital is completed, it will be one of the leading hospitals in all the States of the Commonwealth. For that, I think everybody is happy in the thought that we shall have at least two major training hospitals for medical students when the time comes for them to do their three years and second last year at the hospital and when walking the hospital wards.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital appropriation is £1,424,000, or £73,000 greater than the actual expenditure for the 12 months to June, 1963. The number of in-patients treated at the hospital was 14,670, and during the same period the number of casualty and out-patient attendances was about 114,000, thus indicating that the need for such institutions to preserve the health of the community is great.

As regards the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, taking this figure of 114,000 attendances for the year (that was for out-patients and accidents), it quite clearly shows the efficiency with which those hospitals are run. As regards the non-profit-making hospitals and other institutions, they are to receive subsidies amounting to £178,000: the Minda Home and the Crippled Children's Association, which do most laudable work, helped by highly public-spirited people, in attending to those unfortunate people who have to go there.

I also want to make a few comments on the Tourist Bureau, which looks after tourism in South Australia. With the appointment of Mr. Pollnitz as the Director of the Tourist Bureau, that department has gone forward by leaps and bounds. We all recognize, not only in this State but in other States of the Commonwealth, and overseas, that tourism now has become one of the major industries in providing currency for the respective countries to which tourists go. A sum of £380,000 is provided in this appropriation for swimming pools in country areas, for grants to councils in respect of pleasure resorts—by and large, for the purpose of promoting tourism in this State. In that regard I believe that Mr. Pollnitz is doing a grand job for the State.

Now I come to the matter of housing. For years the construction of houses in South Australia has been entrusted largely to the Housing Trust. Here again the Government has been fortunate in having a body like the trust, under the direct control and leadership of Mr. Ramsay, the General Manager. It has become one of the most efficient sections of this State's economic life, as well as one of the most progressive. Not only does it construct houses, but it is developing Elizabeth. Although there has been much propaganda about the Treasurer seeking new industries for South Australia, the trust has a responsible officer in London interviewing people about coming to South Australia to establish industries. I pay a tribute to the Industries Development Committee for its work. Applications through the trust for financial assistance for an industry is referred to the committee for investigation before the matter goes to the Treasurer for approval. Thus the committee plays an important part in the establishment of industry.

Mention is made in the Budget of accumulated surplus revenue amounting to £297,000. It is to be paid into a special account partly for the purpose of providing houses for persons in necessitous circumstances. We have been given just the bald statement about the surplus being paid into this special account. No details were given by the Chief Secretary and I would like to know what plan is to be adopted for providing the houses.

Now I come to education. Everybody will agree that education plays a paramount part in our economic existence. Even in securing minor jobs, like that of a shop assistant, it is often necessary for the person concerned to have the Leaving Examination certificate. This shows that the standard of education is reaching a higher plane every year. Those who go in for tertiary education find that they have difficulty in getting a good job in industry unless they hold a degree from the Institute of Technology, or a science degree from the university. Much money is being spent from year to year in order to give this education.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: It is being done.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: Yes, and I do not object to it. I am all for education, but it should be directed through the right channels. After the Second World War we reached the stage where science broke through the barrier, shall I say, and now scientific development has come into industry. The types of materials used years ago have gone by the board and it is now necessary for a more scientific approach to be made to production problems. That brings to mind automation. This development in industry must be met by a scientific approach and be in the hands of trained men, because it affects the very existence of the community.

Under "Minister of Education" £4,205,000 is provided. The proposals for this year are £367,000 above actual payments in 1962-63. It was pointed out by the Chief Secretary that the difference is due almost entirely to variations in grants to the University of Adelaide and to the Institute of Technology. Grants to the university, additional to the £44,000 to be paid under the authority of special legislation, and £390,000 provided for the Waite Institute under "Minister of Agriculture—Miscellaneous", are estimated at £3,275,000, which is an increase of £220,000 over payments last year. I think that answers the interjection by the Hon. Mr. Giles about education. An amount of £75,000 is provided for grants to residential colleges, while grants to the Institute of Technology are estimated at £555,000, which is £75,000 greater than for 1962-63. I am one of those who advocate grants to residential colleges. For years I have mentioned it in this place. Now we have a fine set of such colleges within the university, and members will agree that whatever grants are made to them the money is used most effectively in carrying out the traditions of the colleges and providing learning at the university. These grants to the colleges are gross amounts. They include the State contribution and the Commonwealth contribution. The latter is paid to the credit of Revenue when received by the State. Various commissions have been appointed by the Commonwealth Government to consider assistance to universities. Similar to hospitals, education is the responsibility of the individual States and, in order to assist, the Commonwealth Government makes grants to the States. The general proposals for the year in connection with education represent an increase of £1,136,000, or about 7 per cent above the actual payments for 1962-63. This follows increases of almost 11 per cent last year, and more than 14 per cent in 1961-62. A comparison of the amounts spent in Australia and in other countries on education shows that Australia spends the least amount, only 2.2 per cent of its total revenue, which means that if we are to continue with the advance already made in education larger grants must come from the Commonwealth to the States.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Where did you get your figures?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I did not make them up. I have authorities.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Put them in *Hansard*.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am giving them and I take the responsibility.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Are not the figures for the other countries due to other factors, such as free meals?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I am speaking of education, whether or not free meals or clothing are given. It is the actual amount spent. Being a successful farmer, the honourable member should know this. It would not be a differentiation of the various items. The cost of his farm is calculated at so much a year. He does not say it costs 1s. 1d. for tacks to put down a carpet. He works everything out on the total cost of his farm. I am pleased that provision was made for an increase in this amount. This follows an increase of 11 per cent last year and more than 14 per cent in 1961-62. The increases amount to almost £700,000 a year, but I regret that in the 1963-64 proposals no provision is made for any further salary increases for teachers. In the teaching profession today 2,651 young students are attending the three teachers training colleges. There will surely be a greater percentage of children attending school, both primary and high schools, in 1964-65 and, therefore, more teachers will be necessary. Unless salaries are commensurate with the ability of teachers and the training they must undergo, students reaching the tertiary stage of education will direct their talents to commerce and industry rather than to teaching. Unless we have an educated democracy all the money spent from time to time in other avenues of development will be of no avail. Consequently, I regret that the amount provided this year does not envisage increases in salaries for teachers.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Who fixes the rates?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I do not know, but they have been increased considerably. Years ago members of the teaching profession were being paid only a pittance but because of the efforts of the South Australian Teachers Institute the status of teachers has been raised and so have the emoluments associated with their work.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: The salary rates are fixed by a tribunal.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I think they are.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Why not leave it to the tribunal?

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: All I am saying is that the Government, in its provision for this year, does not envisage any increases that may be made by the tribunal.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: There could be Supplementary Estimates.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH: I quite agree. I raise this point as part of my criticism of the Appropriation Bill. I do so to jolt the Government into realizing that no provision has been made for any salary increases. I shall not delay the business of the Council any longer. I have offered some criticism. As I said earlier, the responsible officers are to be complimented on the presentation of the Appropriation Bill and the Government is fortunate in having these public servants because it can bask in the reflected glory of the efficiency of its administrative officers.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES.

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the report by the Electoral Boundaries Commission.

MARINE STORES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1193.)

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): In giving his speech on the second reading yesterday, the Chief Secretary referred to the number of organizations which were raising funds by collecting and selling bottles. He said that these included such bodies as Sunday schools and boy scout groups. He also said that these bottle drives were illegal under the existing legislation. There is no doubt that in some areas such drives are fairly prevalent and children of fairly tender age have called at my home to collect bottles. Whether they were authorized to do so by some organization, I do not know.

The principal Act provides in section 3 that no collector's licence shall be issued to any person under the age of 16 years. Section 6 (1) prohibits the use of a collector's licence by any other person. This effectively prevents persons of tender age from collecting bottles from householders. Section 14 (5) prevents a marine store dealer, licensed under the Act, or any other person on his behalf, from purchasing or receiving bottles from any person apparently under the age of 16 years. Clause 3 of the Bill proposes to exempt the provisions of the proposed new section 7a from the provisions of the principal Act preceding that section. This, among other things, eliminates the restriction regarding the age of the collector licensed under the provisions suggested by this Bill or any person authorized to collect bottles by that person, society, body or association. Clause 4 clears the way for a licensed marine store dealer, or any other person on his behalf, to purchase or receive bottles from a person apparently under the age of 16 years.

I am not sure that I approve of the lifting of all age restrictions in regard to the collecting of bottles even if the collection is conducted in the nature of a bottle drive by one of the organizations to which the type of licence proposed under the new section 7a is to be issued. Otherwise, I can see no real objection to the proposal to make legal the collection and sale of bottles for religious or charitable purposes, provided that the collecting and sale of the bottles is done by adults or young people not of a tender age. These bottle drives have gone on illegally for many years. I do not know whether it is due to this factor or to some other factor that the once familiar cry of the "Bottle-oh," so ably demonstrated yesterday by the Chief Secretary, has become less frequently heard. I do not always agree that because a thing that is illegal becomes prevalent we should move to amend the law to make it legal. However, at this stage I can see no objection to making legal bottle drives conducted by religious, charitable or other organizations with worthy objectives. My only criticism of this Bill is that which I have expressed: that there is no restriction on the age of collectors of bottles from householders. I would like to see some age restriction (it does not have to be 16) which would prevent people of very tender age from collecting bottles from householders and selling them to all kinds of marine dealers. I support the second reading.

The Hon. W. W. ROBINSON (Northern): I support the second reading which legalizes the collection of bottles by such organizations as the R.S.L., Sunday schools and boy scout groups who have been collecting bottles for quite a long time and selling them to augment their funds. Other clubs, such as Apex, have also been collecting and selling bottles and using the proceeds for such worthy causes as the provision of fire slogans on our roads and the provision of youth camps in country districts. I could also quote a case in the Yorketown district. When the people there were deciding to erect a new hall a young man employed in one of the local business houses took it upon himself to collect bottles in and around the district and as a result between £1,000 and £1,100 was raised.

This went towards the building of the very fine institute in that town. This young man should feel proud to have contributed so much by his own efforts. Later, with some of his friends, an amount of £1,500 was collected towards charities in the Yorketown district. That was a very commendable effort. I take it for granted that the scope of the Bill will cover all organizations that raise funds for charitable purposes. As is the position under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, there will have to be furnished a statement verified by a statutory declaration giving details of the collections and the application of the proceeds.

This Bill will not only allow these organizations to raise funds for very worthy objectives, but will have a beneficial influence in developing a public outlook by youths taking part in these operations. I therefore have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 22. Page 1141.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): One could almost describe this as a cottage pie Bill, made up of all the bits left over, so to speak. Certainly, the Bill is made up of lots of little pieces, and has very little continuity. I think, as the Minister very properly said yesterday, it is really a Committee Bill. However, there are one or two points I should like to raise at this stage and voice some blessing in some directions, but in others to express some slight condemnation.

Little fault can be found with clause 3 and I think that clause 4, which deals with the rating of hospitals, is one that will become more and more important as the number of our Government hospitals increases. Clause 4 concerns the rating of hospitals where service is given at reduced rates if not more than one-quarter of the hospital's annual income is derived from patients' fees. It is now proposed to increase this to one-half. The definition relating to "ratable property" is also to be altered. I do not think we have much need to worry about the definition of "township area". It is proposed to alter the number of dwellings necessary from 40 to 20 for a place to be termed a township. I have no objection to that. I know of the difficulty experienced in many council areas where we have these small townships, where they get mixed up with rural lands.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: And they get mixed up with the speed limit of 35 miles an hour.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They do. We find ourselves sometimes going through what is called a town, which may have only two houses and a shop, where one is restricted in one's speed. I think that the proposal to denote the number of 20 houses is quite all right. It certainly protects people in such areas, and makes it easier for the administration.

I now come to clause 5, about which I have some real worry. It amends section 88 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (2), which provides that no person who is not a natural born or naturalized British subject shall be entitled to be enrolled on a voters' roll or to vote at any election, meeting or poll of ratepayers. It is proposed under the Bill to delete that completely, so that the effect will be that any person who has the qualifications of section 88 (1), irrespective of whether he is naturalized or not, will have all the benefits of Australian citizenship. I am not in favour of that and shall oppose it in Committee. I feel that this amendment strikes at the very heart of Australian citizenship rights. Every Australian has certain rights conferred upon him either by the Constitution or by certain Acts of Parliament, either Commonwealth or State, and these are privileges to which every Australian citizen is entitled. Australian citizenship is a very prized thing and most countries would be very proud to have something similar. The type of life we live and

the type of laws we have make it a most attractive country in which to live. In Australia we have gone much further, I believe, than any other country has in allowing aliens to hold land, either as Crown lease land or as land in fee simple, which is a real benefit to those people who come out here and have these citizenship rights.

We do not allow unnaturalized people to have a vote in the State or Commonwealth elections or to enrol or offer themselves for candidature at either of those two polls. Having done quite a lot in naturalization ceremonies, I think that one of the great prizes for the non-British immigrant is that he is getting Australian citizenship, which is something he has waited for and is now having conferred upon him. When he renounces his allegiance to his previous country, he is getting something of real value. We are trying to build a nation, and the Commonwealth Government is paying out huge sums of money annually to bring people to Australia on assisted passages. We do not expect those people to come here, squat, get land, get rich and go back to spend it somewhere else. We expect them to come here, to become Australian citizens and to bring their families up in the Australian way of life. It is necessary in every way that these people should become naturalized Australian citizens.

I think this is only the beginning of the end if we concede this point of giving voting rights in this case because they happen to be landholders. If we are to be consistent, why don't we give them a vote in State and Commonwealth Parliamentary elections; why not let them be eligible for the age pension and all the other privileges? This is something for which there must be a testing time, and in this case the testing time is five years, which is not a long period. A foreign person is fortunate to get property in any country within five years, I doubt whether there is any other country in this world where one could do so, and I do not think we should hand these rights over just like that.

Perhaps I should point out what the qualifications for citizenship are. An immigrant who is a British subject automatically gets his rights the moment he qualifies under the property section. He is entitled to vote for the district council and get his name on the roll. That is his right. After 12 months' residence in Australia, if he wishes he can register as an Australian citizen specifically.

The immigrant who is not from a British country has a waiting period of five years but, if such an immigrant marries an Australian citizen, he or she can automatically apply for naturalization the very next day; so that, if such a person arrived on a boat today and married tomorrow somebody who was an Australian citizen, he or she could immediately apply for citizenship of this country. If a person other than a British subject has resided in a British country—we will say, for a period of four years—and comes to Australia, his waiting time is one year. So it is not at all, in my opinion, restrictive. I would not have anything to do with weakening the immigration laws of this country. I believe we should be very well rid of this clause of the Bill. I shall oppose it at every stage.

The next clause, clause 7, deals with the amount of money that a committee can spend. A committee up to the present time has been able to spend £20, and £20 only. That amount has been increased to £200. In clause 8 the important thing for the council is that, where appeals are being lodged, the time has been increased from 30 to 42 days. The fines are important. We have heard the Hon. Mr. Bardolph recently talking about fines increasing. Provision is made in this Bill to bring district councils on to the same footing as municipalities. In other words, prior to this measure, a person in a district council had until February 28 to pay his rates; otherwise, he incurred a fine. In a municipality the date was December 1. Under this Bill and the amendments, the rates in both district councils and municipalities will be due on the same day, December 1. This will mean that there is a little less time for people in district council areas to pay their rates. The Minister's reason for this is that in days gone by it was considered necessary that those people, who were mainly in the country, had a little longer time in which to get the harvest money in, etc. Now, most farms are completely diversified and there is a little trickle of money coming in all the time—you know, Mr. President, it is only a little trickle, but it is coming in all the time.

The next thing upon which I should like to touch is the power to apply parking meter revenue to car parks. This has exercised the minds of a number of people in local government and also people who have been fined for parking in front of a parking meter for too long, or who have just dropped their honest 6d. or 1s. in. Provision is now made for a reserve fund, which a municipality may be able to put aside for certain specific purposes. Those purposes are:

(*a*) constructing, providing, improving, altering, extending, or maintaining such car parks, parking stations, garages and similar places and such services incidental thereto as the council may construct or provide under section 475g of this Act.

That is a wise provision to enable councils to get together a bit of reserve money so that they can go ahead and provide some off-street parking, about which we hear so much. It is not compulsory for the council to do so; it may do so.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Does the motorist think it should be compulsory?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think there is something in that. I think the motorist may feel sometimes that it ought to be compulsory and that this money should be earmarked for that specific purpose. We are going partly along the way when we get a reserve fund. We had no power to do it before. I know of one large council that was not keen on having a reserve fund, but it will have no excuse now for not having one, which I think will be all to the good. The contents of clause 16 do not seem to tie up with the explanation given by the Minister, who said:

Clause 16 provides for an audit of a council's accounts within 14 days of notification by a clerk of his intention to resign or his suspension or removal from office. Such an audit is not compulsory in the circumstances that I have mentioned, although some councils do have one made. It is considered desirable that the auditor should give a clearance before a new appointee assumes office. I may add that the Auditor-General agrees with the new provision.

Apparently the Auditor-General and I are in agreement because I think that is necessary. My reading of the explanation is that it is compulsory for a council to have an audit.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: It affects the incoming clerk.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It would give the council immediate knowledge of whether or not anything was wrong when a clerk left the job.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It protects the resigning clerk and the new clerk.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: It covers everybody. We have had instances where a clerk has left a job and an appointment has been made in good faith by a council, only to find within a few months that something irregular had happened when the clerk was with the previous council. Not only has that caused turmoil in the old council, but it has done so in the new council. It is a wise provision and should be adopted.

Clauses 17 and 18 are complementary, and deal with the matter of the 10s. that can be charged as a moiety for road and footpath work. It overcomes the difficulty that apparently exists now, because if the money is not paid on the due date interest is charged, and sometimes the interest charge brings the total amount above what the council can legally charge. Under the Bill the interest to be charged will be in addition to the amount charged by way of moiety. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and I are interested in the amendments to sections 423 and 424. The purpose of clauses 23 and 24 are to amalgamate the two sections. That will make the position much clearer for the Minister, and in future borrowings by a council will be on the security of the general rates and not, as previously, on special rates.

Clause 27 amends section 435 of the principal Act and allows a council to proceed with the sewering of its district. It is an admirable proposal, and municipalities and councils that have been waiting for some time for Government schemes to be installed, and have not got them, can now proceed with their own schemes. The Barmera council is keen to borrow money to proceed with its plans for the disposal of septic effluent in the district. It has made arrangements to get the money, and a large scheme is involved. The Minister has approved it, and after many consultations the departments concerned are happy about its being a practicable scheme. Provision is made for the Minister to approve the plans, and that is proper. District councils will be placed on the same basis as municipalities. In these days many district councils are larger than some municipalities. I think of Quorn and several other municipalities. Compare them with the District Council of Salisbury. It is ludicrous that these smaller municipalities should have adequate powers whilst larger district councils are restricted in their operations.

Clause 37 amends section 521, and that is a good proposal. It deletes the words "municipal" and "municipality" in the section.

Clause 40 needs a careful review. Subsection (1) of section 607 is amended. It deals with building, particularly in municipalities. Now, when a building is being erected and reaches a height of 12ft., a suitable and strong wooden structure must be placed around the building to prevent bricks, mortar, etc., from falling on people walking below. The clause says:

Whenever any builder or other person has erected any building or part thereof abutting on or within six feet of any footpath of any street, road or place to the height of 12ft. above the level of the footpath . . .

Previously it was to the abutting boundary, and the proposal in the clause represents a vast change. It now covers, in addition to the old type of brick and concrete construction, steel frame buildings. I see no objection to that. The clause continues:

Every such covering shall be not less than nine feet above the footway at the lowest part of the said covering and shall be suitable for retaining falling materials.

That is a good move because often planks across the top do not have the right cant, which allows materials to fall. The by-law-making powers of councils are extended considerably by this Bill. At present councils have power to enforce by-laws at an intersection where there are high hedges or fences; under this Bill the power is extended to an area of up to 20ft. back from junctions. A number of special provisions under section 41 deal with the by-law-making powers of councils. This legislation is welcome. It deals with such matters as the breaking of metal. The passage relating to coal, coke, casks and barrels, etc., will be struck out and the powers of the councils will be extended. I believe they will take advantage of their new powers. No doubt, these powers have been requested. I know that, from time to time, the Subordinate Legislation Committee had some difficulty with by-laws brought down by councils that were under the impression they had greater power than, in fact, they did, and the by-laws had to be either amended or rejected.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: If you go to Hindmarsh you will get a fair amount of information on that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I agree. I know there is a metal-breaking works in that district used by a second-hand dealer which causes considerable inconvenience to surrounding neighbours, and the council has not had the power in the past to remedy the position.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: Residents or businesses?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Residents.

The Hon. Sir Frank Perry: And businesses?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, business people are there, but many residents have complained bitterly about these works. They are not allowed within 300ft. of a property or the area of a council. I am not happy about section 43 of the Bill and I ask the Minister to examine it closely because it seems to me to be a little harsh. It is brought in on the recommendation of the Local Government Association and no doubt this body has a very good cause for complaint. However, I am wondering whether the clause is not too harsh. It states:

Section 779 of the principal Act is amended:

(*a*) by striking out the passages "street, road, footway" and "bridge culvert, drain," therein;

(*b*) by inserting at the end thereof the following subsection (the previous portion of the section being designated as subsection (1) thereof):

(2) Any person who, otherwise than by reasonable use thereof, damages a street, road, footway, bridge, culvert or drain shall be guilty of an offence and liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds. Any person damaging a street, road, footway, bridge or culvert, shall pay the council the cost of repairing same. Payment of such cost may be ordered by a court imposing any such penalty as aforesaid or may be recovered by the council by action in any court of competent jurisdiction.

This clause replaces the clause which previously referred to "wilfully and maliciously" doing any of these things. It seems to me that under this clause a person who, through no fault of his own, gets his truck hopelessly bogged on a country road can find himself up for a considerable amount of money to fix the council's wretched road. After all, probably the lack of drainage at the side of the road was the main cause of the trouble.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: I think it must be accepted that councils are also reasonable people. If a person is bogged in wet conditions on a road there may be no ground for action. Do you not think that a man who is carrying 30 tons of timber when he should be carrying not more than 15 tons and who ruins a road should pay for the damage?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I think this section should be re-worded, because it is too wide. While I have regard for councils I know that from time to time they are not very consistent. Also, offenders would appear in a court in the district concerned and be dealt with by local justices who would often be councillors. I hope the Minister will examine this clause closely because a person with the best intentions can find himself up for a large amount of money when he has not maliciously or wilfully, but by pure accident, damaged a road. The matter is then in the hands of the court to decide and it could well be that an offender will be faced with paying a considerable amount of money if he has been forced through a bridge, thus causing damage. Of course, I have every sympathy for a council

when some careless person allows cultivator tines to be dragged along the road tearing strips out of the bitumen. I have seen semi-trailers drag things for 100 miles or more along a road and the council or shire has had to repair the damage.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It could occur on a cinders road; it need not necessarily happen on a bitumen road.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That could be so.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It would cost a lot to fill in the hole.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Do you think the fine should be increased and the payment for the cost reduced?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I do not think so.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: You think a fine of £2 is sufficient if a man is ten tons overloaded?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, I do not. Perhaps, we are thinking along different lines. A redress is provided if the vehicle is overloaded.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: He is fined £2.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, £2 per cwt.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: It is often only £2 in all.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We should amend the Road Traffic Act to deal with that. I do not want to confuse the issue. To my way of thinking, this measure could be open to serious abuse affecting innocent people. I will discuss the matter with the Parliamentary Draftsman and the Minister and see whether we cannot reach a compromise about this clause. Clause 44 is another which I believe could result in people being in trouble. It provides:

Subsection (4) of section 779b of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word "twenty" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the word "fifty".

It merely increases the penalty for travelling on a road under construction. I have no objection to the increase to £50 but I believe there should be some stipulation that an adequate sign be displayed. I have had the experience, along with many other people, where on certain roads a couple of drums are placed with a sign between them, painted in the manner of *Clancy of the Overflow,* "with a thumb-nail dipped in tar". The wind blows down the sign and the drums roll away and there is no way of knowing that the road is under construction until you have travelled a couple of miles on it. I have seen four or five mallee shoots cut down and thrown across the road.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: Those days have gone.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, they have not. It may be all right on the Minister's highways. His department has done a pretty good job in sign-posting, but I am not so sure that councils do it so well. An amount of £50 is quite a sum to pay if one gets on the wrong road at the wrong moment. If there is a sign and one does not observe it, one asks for trouble, but we should make some allowance if there is not an adequate warning that the road is being repaired.

I agree with clause 48, which gives authority for the disbursement of money in the Corporation of the Town of Kapunda Mayor's Bounty Fund. I am sorry that it was necessary for Kapunda to give up its mayor, as it is one of the very old towns with much tradition, but like many other old towns, Kapunda has slowly run down. I consider that the people of the district showed good judgment when they decided to merge the municipality and the district. However, it is rather sad to see a town, which was rather important and had sufficient interest in the welfare of its people to establish a mayor's bounty fund, change its status. All that has gone; but such is progress. I am sure that the money left in the fund, which does not amount to very much, will be used for the benefit of the district. I ask the Minister to consider the matters I have mentioned as having disturbed me, because they may also have disturbed other honourable members. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 22. Page 1144.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I support the Bill, which is designed to bring the Children's Protection Act up to date and to prevent the exploitation for commercial purposes of any child under the age of seven. I am completely in agreement with the principle of looking after a child's interests and preventing any exploitation, but I cannot agree with the way in which the Bill is framed. It has very wide implications.

In the first place, section 12 (1) of the principal Act states that no child under the age of six years shall take part in any public entertainment or be employed in connection with any public entertainment. Clause 3 of the

Bill provides a new definition of "public entertainment". At present children can only perform at a public entertainment in aid of a charitable, religious, educational or patriotic object, provided that the services of the child are gratuitous. Now that television is an entirely new medium, this Bill merely envisages a child of tender years being subjected to harsh lights and facing the strain of cameras and so on, but of course television brings children to the public gaze in many other ways. If the amendment is accepted in its present form, no child under the age of seven could ever be seen on a television screen. Take, for example, the specific case of a child riding Nimble in John Martin's pageant. This is not in aid of charity or for any religious, educational, or patriotic object—it is just for sheer fun. Nor could a child under seven be called out at a studio to answer a simple question, nor could it appear in an advertisement even though it had been photographed once, say, out in the country on a picnic jaunt. In other words, the photograph of a child could not be sold for advertising purposes.

Honourable members must bear in mind that the Commonwealth Government requires under the Commonwealth Broadcasting Act that there shall be a children's programme on television, and already South Australia's programmes in both media have been of a high standard. One programme arranged by a well-known South Australian woman has been commended by other States and the Commonwealth. Her children occasionally include some under seven years of age, and they provide great pleasure and fun to the young child viewer. There is no question that a little child loves watching his or her contemporaries on television. I can assure honourable members that most little children do look at television and enjoy it. There are difficulties, of course, and I can appreciate this, and I know that the Government will do all it can to make this straightforward. Other Governments have legislated in various ways and I understand that some States allow children to act only under licence.

The New South Wales Government has a system of licensing which is extremely cumbersome and is not the way in which we would wish it to be done. The British Broadcasting Corporation is very strict and allows children to act only if they are over the age of 14, but all performers are paid. It has made the position difficult by placing a complete embargo on young children performing. This is one of the reasons, I am told, why British children's programmes are extremely dull. There, they ignore the implications of commercial television altogether. It seems to me that under this Bill a child under the age of seven, whether paid or not, could not take part in a school play for public entertainment, in school sports, in Sunday school choirs, such as at anniversaries, in marching or eurythmic displays—in other words, in many innocent and pleasurable activities. Under clause 13, the Bill merely raises the age from 13 to 15 years for any person taking part in any circus act or acrobatic entertainment or exhibition, and therefore this can be supported completely. I should like to have a few of the points I have raised in connection with clause 12 cleared up when the Bill reaches Committee.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MINING (PETROLEUM) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 1201.)

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES (Southern): I support the Government in its introduction of the Bill, the aims of which have already been set out in detail by the Minister of Mines. Its object is to aid in removing doubt as to areas in which the Minister may grant licences. In his speech on the second reading the Minister gave details of various actions that can be taken. It is proposed to eliminate the words "in the State" in the early sections of the original Act and also the definition of "Crown lands" which incidentally is not used, as far as I can see, in the body of the original Act. It also deals with the anomaly of the doubtful jurisdiction of the State as to the sovereignty over land stretching between low and high water mark. There are one or two matters to which I should like to refer briefly. First, I notice that the Hon. Mr. Bevan points out that he is in a quandary about how the Bill will be implemented. What we are doing in this Council at this stage is implementing the Bill. To carry that argument a little further would amount to arguing outside the normal sphere of operations of this Parliament, but the point is that it is most desirable for the Government to get its own legislation in action and functioning.

Only this morning I read of many cases of international off-shore limit disputes. The more I read the more convinced I am on one point, that international courts rarely succeed in settling disagreements between countries in

respect of off-shore limits, and that more often than not what happens is that the two countries concerned enter into a working agreement between themselves. This has happened in many instances. There was the argument involving fishing rights around Iceland and there was a dispute between Great Britain and Norway. Over and over again we find that agreements have been negotiated between two countries for their mutual protection in respect of off-shore limitations.

Many countries can be cited: the Netherlands, Pakistan, the Irish Republic and Liberia favour the three-mile limit, but there are equally as many (in fact, I think there are more) countries which do not recognize the three-mile limit. I have a list of countries here. I shall not weary the Council by referring to them all, but the limit varies from 200 miles to 12 miles, 4 miles, 3 miles, and all sorts of different figures are given to denote the various practices on the breadth of zones under which the different countries operate in respect of fishing, Customs duty and other rights. Recently, for instance, Indonesia altered its limit to a 12-mile limit. Great Britain and 15 other countries have agreed to ignore this and, in fact, are treating that part of the Indonesian coastline as part of the high seas. This problem arises all over the world where each State or country has its own laws operating. Observance of the old principle of usage and common acceptance is of vital importance in establishing a Government's authority in a certain set of circumstances.

The Hon. Mr. Bevan also pointed out that new oil fields must be found so, briefly, for the sake of the record, I shall say one more thing: although it is quite obvious to all honourable members that more oil must be found, the fact is that over the last decade consumption rates have not been increasing at the same rate as the finding of new world oil reserves. In 1951 the ratio of reserves to production was 24 whilst in 1952 it was 26; it was 28 in 1953; 31 in 1954; 33 in 1955; 36 in 1956; 41 in 1957; 42 in 1958; 42 in 1959; and in 1960 it was 40. So the proportionate increase in available reserves of petroleum oil throughout the world is greater than the increase in consumption over the last two decades.

The annual increase in consumption is 7 per cent compound, which means roughly that within a 10-year period the figure is doubled. If we look at consumption, the picture is not quite so clear because we can rely only on past figures of increasing consumption, which makes it difficult to calculate with any certainty or to forecast the future requirements of the world as it develops. The only thing we can do, looking at the figures from America, which is developing rapidly, and for Australia over the last few years, is forecast the rate of consumption that will occur in the under-developed countries when development starts to become rapid there. This is rather by the way but purely in answer to the honourable member's comments.

If I had the opportunity, I should be interested in moving at least one minor amendment but, unfortunately, the amendment I have in mind does not come within the compass of the amendments to this Act. So, instead of that, I seriously ask the Minister of Mines to keep an eye on the rights of property holders where licences are granted, either for oil exploration or for oil prospecting, because in the past people on whose land companies have been boring for oil or minerals have sometimes been treated with an unfortunate lack of consideration.

I conclude by congratulating the Government on introducing this Bill which, in effect, puts its own legal house in order in this matter. I am certain that, as long as this is so, there will be complete protection, as far as can be envisaged, for any licensees wishing either to explore or to prospect for oil, whether on land or in the ocean, under South Australian legislation. I repeat that I am certain that, if we are in order in this and the Bill is effective, it automatically establishes the right of South Australia to pursue its own course in these matters.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Minister of Mines): I do not wish to delay the Bill. I thank honourable members for the attention given to it. The honourable member who has just resumed his seat referred to something affecting a landholder and the actions of licensees. I want to make it clear to the honourable member that for many years in other fields of exploration we have had the picture of people with mining rights or leases having to operate on private property. In all such cases, the responsibility is upon the company or the individual who is exploiting a mineral or other right under the Mining Act. He is responsible to the landholder to do everything possible to protect his property, to close his gates and that sort of thing. This applies also to petroleum leases. If there is any problem, it will be handled by the appropriate officers of the department. It does not matter

what laws we have; there will always be people who will break them or be neglectful of their obligations. I think that possibly the honourable member had in mind the actions of certain contractors, but these things occur whatever laws we have. If we had to carry things to the limit we might as well give up our ideas of expecting people to spend money in exploring our mineral deposits. If we make things impossible so that everybody will be interfering, we shall get nowhere. Under mining legislation there is provision for action to be taken to prevent the property of landowners from being damaged. For instance, there is nothing to stop people from drilling a hole in a back verandah whilst exploring for minerals. Some people may argue about that, but it can be done. I give the honourable member an assurance that if anyone abuses his rights under a mining lease I shall be glad to have a report about it and the matter will be attended to.

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

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (POLES AND RATES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 22. Page 1150.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I support the second reading of the Bill, which provides for transmission lines and poles of the Electricity Trust being exempt from local government rating. The need for the Bill arose from the desirability to have as much expansion of electricity supplies in country areas as possible, and the fact that the achievement of this state of affairs could be somewhat jeopardized by fairly severe rating by some councils. Generally, I am not in favour of restricting in any way the field in which local government may operate and I hesitate to support any move to deprive local government of powers or of sources of revenue. However, if severe rating on trust poles and lines, which has happened in some cases, is to impede and slow down the quite remarkable extensions made in electricity services in this State it becomes necessary to provide for trust poles and lines to be exempt from local government rating.

In passing, it is pleasing to note that the trust has undertaken to carry the full cost of the reductions in tariffs in country areas in due course and that the Government subsidy will then cease. It is hoped that it will happen within five years. I look forward to the day when a complete equalization of tariffs for electricity throughout the State will be an accomplished fact. It is obvious that the supply of electricity in country areas is more expensive than it is in closely settled districts and in the city. It would be quite remarkable if this were not the case. This does not prevent me from looking forward to the day when the trust will be able to carry the cost of the subsidy and supply power at equal tariffs throughout the State. In the present circumstances, however, it is undesirable that trust transmission lines and poles should be rated, although I believe it is proper and reasonable that there should be a provision in the Bill that other trust property should continue to be the subject of local government charges. I understand the Minister has had some consultations with local government on this matter and I trust that the intention of the Bill will meet with the approval of local government.

Although the Bill provides that equipment, poles, wires, fittings, etc., of the trust, together with easements and rights-of-way for land over which lines are carried, shall be excluded from the definition of "ratable property", it also provides for the removal, without cost to local government, of poles in reasonable and proper circumstances by the trust, where that is required by local government. While I am completely in favour of this provision I am not altogether on all fours with the wording of the Bill in that I do not think that quite enough attention has been given to the needs of local government. Perhaps the Bill could have been more precisely worded to provide for the rights of local government. In its present construction there would appear to be some loopholes which the trust could exploit if it did not wish to move a pole for a council.

The first part of new section 363a (1) seems fairly definite. The new section was quoted by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan and to my mind it meets the case except that it does not state that councils should still be consulted on the re-siting of the poles. I believe it has always been the practice that various Government bodies have given the courtesy to local government bodies of consulting with them, and that practice should be continued in this case. The latter part of this new section, which

says, "provided that the trust shall be under no obligation to effect any such removal in any case unless the Commissioner of Highways certifies that in his opinion any such pole post cable or wire impedes or obstructs vehicular traffic", opens the door fairly wide for the trust to get out of its obligations if it so wishes. I share the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan's doubts about this clause and I believe that it could be tightened up. I am of the opinion that the safeguards, from the point of view of the trust, have been very well prepared, but I feel that there is room for a little more consideration of the local government viewpoint. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan has given this Bill a considerable amount of attention and consideration and he has put some amendments on the files of honourable members to which I shall not refer in detail except to say that I think they have some merit and should have the earnest consideration of members in Committee.

I am very pleased to see the provision I have been discussing included: that is the removal of the poles by the trust and at the trust's expense. This is something which local government has been seeking for some time. However, I support the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan's contention that, as it stands, the concession is somewhat limited. As I said earlier, the councils seem to have no say with regard to the re-alignment of the poles or lines and no power to seek the removal of a pole which might be dangerous. The words in question are "impedes or obstructs the flow of traffic", and I believe with my honourable friend that a pole can be awkwardly placed and, perhaps, be in a dangerous position without actually impeding the flow of traffic. I ask the Minister to further consider these matters, which I trust will be tidied up in Committee. I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the second reading. I have listened to this debate with interest, both as a consumer of electricity and as one who is interested in local government. I do not believe in the principle of rating poles that are used for the reticulation or conveyance of essential services such as electricity, water or telephone services. By the extension of electricity supplies the trust has brought great benefit to country districts. It has allowed country people to enjoy some of the amenities that are taken for granted in the more populous parts of the State. It has also been of great benefit to industry throughout country areas by supplying it with a ready and cheap form of power. I believe that, whatever the advantages or disadvantages of this Bill may be, the interests of the consumer, whether he is a ratepayer or not, will be affected in some form or other. If he is a ratepayer and his council has been heavily rating the poles in that locality, obviously the council will lose some portion of its income and to make up for this it may be necessary for it to increase rates generally in the area. On the other hand, if the Bill is defeated and the councils are still able to rate at present levels, then the consumer might well be in the position of having to pay more for his electricity.

I do not think that councils should expect to make a profit out of a non-profit making supplier of essential services. It should even be protected from being at a disadvantage through any such actions of those bodies. One point I raise is the position in respect of the placing of Postmaster-General Department's poles. Councils are not consulted on the siting or location of these poles, but if a council, in grading its roads, should happen to grade too close to a pole, the P.M.G. Department can demand that that council re-site that pole at its own expense. In view of these experiences I believe that the amendments suggested by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan are necessary to protect the interests of the councils.

Some doubt exists on the interpretation of some sections of the principal Act. These points have been well made by other honourable members and I do not wish to repeat them, but merely say that I support the amendments that have been foreshadowed by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): One or two suggestions have been made in regard to this Bill, one of which I would particularly like to qualify before we go into Committee. I have been authorized by the Chairman of the Electricity Trust (Sir Fred Drew) to state that it is not the wish of the trust to embarrass the finance of certain councils by a sudden withdrawal of the usual payments. On the other hand, it is proposed to taper these off over a period of five years; that is to say, the payments will be reduced by one-fifth per annum, and I trust this will be acceptable to those concerned. I think honourable members were concerned, particularly city members, that the Adelaide City Council would lose revenue. Also, there was concern that one or two country councils might lose

revenue and find this embarrassing. I think it is very generous of the trust to obviate any embarrassment and gradually withdraw its payments over a period of five years. The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, who is a member of the Adelaide City Council, told me that this would be acceptable to that council.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Amendment of principal Act, section 5."

The Hon. N. L. JUDE (Minister of Local Government): As there appears to be doubt in the minds of some honourable members as to certain verbiage concerning transformers, I should like to consider the matter further and therefore ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.18 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 29, at 2.15 p.m.