LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Tuesday, October 29, 1963.

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

QUESTIONS.

STRONTIUM 90.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Has the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked on October 15 regarding strontium 90 and its effect on subsequent generations?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes. I have received the following report from the Director-General of Public Health:

A strict watch has been kept in Australia for levels of radioactivity resulting from weapons tests and other sources. Since 1956 the Atomic Weapons Test Safety Committee has operated a network of about 20 fallout stations which monitor global fallout on a continuous basis. Early in 1957 this programme was extended to include measurements of global fallout, in particular strontium 90, in materials from the Australian environment. The environmental survey of strontium 90 in Australia is directed towards assessment of the position in each of the five major centres of population—Perth, Adelaide, Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane. Specimens of precipitation, soil, milk, cabbages, flour, human and sheep bones, between 1,000 and 2,000 a year, are collected for strontium 90 analysis, carried out by three overseas laboratories. The mean annual deposition of strontium 90 in precipitation in Australia has remained in the region of 1 millicure per square kilometre from 1956 to 1960, with some local differences and seasonal variation. The mean level of strontium 90 in diet has not changed significantly over the period 1957-1960. An examination of diet and bone data indicates no significant difference between Australian cities. The National Health and Medical Research Council and, through that body, the various State Governments are kept informed of the results of these examinations, which have remained similar since that time. Despite the satisfactory results so far recorded, and the continuance of assessment of strontium 90 levels, the Government, in common with all other Governments in the British Commonwealth, is gratified at the recent partial nuclear test ban entered into by the great nuclear Powers.

KESWICK BRIDGE.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: On October 23 I directed a question to the Minister of Railways relative to the reorganization of the Keswick bridge and the spur railway line running to the showgrounds, and the Minister informed me that he would seek further information on the matter. Has he obtained that information?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I have obtained information that it is intended to remove the spur line running to the western boundary of the showgrounds in the event of the widening of the bridge.

KINGSTON AND BERRI FERRIES.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Roads as to the amount of delay which he expected between the completion of the Blanchetown bridge and the availability of the second ferries at Kingston and Berri, particularly Kingston. In his reply the Minister said:

There has been one feature that has caused some delay in the actual drawing of the plans and specifications for the duplication of ferries both at Kingston and Berri. It has been due to some extent to pressure put on me by members of the Midland District in connection with deciding where the next bridge will be.

I was under the impression that the members for Midland had done everything possible to help the local authorities towards a reasoned and sensible approach to this matter, devoid of parish pump outlook. I believe that the local authorities all accept the fact that there must be an interim period for the two ferries to operate in these localities before a new bridge is built. The Hon. Mr. Story, the Hon. Mr. Hart and myself, together with one of the members for the Northern District, the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, attended two meetings, which were aimed at securing this commonsense approach from the local authorities. Mr. Story gave much constructive thought to and advice on this matter. As I was under the impression that we had secured from the Upper Murray authorities a most satisfactory approach to the eventual location of a new bridge, can the Minister say in what way the pressure from the Midland District members has delayed the drawing of plans for the duplication of the ferries?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: I do not know whether the honourable member imagines he is ticking me off—

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Not at all.

The Hon. N. L. JUDE:—but, if he likes, I am prepared to bracket the Northern District members also. The matter is one of common sense and all the members interested in this project were very keen to see whether they could not get a further bridge built in that area. It was also pushed by the residents of that area that the contractor who was doing the present bridge had the material and equipment up there, and that was the truth.

They were very keen about it and so we pressed on and spent much time going ahead endeavouring to find a suitable location so that they could make a report to the Public Works Committee, and in due course to the Government. If the honourable member feels that I left out the members for the Northern District and said that only the Midland District members were pressing for this, I apologize, but I do not apologize for saying that I was certainly put under some pressure to look for a site for a new bridge. I explained that we were very short of officers to make investigations of this nature, and that was why the ferry site had become secondary for the moment and we might have lost a few weeks in the matter. However, I stick to my original statement: we shall do our best to see that the ferries are opened as nearly as possible to the time of the opening of the Blanchetown bridge.

HEIGHT ABOVE SEA LEVEL SIGNS.

The Hon. G. O'H. GILES: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked on October 1 regarding signs being erected at certain tourist vantage points to signify their height above sea level?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I referred the question to the Minister of Immigration, who handles tourist matters in this State. I have received a report to the effect that, whilst the idea had the support of the Director of the Tourist Bureau, if anything was to be done it would be better carried out by the Highways Department. So, it was referred to the Minister of Roads, and the Commissioner of Highways states as follows:

> This department is prepared to erect signs signifying the height above sea level, where it is considered of interest to tourists, and the site is adjacent to a highway.

The Minister of Roads concurs in that suggestion, which is qualified by the stipulation that it be confined to a road used by tourists.

HACKHAM ROADWAY.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to the question I asked last week relating to the Hackham roadway?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Yes. In relation to the double lines leading over the hill being somewhat short my Executive Engineer reports as follows:

> If the double lines at the locations mentioned are too short then the board will take immediate action to see that they are lengthened. An investigation is being made into the matter.

HACKHAM RAILWAY SIDING.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Has the Minister of Railways a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the railway siding at Hackham?

The Hon. N. L. JUDE: Yes. I have been informed that there is no siding now at Hackham. When we provided a passenger service trains stopped there to take on or set down passengers, but since the passenger service was discontinued no trains stop at this place.

MARINE STORES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It extends the operation of the Land Settlement Act, which would normally expire in December of the present year, for a further two years. The Bill is in similar terms to that passed in 1961. The Government is still of the opinion that the provisions of the principal Act should not be allowed to lapse and the effect of clause 3 is to extend the term of office of members of the Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement until December 31, 1965. Clause 4 amends section 27a of the principal Act enabling the acquisition of lands in that portion of the Western Division of the South-East which is south of drains K and L, up to December 22, 1965.

The Hon. K. E. J. BARDOLPH secured the adjournment of the debate.

OFFENDERS PROBATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

POLICE REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The House of Assembly intimated that it had agreed to the Legislative Council's amendment.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It merely continues the administration of the Egg Marketing Board. It is not considered to be controversial because I think everybody would agree that this legislation should be continued.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Does it have any provision for creating a further egg marketing board?

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Some amendments to the Act are under consideration and will be introduced in a separate Bill. This Bill merely extends the operation or the life of the board because its time has expired. In any event there will be a further Bill, which is expected to be brought down at an early date.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1227.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support this Bill. I say at the outset that I do not intend to spend much time in debating this Bill but merely wish to make one or two relevant points. The Bill in itself is responsible for the expenditure of a considerable amount of money. This year is one of great things for South Australia. I think our total overall spending this year under the Budget and the Loan Fund for the first time will exceed £100,000,000. I think this is a year of great importance also because it is the twenty-fifth Budget introduced by the present Treasurer in this Parliament. In addition, our population has now reached 1,000,000 people. This is a milestone in the history of this State. The Government is to be complimented upon the manner in which it has managed the State's affairs over that period of 25 years.

My honourable friend, the Acting Leader of the Labor Party, when he was speaking last Thursday was somewhat scathing in his remarks, but he blessed the Bill with faint praise when he paid a great compliment to the Public Service—and rightly so. However, the Public Service has to take directions from the Government—from the Ministers administering the departments, and especially from the Treasurer. I could not quite understand why the honourable member was not just a little more generous in his attitude towards the Government in view of the progress that this State has made. He did point out at great length how far the State had come in the last two years.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I hope you are going to be gracious.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have been so far. I could not quite understand why my honourable friend had so much to say about the welfare of the States and what the Commonwealth Government would do for the States. As an official statement for a Party that believes in unification, I should have thought this was a way to get rid of State rights. I do not believe the Commonwealth Government is doing the things the Acting Leader referred to. He said this State was now receiving a shoddy deal from it and that the situation was better when a Labor Government was in power. I remind him that during the period to which he referred war was being waged and the taxing powers of the States were taken over as a wartime measure. People in doubt about their future are prepared to make money available to see that the Government can buy arms to defend the country against invasion. If the States were given more than their just dues when the population was half that of today, they must have received much money. I believe the Menzies Government has adopted a very proper attitude in recent years. It had to put a slight brake on the economy for a time as a steadying measure. At the insistence of the States, the Commonwealth Government readily made money available to relieve unemployment. These were not Loan moneys but straight-out grants, and if I have any disagreement with the Commonwealth Government at the moment it is that not enough grants are being made to the States. I was interested to read the comments of the Auditor-General upon the very matter the Acting Leader referred to—that large deficits do not matter because they provide a way of overcoming difficulties.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You should get your facts straight.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Auditor-General mentioned the heavy debt charges of this State and said that it could not continue to spend Loan moneys for unproductive purposes. In the long run the State will be paying its whole income to meet interest charges. I realize the necessity of expenditure in particular on water supplies in country and near-metropolitan areas. The money for these works must come from loans and it would be impossible to recoup the whole amount

of the interest charges on capital works, which in the case of water supplies would be about 5 per cent. Very few schemes could be found that would return the whole 5 per cent. The Engineering and Water Supply Department must continue with certain of these undertakings.

One criticism I could make is that at the moment much money is being spent in purchasing land for road widening and this land will probably not be used for 30 or 40 years. I know that this is prudent, because the land can be purchased more cheaply now than at a later stage, but much money is being expended for this purpose and for land for houses. I do not know how much money the Housing Trust has tied up in land, which may not be used for some time, but I feel sure it amounts to many millions of pounds. I only raise this point because it illustrates what the honourable member said about the method of finance a Labor Government would use if in power. It is a practice that the Auditor-General refers to unfavourably. I imagine that this officer falls into the category of those public servants mentioned by the honourable member who are doing a capable job.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are having a flight of fancy!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I believe that the honourable member was engaged in a flight of fancy in his speech, but the difference between our speeches is that mine is based on facts. I know that this is so because the Government has the proof of the pudding; over the years it has proved what it can do, whereas the Acting Leader's theory is nothing but a theory. I believe the people of South Australia agree with me.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are making a good political speech.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Well, what are we here for? An amount of £15,760,200 has been provided for education. The Government is often criticized for not providing sufficient money for education. However, it represents one of the biggest individual allocations on the Estimates this year. With the Railways Department's allocation, it takes a very large proportion of South Australia's total expenditure on essential services. For some time I have been interested in the new schools being built in various parts of the State. I do not think anybody questions the necessity for them. To say the least, they are as modern as one would wish to see. They are equipped with practically every facility possible in the way of visual and oral aids and so on. Considering that this State has only 1,000,000 people, the sum being spent on teacher training colleges and facilities compares very favourably with that spent by the other States. I do not know where the Acting Leader obtained his figures the other day, nor do I know what he used as a yardstick, but I know that in South Australia we are spending a large proportion of the money coming into the Treasury on education.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Actually the Government is using 25 per cent of the total amount which should go to private schools.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: That is a moot point. The Acting Leader has had plenty of opportunities to test this and see whether this Chamber believes in the Government's giving assistance to private schools; and to my memory he has never done so, although it has been on the Notice Paper on many occasions for an entire session.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You have a short memory! Look at *Hansard*.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have. The matter was tested on a call of voices on one occasion. I do not wish to become involved on the question of whether funds should be made available for private schools, but this State is doing as much for private schools as any other State. By indirect benefits we are doing a lot in paying teachers in our training colleges. We are making school buses available for children who want to use them, in the same way as for students at our public schools. We are also making available to them bursaries, book allowances, hostels and, in some instances, assistance with buildings. When that is all tallied up it shows that we are not far behind the one State that is having difficulty in getting Caucus to agree to its proposals.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Which State?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: New South Wales.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are now talking adversely of New South Wales Government policy?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am. I know that the New South Wales Labor Government has been strong enough not to do something that a few years ago caused the Queensland Government to be defeated.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: What do you mean?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Mr. Chamberlain was not successful in getting the New South Wales Government to dance to his tune, as did Mr. Gair, who had difficulty with certain political associations. I think South Australia

is doing as much in education as funds will permit. Ours is not a large State. Ours is a young country and we realize that our children must be given every possible opportunity to get education in this changing world. We have aged and mentally sick people, and a hundred and one other calls on our money, and it is impossible to stretch the funds farther than they will go. I believe that the way the money has been allocated by the Government has been fair and just. Additional money has been made available this year to deal with mental health problems. Over the last few years we have had much criticism about our mental hospitals and the way in which patients have been treated, but our Government can say honestly that under the present Director of Mental Health it is getting somewhere. It is impossible to pull down all the old structures in one year. The work must be done gradually. Figures have been given to us to prove that the Government has been helping considerably our various mental institutions. I was pleased to read the other day a newspaper article, printed in South Australia, which was complimentary about the work that is being done. A cogent point was made that it was also the responsibility of individuals to do something about the welfare of handicapped people. In this State we have been fortunate over the years in having many people ready and willing to do charitable work. What has been done has been achieved despite the fact that we have no raffles and one-arm bandits in South Australia. We believe that charity plays an important part in the make-up of the individual.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Charity begins at home.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. The honourable member has mentioned that before. I was impressed by the article because it said that large groups of people could do much to assist our mentally sick people, which Government money could not do. That is the way to approach the matter. After all, our Government comprises eight hard-working men. Government officers are employed to do a job, and one of their achievements is the interest they take in helping our mentally sick people. The Acting Leader of the Opposition referred to salary increases in his speech.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: My speech seems to be the basis of your speech.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Of course. This is one of the advantages of speaking second in a debate. The honourable member deplored the fact that no provision was made for salary increases this year for public servants.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: I spoke about teachers.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am sorry. The nonourable member did refer to teachers. I think it was said by Sir Frank Perry that a tribunal had been set up to deal with salaries of teachers, and no doubt that tribunal will deal with the matter when the need arises. Clause 3 (2) of the Bill refers to salaries and states:

> If during the financial year ending on the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-four, any increases of salaries or wages become payable by the State Government pursuant to any return made under the Acts relating to the Public Service, or pursuant to any regulation or any award, order or determination of a court or other body empowered to fix wages or salaries, and such increases were not provided for in the Estimates of Expenditure for the said financial year, the Governor may by warrant under section 32(a) of the Public Finance Act, 1936-1960, appropriate out of the general revenue of the State any money required to pay the said increases.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: My criticism was that the Minister indicated that there was no provision for increases in teachers' salaries. Read the Minister's explanation.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: There is adequate provision in the Bill.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: Read what the Minister said.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: One must read what is in the Bill, despite what may be said.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are decrying the Minister as not being correct.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. The honourable member may have misread his remarks. The clause deals with subsequent salary increases. Under the Playford Government we have had a policy that has carried us from a mendicant State to one of which we can all be proud. I join with the Hon. Mr. Bardolph in his remarks about the Public Service and what its members do. Leadership in government plays an important part in the management of departments. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Central No. 1): I do not intend to delay the passage of this Bill by making a long speech. The honourable member who has just resumed his seat made quite a political speech, in parts. I do not think mine will be any more political than his was or the one that Sir Robert Menzies made on television the other night, which was supposed to be a non-political speech. I desire to refer to one or two features of the Budget which, like that of last year, is again a record one. Of course, it is the natural thing for each succeeding

Budget to be a record one when the population of the State is increasing rapidly each year. We passed in this State the million mark in January of this year and are now on our way toward the second million. Although it took 127 years to reach our first million, it has been suggested that it may take only another 20 to 25 years to reach our second million. The rapid increase in our population has brought all sorts of problems with it, one of the major ones being education. It is not surprising that the two speakers on the Budget have mentioned education, because it is one of the most important problems with which we have to deal nowadays. It is necessary to provide all the facilities required to give our children the education they should have, in view of all the problems facing them in the future.

I was interested to read in his report the Auditor-General's references to education. He comments upon the pupil-teacher ratio in South Australia and gives it as his opinion (and he is supported by the figures) that this ratio is steadily being reduced. During the calendar year 1962 the number of pupils attending all State schools was 181,994 compared with 175,515 in the previous year, an increase of 6,479, or 4 per cent, for the year. The number of full-time teachers was 6,455 in December, 1962, as against 5,977 in 1961. This was an increase of 8 per cent. The average number of children to each teacher was 28.2 compared with an average of 29.8 in 1961. There were also decreases in the average number of children per teacher in high schools, 23.0 as against 24.2 in 1961; primary schools (including secondary grades in area schools), 31.1 as against 32.4 in 1961; and technical high schools, 18.8 as against 20.9 in 1961. Despite this improvement and the apparently satisfactory average figure, I am told authoritatively that in the large schools the pupil-teacher ratio still averages over 36 a class.

This would indicate that, as one would expect, I suppose, many country schools have very few pupils. These included in the total would result in the apparently good figure shown in the Auditor-General's Report. A report submitted to the National Education Congress in Melbourne in May of this year by Mr. M. Haines, President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, was to the effect that at the beginning of 1963 there were 10 high schools in this State with an enrolment in excess of 1,000 and, of these, four had more than 1,500, while one had 2,000 pupils. He went on to say that most high schools had classes in excess of 40 pupils and some Leaving Honours classes were as large as 48. He said that the ratio of pupils to teachers in our high schools was far too high for efficient teaching.

Two high school headmasters who retired at the end of last year agree emphatically that, numerically, Adelaide high schools are too large. The two headmasters I refer to were Mr. S. L. Tregenza of the Brighton High School (1,479 students last year), and Mr. W. M. C. Symonds of Adelaide Boys High School (1,200 students last year). They both expressed the opinion that the number of students at high schools should not exceed 800. The retiring headmasters gave these views in a newspaper interview published in *The News* on December 13 last year. The newspaper referred to them as two of Adelaide's most experienced high school teachers. With the raising of the school-leaving age, the number of students attending high schools and technical high schools will increase considerably. I understand that there is a distinct shortage of qualified senior teachers in our high schools and technical high schools. Every encouragement should be given to our teachers to seek diploma or higher qualification to equip themselves for the positions of senior teachers in our high schools.

It is gratifying to know that the department's campaign to attract young people to the teaching profession is bearing fruit. The figures I have given regarding the pupil-teacher ratio, which were taken from the Auditor-General's Report, were for the year ending December, 1962. Since then 783 more young teachers have completed their courses at the teachers colleges and moved into schools last February. A further 855 students will complete courses and be available to teach in 1964. The supply of these young teachers is gradually reducing the class sizes and I understand that classes in some schools could have been reduced further this year if accommodation had been available. I know that the difficulty in regard to all aspects of the education problem is tied up with the lack of adequate finance. Most of us agree that the problem is a national one and that there should be more financial assistance for education from the Commonwealth Government. It has been suggested by members of the Party to which I belong that a Commonwealth committee of inquiry should be set up to investigate the needs of primary, secondary and technical education on a national basis.

This should then result, we believe, in a long-term plan for Commonwealth aid in the whole field of education, with perhaps some special emergency help being made available immediately. There is another matter connected with the cost of education which seems to be an anomaly to me. I refer to the lack of any provision for the payment of a subsidy towards the cost of maintaining playing fields and certain types of school grounds in good condition. We have built some fine schools in recent years. School committees and councils have worked hard to make the playing areas and school grounds attractive at some of these schools by planting lawns, shrubs, trees and flowers. In some cases voluntary labour or labour contributed at nominal cost has been forthcoming to maintain the lawns and tend the flowers, shrubs and trees. In other cases the teaching staff assisted by some of the pupils have undertaken the work outside school hours. I understand that regulations under the Act do not permit school councils or committees to seek a pound-for-pound subsidy to assist in the purchase of plants, manures, soils, etc., or in other ways in maintaining the school grounds in an attractive state or the playing fields in a well-grassed condition.

I know of one large school in my district, comprising a boys and a girls technical school on the one large block, where the work of cutting and watering lawns and tending generally to the attractive school grounds is developing into a full-time job. The school council up until now has been able to meet the cost of this work because of the generosity of some people who have offered their services free or at very little charge. The regulations do allow a pound-for-pound subsidy for the cost of establishing a recreation ground but not for the cost of maintaining that ground in usable condition. This seems to me to be an anomaly which should be corrected. The work that some school committees have done in beautifying the surroundings of their schools is commendable. I am sure that the beautiful surroundings of these schools must have some very good psychological effect upon the children attending them. It is my belief that the school committees should be encouraged to continue this work by at least a pound-for-pound subsidy.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: The more help on a voluntary basis by the parents' association the better.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. However, it is not only voluntary work: to have this work done properly there must be someone permanently employed. There are amounts added to book lists of pupils to cover these matters and this increases the cost of education to the parent who, in some cases, cannot afford it.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Did you say "book lists"?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In addition to the book lists there are other fees paid by parents. The honourable member should know that. I knew it myself when my children attended technical high school. These other charges are connected with sport, the committee, etc. Although they may not be included in the book lists those charges are made to maintain the school grounds and to supply the finance to the school council or committee. A charge is made upon the parents of the children.

Before leaving the subject of education there is one more matter to which I should like to refer. Recently I was fortunate in being present at one of the concerts of the South Australian Public Schools Music Society's Festival of Music. The society has been conducting these festivals for a number of years and I have enjoyed immensely the performances I have seen. As on former occasions, the appearance, marching and singing of the children was excellent. Honourable members may know that the festival is spread over several nights. On each night a separate group of schools comprises the choir, there being 10 schools represented by 40 pupils each in each choir. In addition to the singing of the main choir there were individual vocal and instrumental items by talented young people. Altogether this made a very enjoyable occasion. The teachers who trained the children, and the conductor (Mr. S. J. Scoble, B.A.), are to be congratulated upon their efforts in bringing the choir up to such a high standard. In addition, the excellence of the children's singing, their demeanour and their appearance on the platform were a credit to them.

With the visit of the Queen Mother scheduled for the early part of next year, I would make a suggestion to the Royal Tour Director and other officials. Knowing that the Queen Mother has shown her love of children, I think that rather than have another such function as the one held at Victoria Park when Her Majesty the Queen was here—which was widely criticized—a children's musical festival could be staged. This could take place at Centennial Hall where a larger choir and a larger audience could be accommodated. This, I am sure, would be a much more enjoyable function for everybody, including the Queen Mother.

The Chief Secretary referred to the continued efficient operation of the Railways Department, which resulted in the payments for 1962-63 being £122,000 below estimate. In addition, receipts bettered the estimate by £17,000. Despite this unexpected result the department found it necessary during the year to raise the rent of railway cottages steeply. The spreading of the increases over a few years, although it may have softened the blow, did nothing to remove the injustice of the heavy increases.

I am pleased to see the increase in the amount proposed to be allotted to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. It is an increase of £162,000 over the actual payments in 1962-63. This increase will assist the department in its administration of the new Aboriginal Affairs Act, which came into operation by proclamation on February 28 this year. This Act is a vast improvement on previous legislation relating to Aborigines in this State since the Colony was settled. A new deal for the first Australians was long overdue, and had the Government not introduced this legislation last session the Labor Party would have introduced a somewhat similar measure. A Bill was being prepared and was almost ready for presentation when the Government's Bill was brought down. The inclusion of a sum of £85,000 for the erection of houses for these people in country towns must go a long way towards promoting assimilation. Every effort should be made in the meantime to push on with the work of assisting them to acquire the necessary skills and social habits which will make it easier for them to live happily in these new surroundings.

In conclusion I wish to refer to the economic situation to which the Chief Secretary also referred in his speech on the second reading. He said that stamp duty receipts had shown a pleasing upward movement throughout the year 1962-63, due largely to the improving economic situation, and that it is confidently anticipated by the Government that this upward trend will be maintained during 1963-64. I hope this proves to be correct, but I am not as confident as the Government says it is on this point. From my experience whenever we hear spokesmen for the Government, both here and in Canberra, referring to the good economic situation and the falling off in the numbers of unemployed persons, I fear the worst. It always seems to follow that we get credit restrictions or some equally unpleasant measure that brings about further unemployment and a worsening of the economic situation. Another indication that something like this is in the offing is the sudden decision of the Commonwealth Government to have a snap election. An election next year following a restrictive Budget would have really sealed its fate. However, I believe the result will be the same—its past actions will be sufficient to cause its defeat on November 30.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Is that not guess work?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I open my eyes when I read what is available to be read on these matters.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I support the Bill and in doing so I wish to associate myself with other honourable members in extending congratulations to the Treasurer on the occasion of his 25th consecutive Budget. This is surely a remarkable effort and one in which all members of this Chamber, together with the people of the State as a whole, can rejoice. In this period of 25 years Government expenditure has increased eight-fold, and the Government's income has increased by a similar amount. This in itself is proof of the sound government enjoyed by this State over the last quarter of a century. I believe the Treasurer, in his Budget, has made a fair and equitable disbursement of the funds available to the Government. Obviously, some Government departments could make good use of further funds, but expenditure of public money must be kept in its correct perspective in relation to the needs of the State as a whole.

I trust that during this session legislation will be introduced to deal with transport control. The present Act has been in operation for many years and I believe is very much out of date in relation to present-day transport requirements. Its original purpose was to co-ordinate road and rail transport, with emphasis on channelling as much traffic as possible on to the railway system. This may have been a good idea, provided it did not unduly hinder industry, both primary and secondary. The Act, in its present form, has little to commend it to primary producers and needs to be drastically overhauled, if not abolished altogether. I believe it should be more liberal in its application to the transport of perishable products of primary producers. Admittedly some relief has been granted recently but these concessions, in many instances, are not obtained without some annoying delays. In reviewing the Act I believe our whole outlook should be based on the concept of assisting the producer. Our railways have provided a very essential service and can continue to do so in the carriage of many commodities, but

it does seem ludicrous to run trains on some lines at considerable loss when the same produce can be carried by road transport more efficiently and at lower cost. The overall effect of the present Act is that it forces primary and secondary producers into providing their own transport arrangements. While being convenient, this can well be uneconomical, particularly to primary producers, and can prove to be a form of unfair competition to the licensed carrier.

Owing to their geographical position, certain parts of the State need special treatment in relation to transport control. I refer, in particular, to Yorke Peninsula and the Upper River Murray areas. Much of the produce of Yorke Peninsula is carried to Adelaide and in the course of that journey it is half-way to its destination before it reaches a railway. I believe that it is not a good practice for this produce to be unloaded for transport by rail when those very same road transports continue their journey to Adelaide to deliver the rest of their load, which is not subject to transport control, and to pick up loads for the return journey to Yorke Peninsula. In the Upper Murray districts much perishable produce is grown and has to be transported to the consuming areas. I know that many of these towns are connected with the railways, which have a long and deviating course and tend to take too long to reach areas where the goods are marketed. It is essential for the well-being of these areas that produce be transported by the road system.

The dumping of rubbish on country roads is causing grave concern to district councils and other bodies. This practice has become more prevalent in recent years despite many offenders being prosecuted. It is hard to understand why people indulge in such a filthy and untidy act. The beauty of many country roads is becoming completely disfigured by this practice, which is on a par with vandalism. In looking for the reasons for this practice I feel that the lack of civic pride is probably one of the main ones. Also, there is a lack of easily accessible and suitable facilities at all hours. I feel that many metropolitan councils do not provide suitable facilities for the receipt of rubbish from their ratepayers. Then there are people whose pride does not permit them to be seen near a rubbish dump but who have no compunction about depositing their rubbish at the side of the road when out motoring and enjoying the scenic beauty of the countryside, spoiled only by other heaps of rubbish. Many offenders are prosecuted. Evidence is gathered and on being confronted with it many people admit their offence, but in other cases when evidence is obtained the offenders deny all knowledge of it. In those cases it is useless to prosecute. I feel that the answer to the problem is to place the onus of proof on the defendant. If we did this it would be for the defendant to prove that he did not deposit rubbish on the road. There is ample precedent for it and I feel that it is a move that could be well pursued.

I now briefly refer to the need to acquire land for recreational areas. The acquiring of open spaces for this purpose is largely the responsibility of district councils. Realizing that the purchase of sites for recreational needs could impose heavy financial burdens on councils the Government generously agreed to grant subsidies on a pound-for-pound basis, which has been of great assistance to many councils. However, I refer to the position of councils which see the need to acquire land for open spaces but which do not require it for the benefit of their own ratepayers. They have nothing to gain by acquiring land. They already have sufficient of it. It may be wooded land or land near the coastline. These councils realize that these areas of land are necessary for the recreation of people who live in the metropolitan and near metropolitan areas. The land may be situated on the outskirts of the councils concerned and of no real value to them. Although they can get the subsidy for the purchase of the land, they have no need to acquire it.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: I suppose this would be the answer to the problem of getting ovals.

The Hon. L. R. HART: It could well be. It is essential that sufficient areas be procured and that the natural features not be destroyed. I feel that in such cases the Government must be prepared to accept the responsibility of finding all the money needed for procuring such areas. I support the Bill.

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

CITY OF WHYALLA COMMISSION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1223.)

The Hon. R. R. WILSON (Northern): The object of this Bill concerns the Housing Trust and the City of Whyalla Commission. With a fast growing city like Whyalla it is most essential that the work on streets, roads and footpaths keep pace with housing development.

The quarterly report to July 1 last of the Housing Trust shows the number of houses built in country towns. At Whyalla 2,236 have been built. Other places over the 1,000 mark are Salisbury 1,366 and Mount Gambier 1,262. At Whyalla the cost of roads, etc., is shared by the trust and the commission. In the past the trust has provided accommodation to the commission by prepaying rates over a term of years. The trust can legally do this, but the Crown Solicitor has advised that under the Local Government Act the commission cannot lawfully accept loans of this nature. The houses being built at Whyalla in the trust's area extend some distance from the city centre, and more roads there are an urgent necessity. At present the borrowing powers of the commission are fully extended and the passage of the Bill will allow work to continue as in the past. The Bill was considered by a Select Committee from another place, which recommended its passage. Therefore, I have much pleasure in supporting it.

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 24. Page 1232.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): Although I support the second reading of the Bill, I do not support all of its provisions. I understand that its preparation occupied more than 12 months. All members will agree that every clause in the Bill is important, not only to the Government but to all people associated with local government in South Australia. Therefore, it is important that this Bill be given close attention before it passes through this Council and another place to become law.

It has been suggested that it is primarily a Committee Bill, but I think it is necessary to investigate it before we go into Committee. I have amendments on the file that show how important it is to examine the Bill on second reading. The first clause I oppose is clause 5, which amends section 88 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (2) thereof, which subsection debars an alien from being enrolled on a council roll and voting at municipal or other local government elections. This amendment of the principal Act would, if carried, cheapen the value of local government here compared with other local government and, by so doing, would devalue government as a whole. Citizenship is a quality of the heart and mind and should not be measured in terms of property, money or votes. The citizen who is not naturalized pays Commonwealth and State taxes, but that does not give him a Commonwealth or State vote. There is no reason why the payment of municipal rates should give him a municipal vote. The municipal rates he pays are his share of the municipal services that he uses and enjoys, but the right to participate in municipal government is the privilege of a person who has fully earned the right to Australian citizenship.

Immediately an alien commences work in this State, he becomes liable to pay State and Commonwealth taxation; he immediately contributes to federation, but his liability for Commonwealth taxation would not entitle him to be enrolled and to cast a vote at municipal elections. If this amendment is carried, it will mean that an alien who has put a deposit on a house or a building block has his name immediately placed in the assessment book of the district council or municipality in which he intends to reside or is residing and, under this amendment, immediately his name appears on the assessment book, he becomes eligible to cast a vote at municipal elections.

For some time many of these people cannot speak a word of English, yet this amendment enables them to go to the poll in municipal elections and cast a supposedly intelligent vote in relation to the affairs of the district. It is not such a long time ago that under Commonwealth legislation an alien coming into this State could not own property until he had been here for five years; but that provision has been altered because it was considered that debarring these people from obtaining a house or a block of land to build on was creating hardship. That is one reason why that restriction was lifted—to enable aliens to secure a house immediately they arrived here, if that could be done.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: They can own a house but they cannot vote?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That is the position as far as the State and Commonwealth are concerned. If it is good enough to allow those people to vote in local government affairs, it should be good enough to give them a vote in State or Commonwealth elections. I feel that the Minister of Immigration would not agree for one moment that that should be so, so this amendment should not be supported by honourable members. There should be a qualifying period. These people should be naturalized before they can participate in local government or Government affairs, because it takes them some time to become

fully conversant with our laws and set-up and the workings of municipal and district councils' affairs.

I said earlier this afternoon that I understood from the remarks of the Minister that this Bill had been receiving consideration for over 12 months. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated that this request came from the Salisbury District Council, from whom representations were made to the Minister to include this amendment in the Bill. Honourable members who know the Elizabeth and Salisbury areas will agree with me that 90 per cent of the residents there are British immigrants. I understand that the reason given by the district council to the Minister for wanting the amendment was the paucity of people in that area entitled to vote in municipal elections. Under the Act, a British immigrant has to be resident in this State or in the Commonwealth for a period of six months before he has every privilege of an Australian-born person and can vote in municipal, State or Commonwealth elections or can participate in anything else governed by Commonwealth or State laws. After that period, if he so desires, a British immigrant can nominate for political honours or take part in municipal elections because he has achieved full citizenship by then. Surely a residential qualification of six months is not a hardship. Surely that does not create a paucity of persons eligible to vote in the district of Salisbury. It is not a valid reason why this amendment should be submitted or why we should pass it.

I point out how cursorily this amendment has been examined by either the Minister or the person who drafted it. If it is carried as drafted, it will be of absolutely no value at all because it cannot be given effect to. Some honourable members may feel that that is the intention behind the amendment—that we cannot give effect to it, so we can get out of it like that. But I do not think that is the reason. No consideration has been given to the effect of the ramifications of section 88 of the principal Act. Under section 122 of the Act, if a query is raised at the poll, the poll clerk must ask certain questions. One of those questions is: "Are you a naturalized British subject or are you of British nationality?" If the answer is "No" the poll clerk says, "You are not entitled to a vote." I suggest that no consideration has been given to that section of the principal Act. In addition to this, under section 820 and also the nineteenth schedule there is provision for a postal or absent vote.

Here again the question is asked (and must be answered by the applicant for a postal vote): "Are you a naturalized British subject?" If the answer is in the negative this person cannot obtain an application form for an absent or postal vote. Is it intended to debar him from a postal vote? Is it intended to debar him altogether from a vote at the poll because of a query that may be raised by the poll clerk on the issuing of the ballot-paper or is it the intention of this section to give this person a vote at a municipal election irrespective of any residential qualifications whatsoever?

The Hon. N. L. Jude: This is an amendment to the Local Government Act, not the Electoral Act.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I am speaking of the Local Government Act and I suggest that the Minister make himself conversant with it. Section 88 (2) of the Local Government Act lays down the qualifications of people who are entitled to vote at a municipal election under the Local Government Act. This amendment would take out of that particular section the qualification that the person must be a naturalized British subject. The Minister knows that the Electoral Act does not govern a person who votes in municipal elections. There are another two sections of the Local Government Act which are not amended by any of this amending legislation before us this afternoon. These sections debar people from exercising a vote which the Minister says he considers they are justified in having.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I cannot agree with the honourable member's interpretation.

The Hon S. C. BEVAN: I suggest that the Attorney-General read the Act and he will find that he cannot place any other interpretation on those sections.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: A poll clerk can ask a question without debarring a man from a vote.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If the person answers "No" the poll clerk is not entitled to hand a ballot-paper to him. The same thing applies to the application form for a postal vote; the applicant is required to fill in the form and send it to the particular authority. One of the questions on the form is, "Are you a naturalized British subject?" If the answer is "No" does the Attorney-General imply that it does not matter? The Act says it does matter. The man could say "No" and the clerk could then say "It does not matter anyhow"; is that the interpretation we

now place on this? I say quite frankly that my interpretation is correct and that these people would be debarred from exercising their right to vote at elections in the present circumstances. I consider that further attention should be given to this.

My next objection is to clauses 9 and 10, which have a retrospective effect to July 1, 1961. They deal with an alteration of the assessment of the ratable property in relation to the waterworks rating. I do not desire to speak on these matters at length because I intend to have something further to say when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. However, under the principal Act one of the first duties of the council is to determine what the assessment shall be. That shall then be adopted and it then becomes the assessment and the assessment notices are sent out accordingly.

What happens is that if the Waterworks Department amends its assessment in the middle of the year, the council adopts that assessment and we find that then the council sends out a supplementary assessment altering the existing one. We find, too, that there has been an upward trend in assessments. Some councils have apparently adopted the waterworks assessment as such and have altered their own assessments accordingly. It appears to me that the date mentioned in the amendment could have an adverse effect upon the councils that have conformed to the Act itself, have not immediately rendered their assessments, and are waiting until the following assessment year. I think the fairest way to treat this matter would be to make the provision operative as from July 1, 1963. It would not create any hardship and would ratify the actions of those councils, although there might be some complication if this date were adopted. I think, however, that this should be the operating date for assessments in accordance with the Act itself. I shall mention this amendment when the Bill reaches the Committee stage.

I deal now with clause 15 of the Bill. It concerns the powers vested in municipal bodies in relation to parking meters and revenue received therefrom. I have no real opposition to the first part of the clause at all. In fact it tells us what is meant by the word "revenue" and where that revenue shall be derived. It relates to revenue in respect of charges and fees received by a council. Paragraph (*a*) of proposed new section 290d (1) states:

> In respect of charges and fees paid by owners and drivers of vehicles for the parking and standing of vehicles in and at metered zones and metered spaces pursuant to any by-law made by the council under section 475a of this Act:

This subsection deals purely and simply with what is meant by use of revenue. My objections relate to subsection (2). For a long time I have said that the wholesale installation of parking meters is an imposition on the motorist and I consider that he already has enough impositions. It has been said that meters would be beneficial within the boundaries of Adelaide because of the congestion of traffic and because of parking difficulties. The installation of meters would allow freer movement of traffic and it would be possible to obtain a parking space outside a business house where a meter is erected. When I was a member of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation a reason given for the installation of parking meters was that they would provide revenue for off-street parking. This proposal has never been given effect to.

Recently I spoke in this Chamber about the revenue derived from parking meters, which, over a period of five years, has amounted to about £500,000. At present councils have no authority to create a reserve fund for off-street parking, but they may establish reserve funds for specific purposes such as the provision of long service leave and for superannuation payments. However, they are restricted and are unable to establish a reserve fund for parking stations. The Adelaide City Council believes that it should have the right to put money aside for this purpose. I understand that representations have been made to the Government and, perhaps, to the Minister of Local Government, for authority to establish reserve funds, but this has been refused. I have been informed that at a meeting of the Adelaide City Council a resolution was passed that the council would provide such a fund if the Government would amend the Act for this purpose. Proposed new section 290d (2) contains the following:

> In addition to the powers conferred by this Part a municipal council may expend the whole or any part of its revenue to which this section applies in providing a reserve fund or funds for all or any of the following purposes:—
>
> (*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:

Under this proposal the council has the authority to construct all or any of those projects. Parking meters are a levy on the motorist to provide facilities for him; therefore, if a reserve fund is to be established by a council from revenue derived from parking meters and fines the Act should state a council "shall" provide the fund and "shall" make the money available for the purposes laid down in the Act.

Subsection (4) states that at any time in the future where a fund has been established and an amount of money has been accumulated, perhaps over five, six or ten years, the council may then, if it so desires, wind up the fund and pay the money into general revenue. This could mean that a council would establish a fund for a specific purpose, and later it might desire, for instance, to build a swimming pool. One or more of the councillors may then consider that as the council has a special fund amounting to £500,000 it would be desirable to wind it up and use the money for another purpose. This Bill will give the council the right to do that. I would not be surprised if someone came up with the idea of having a fountain in the middle of King William Street and using the money in a fund established for another purpose to build it. I believe that subsection (4) should not be included in the Bill.

The fund should be established for the purposes set out in the Bill and be used only for those purposes. However, if all those requirements had been met, surely it would be a simple matter for the council to make representations to the Government to amend the Act to allow the council to use the surplus for another purpose. Surely that would not be a hardship. It has been suggested recently that parking meters should be installed along the foreshores of the metropolitan area provided that all councils in this area agreed to do so for establishing a fund to provide foreshore improvements. I do not know how far we are going with these impositions on motorists. If a fund is to be established for the purposes laid down under the Bill, the word "shall" and not "may" should be used. I have an amendment to move in Committee on this matter.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: It would be a matter of dictation to the local government authorities.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That may be your opinion.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: It is your opinion.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I said that it may be the opinion of the honourable member.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: No.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The honourable member says that it amounts to that under the Act.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: No, you are saying it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: No. I said that a resolution had been carried by the Adelaide City Council. I do not know about dictatorship. It was not my word. Under this Bill there is to be greater dictation to councils. I refer to traffic control, which I shall mention later. A close scrutiny should be made of clause 21. I have no amendments to move to it in Committee. The clause relates to signs associated with road traffic control. Before a council can erect a sign it must first get the approval of the Road Traffic Board. If that is not done the sign is illegal. The clause provides for further regulations under the Act. Councils have already acted in accordance with their powers on the control of parking, etc. Prosecutions have been launched but cases have been lost because the action taken has not complied with regulations under the Act. I think the Minister appreciates the position in which the councils have been placed. The signs must conform to those set down by the Australian Standards Association. This is stated in the regulations under the Act. Councils have experienced many difficulties. Letters have been sent to the Minister pointing out those difficulties and the inability to take action under the Act, because the Road Traffic Act over-rides the Local Government Act.

The Hon. N. L. Jude: The object of the amendment is to bring these things into line.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I suggest that it will not bring them into line. In Committee I shall refer to the clause and its effect on councils. Recently there was a proclamation, which I think was redundant under the legislation. I shall leave other comments that I have on this measure for the time being, but I point out that clause 41 is a good amendment. Unfortunately it does not go as far as it should go. The clause amends section 667 and deals with the loading and unloading of materials. It has reference to the great difficulty experienced by the Hindmarsh council with one scrap metal yard, where a mountain of scrap metal has been piled without any consideration being given to the possibility of metal falling on people walking on a nearby pathway. Because of agitation by the council,

the firm has now erected a cyclone fence. There is much congestion in the present position and vehicles cannot always load or unload in the yard. After being loaded the metal is taken to Port Adelaide for export, principally to Japan. When a vehicle cannot get into the yard the loading or unloading is done in the street. The council found that it could do nothing about the matter because section 667 deals with what can and cannot be loaded or unloaded in a thoroughfare. The council could do nothing with the firm, which thumbed its nose at the council and did nothing to improve the position. The clause will prevent this sort of thing from happening. Serious accidents can occur in the breaking of the metal because no protection is provided for people nearby. The following is a letter sent to the Hindmarsh council by J. H. Sherring & Co. Ltd., 54 Drayton Street, Bowden, dated February 8, 1963:

I wish to draw your attention to a danger which exists in the area surrounding our factory at the above address, which is in your corporation area. At 3.30 p.m. on 6th inst. one of our employees (Irvine) was talking to me within our factory walls and under our factory roof when a sound similar to a small cannon was heard and Irvine fell to the floor writhing in agony. The explosive sound more than startled most of our employees. Irvine lay writhing on the floor and when I spoke to him he said "My arm". Looking at his arm I discovered it was lacerated and bloody. I put Irvine in the care of our first-aid attendant prior to sending him to a doctor and tried to ascertain the cause of the explosive noise and of Irvine being hit. Another of our employees came up to me with a jagged piece of cast iron which was warm to touch and weighed about 3½ lb. to 4 lb. After looking around a hole about 15in. x 4in. was discovered in the roof of our factory. I realized the metal must have come from the premises of W. Brown & Sons, which surrounds our factory. I went to the back of our premises on Brown's property and there met two men, obviously employees of Brown. Upon explaining what had happened they denied metal was being broken up. I then returned to our factory and rang W. Brown & Sons asking for Mr. Brown, and being informed that neither Mr. Brown was available I spoke to a Mr. Becker.

Having told him the happenings, I went back to Brown's yard at the rear of our factory, and met the man in charge of the yard. I told this man what had happened and he said they were breaking metal, pointing to the area where the metal had been broken up, he could not believe metal could travel so far, the distance would be approximately 200ft. from where Irvine was hit. The position of the metal breaking was near the weighbridge close to the East Street boundary. Our factory wall is becoming scarred by flying metal and the danger to our employees is small compared to the public danger of people walking along the streets. On this occasion metal was being broken within 20ft. of East Street, and people walking along this street were protected only by a cyclone fence.

That is the fence to which I have already referred. The lettter continued:

Surely this is a public danger and nuisance. Our employees feel frightened every time they hear the metal breaking ball drop, and wonder where the metal will fly to and who will be the next person hit. Fortunately Irvine's injury was caused by a glancing blow and is not serious. Had this metal hit him full on he would have undoubtedly been killed. Damage to our machines, some of which are worth in the vicinity of £1,800, is a continual source of worry. Had a piece of metal flown into a machine whilst it was running, I am afraid the machine would have been a total wreck. This matter has been reported to the Hindmarsh police and they are now in possession of the piece of cast iron which came through the roof and hit Irvine's arm. Reiterating my statement regarding the public danger.

That letter is signed by the Manager of the company.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: That matter was reported to my department and action was taken in connection with it.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Attorney-General says that action has been taken. I am aware of that but it is interesting at this stage to see whether this moving belt will be effective or not. I appreciate that representations were made to the Department of Labour and Industry, which investigated the matter, but I point out the advantage of this amending legislation in regard to these things that have happened. This amending legislation says that scrap metal cannot be broken up within 300 yards of any occupied premises, which is a further safeguard and will go a long way towards ameliorating the position.

The only thing is that reports are coming in continually from business people in the area of damage done to the tyres of their motor cars by their picking up many pieces of metal on the road, which become embedded in the tyres and so puncture and tear them that they cannot be repaired; they have to be scrapped. That difficulty this clause does not remedy but it remedies dangers that have become apparent and deals with the position of loading or unloading in the streets. To that extent it is good amending legislation. I shall have some further comments to make in Committee. For the time being, I support the second reading and hope that my remarks will be of some benefit to honourable members. I suggest that they examine the schedules of the Act and their effect upon this Bill.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): In rising to support the second reading of this Bill, I agree with other speakers that it is, in the main, a Committee Bill, being made up of many "tidying up" clauses. However, there are some clauses that I ask the Government to reconsider. Many of the clauses are necessary improvements to the Act and I do not, therefore, wish to touch on them.

Little fault can, in my opinion, be found with the clause referring to hospitals. It is a necessary step in the right direction that hospitals shall be exempted from rating if not more than half of their revenue (instead of one-quarter, as previously was the case) is received from patients' fees. Also, I can see no objection to the subclause varying the number of houses required to qualify as a township from 40 to 20, as requested by the Local Government Association. However, I must protest about clause 5 which seeks to amend section 88 of the principal Act by removing subsection (2), which has the effect of preventing people who are not natural-born or naturalized British subjects from being enrolled and taking part in local government elections, polls or meetings of ratepayers.

The Bill now before us proposes to delete that provision completely, so that an unnaturalized person may have the benefits of citizenship. With my honourable friend, Mr. Story, I am completely opposed to this, and for the very reasons that Mr. Story stated (and which I do not propose to repeat in detail) I cannot support it. I do not believe that unnaturalized persons should have a vote in local government affairs any more than they should in State and Commonwealth elections. As the Hon. Mr. Bevan has said, I believe this request came from Salisbury—in fact, the Minister said so in his second reading explanation. If my memory serves me correctly, it came from the Salisbury District Council, was referred to the Local Government Association and, as I remember it, met with considerable opposition in local government circles. I believe firmly that all these rights that come at present with naturalization, these priceless privileges, should become the property of the new citizen when he is naturalized, and not before. I think we weaken the naturalization ceremony itself and the possibility of people becoming naturalized and Australian subjects if we remove these things from the naturalization ceremony. I am of opinion that this proposed clause is the thin end of the wedge, and I shall oppose it.

I support clauses 9, 10 and 11 as they stand. To my mind, they make desirable "tidying up" improvements to the principal Act. I cannot, however, support the amendments of the Hon. Mr. Bevan, and can see no reason for altering "1961" to "1963" in those clauses. I believe these clauses make valuable improvements to the principal Act, but I cannot support clause 12, which reduces by three months the time in which a ratepayer, and particularly a primary producer in a district council, shall pay his rates. The date of March 1 was fixed many years ago because of the harvesting and marketing of grain and the fact that the proceeds from those commodities do not come in, even today, until late January or early February, in many cases. The Minister referred to the diversity of farm income, and the Hon. Mr. Story concluded (happily for his argument but somewhat inaccurately, I fear) that most farms are completely diversified and that there is a little trickle of money coming in all the time. I am glad to know that in the Upper Murray, apparently, this happy state of affairs exists and that a little trickle of money is coming in all the time. I was not aware that things were quite as good as that.

The Hon. C. R. Story: "Little" is the operative word.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not think any council has suffered real inconvenience or hardship from the fact that many primary producers do not pay their rates until February 28. This clause should not be inserted in the Bill in my opinion. I wonder whether my honourable friend from the Upper Murray is becoming confused between the River Murray and the rather considerable trickle of water that runs past his back door. With respect, I think both the Minister and the Hon. Mr. Story—and even the Hon. Mr. Hart—should be well aware that there is a considerable number of farms within their districts which depend largely on the cereal harvest for their main income. There is a period of about six months when this trickle that Mr. Story talks about dries up almost completely. If my honourable friend or any other honourable member doubts these statements I suggest they ask any bank manager who has dealt with clients in cereal growing country or, for that matter, any stock firm that gives banking facilities to its clients. The River Gawler and the River Light are different from the River Murray; they dry up

sometimes, although even the River Murray did at one time before the locks were constructed.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: What year was that?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I do not know, but I know people walked across its bed. My honourable friend on my left and I could be fortunate enough to sell a couple of rams before December 1, but I should like to remind honourable members that there are many farmers who have to wait for their main income until late January or early February and it is on their behalf that I oppose this clause. If it were introduced after a series of good seasons it might be all right but I remind honourable members that we have had only two good seasons since 1956, and they were 1958 and 1960.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: What about the good seasons prior to that?

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: There were a few good seasons prior to 1956, but that was a fair while ago. It has been a difficult situation for some primary producers. My attention has been drawn to the fact that local government associations supported this amendment. That was given as one of the reasons why it should be brought in. I wish to draw the attention of the Council to the fact that there are many professional officers who are voting members at local government conferences. One such officer recently put this very type of thing up to a council and could not find one councillor from a rural council in favour of it. I would ask the Minister to consider this point seriously, and the other points I have made. I do not think that any council has suffered hardship because of the present provision but I am sure that many ratepayers would suffer hardship if it were altered. I believe that we should not at this stage make things more difficult for primary producers and I am speaking on their behalf.

I support clause 15 as it stands. I said last week when speaking on the other Local Government Bill that I was not in favour, generally speaking, of reducing any powers of local government. The amendments which the Hon. Mr. Bevan has foreshadowed in all cases seek to restrict—or, as the Hon. Mr. Giles interjected, dictate—because in the first amendment which Mr. Bevan seeks to make to clause 15 he has deleted the word "may" and inserted the word "shall". If we "may" do a thing we have the power either to do it or not to do it; but by using the word "shall" we are restricting the powers of local government. The third amendment which the Hon. Mr. Bevan wishes to make to clause 15 is to remove the whole of subclause (4), which is a power given to councils by this amending Bill to wind up funds if they so desire. I am completely opposed to dictating to councils and to removing their powers where it is possible to leave them with these powers. I must oppose those amendments and I support the clause as it stands.

Clause 16 is a wise provision to ensure an audit of a council's books within 14 days of a clerk's resignation or suspension. This has my full support as it is necessary for the protection of all concerned. I also support clause 22, which enables councils to buy houses to be let to their employees on a long-term agreement. I believe that this is a step in the right direction and that satisfactory arrangements can be made with the Housing Trust. I believe also that clauses 23 and 24 will simplify the councils' accounting systems and that it will be a better arrangement for all borrowings to be on the security of the general rate. I have spoken on this Bill for a little longer than I intended, but before I conclude I wish to support the Hon. Mr. Story's objection to the wording of clause 43. I do not believe that the words "wilfully or maliciously" should be removed. With my honourable friend I hope the Minister will consider rewording this clause. I would ask the Government to consider the points that I have raised and with these reservations I support the second reading.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1233.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the second reading of this Bill. I am sure that I, along with other members, listened with much interest to the remarks made by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper. Broadly, this Bill has three provisions: it increases the age from six to seven at which young children may participate in public entertainment; it brings in, in the definition of public entertainment, television programmes whether live or transmitted by means of films; and finally, it brings in the matter of advertising for goods and services on television and radio. I do not

intend to say anything about the increase in age from 13 to 15 for the employment of children in circus acts. I think that particular provision speaks for itself and all honourable members would support it without any further ado.

In introducing the Bill the Minister said that it was designed to protect children of tender years from exploitation. I think we all agree with this. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper expressed the fear when she spoke that this amendment would preclude much entertainment in which young children now take part, particularly when television was involved. I would say that on the wording of the original Act it could well be said that what Mrs. Cooper had to say about children participating in sporting and similar activities was true if the Act were applied very strictly.

However, I think we can take some comfort from the fact that over the years in the administration of this Act the provisions have never to my knowledge been very strictly policed in this State, and as a result we have never had the situation where young children under the age of six years (as it is at the moment) have been precluded from taking part in sporting activities, a pageant or any activity of that kind. Under the existing legislation unless it is for a religious, charitable, patriotic or educational purpose such activity is prohibited whether the child is paid or not for its services. The Government is to be congratulated on the way it has administered this legislation over the years. Apparently it has adopted a wide view of what is a religious, charitable, educational or patriotic purpose. I have never heard of any child under the age of six years being prevented from taking part in sporting activities or in John Martin's Christmas Pageant. We need have no worry that in extending this provision to television it will be enforced any more severely in future than it has been in the past. By extending the Act to include television it will prevent the extensive use or employment voluntarily or otherwise of children under the age of seven in the advertisement of goods or services. I wonder whether the Government or the Parliamentary Draftsman has really considered this fully. It is very simple to accept it on principle.

All honourable members would agree that it is very laudable to prevent the exploitation of young children. It is suggested that seven is a better age than six. I am rather at a loss to follow the Chief Secretary's reasoning on this particular point. As I was saying, it is easy to accept this provision and give it a mental tick and pass on to the next matter. However, when one actually comes down to its practical aspects and applies it to television, including the advertising of goods and services, one wonders whether it is altogether wrong to transmit over television a picture of a baby advertising some kind of powder or soap. Surely this is not really harmful to the baby. Probably it is not even conscious of the fact that a film is being made of its antics, and it seems to me that unless there is something sinister behind the matter there can be no real exploitation of the child. Although I am not sure, I suppose the baby's parents receive some baby powder, a few cakes of soap or a packet of crunchy crackles for its part in the advertisement.

The Hon. K. E. J. Bardolph: You are only surmising.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes. I do not think this is carrying the matter through to a very logical conclusion. I am comforted by the fact that it is obvious that this provision will only operate against young children in this State who take part in such nefarious activities as advertising some of these products. If the film of an advertisement is made in another State or overseas, or if a children's programme is produced in another country or State, this provision will not apply to it. It is not designed to prevent the transmission by television of the activities in public entertainment of children under the age of seven years. It merely prevents young South Australian children from taking part in these activities. I find it difficult to see how this can be said to be logical in its practical application.

I believe its effect on South Australian children is a pretty minor one and if the Act is administered in the future as it has been in the past I do not suppose we shall be prevented from seeing a young girl riding Nimble in the Christmas Pageant on our television screen. However, if the Act were strictly applied and the child were under the age of seven years, I think such an instance might be an offence.

The Minister said that the reason for increasing the age from six to seven years was to comply with a recommendation by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board that the section be extended to children who had not enrolled in school until their eighth year. I do not have any information on this, but I feel that only a limited number of children would not have enrolled in a primary school by their eighth year. If this

is the only reason for extending the age from six to seven, it seems to me it will affect a large group of children for the sake of a very few.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Where does the eighth year come in?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am referring to what the Chief Secretary said in his speech on the second reading. He said that the board recommended that the age be increased to seven to cover children who had not enrolled until their eighth year. I can refer the Minister to his speech in *Hansard.*

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: The amendment only alters the age from six to seven.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I agree. On turning seven, children enter their eighth year and this is apparently the reason behind the Minister's remarks.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: There is a difference between the eighth year and being eight years of age.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I agree.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: That is what I was getting at.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: In my interpretation if children do not enrol in school until their eighth year, this means that they do not enrol until they are over seven years. I would say that the number of children who do not enrol in a primary school until they are over seven years is pretty small, and if the Minister is wrong and meant to say seventh year, I still say that the number of children who do not enrol until after they are over six must be small compared with the number who enrol between the ages of five and six. It is only a small matter.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: Do you agree with the Bill?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I am supporting it. I think there is little difference between children of six and seven years of age, and I base that on my experience as a father. I looked at the Minister's explanation for the reason, and the only one given was the one I have mentioned.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: I meant, do you support the Bill generally?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Generally, I support the Bill because I can see nothing objectionable in it. However, I wonder whether the move is necessary. No great harm occurs to children who take part unknowingly in a television advertisement.

The Hon. G. O'H. Giles: It affects television screening in this State.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes. It will not affect anything in other States.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: There is no new punishment in the Bill. All the measure does is to add one year to the age.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: True. It prohibits South Australian children from taking part in an organized form of entertainment on television unless that entertainment is in aid of a charitable, religious, educational or patriotic object. If we applied the definition rigidly we would cut out much entertainment which the Hon. Jessie Cooper says is for none of these objects, but just for sheer fun. Therefore, I wonder whether the matter has been considered right through to the logical conclusion. I have no great opposition to the measure; in fact, I support it. Government advisers say that it is necessary. They know more about the facts than I do, and I shall not vote against it. However, members should see all the implications and I have endeavoured to interpret the position as I see it. I support the second reading.

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

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) BILL.

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

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object, as its long title indicates, is to enable the Government to subsidize the capital costs of aged citizens clubs. Clause 3 accordingly empowers the Treasurer to make a grant, either to a local government authority or to any institution recommended by it and approved by the Treasurer, for the purpose of assisting in the purchase of land, buildings, furniture or equipment. Subclause (2) provides that before making any such grant the Treasurer must be satisfied that the land, buildings or equipment concerned will be used wholly for the purpose of a club for the provision of physical and mental recreation of aged citizens. Subclause (3) provides that no grant can be made unless the local government authority contributes an amount and that the contribution by the Government is not to exceed the council's contribution and any additional amounts contributed by any other body or person. Subclause (4) limits the total amount which can be granted for any one club to £3,000. Clause 5 enables the Treasurer

to attach terms and conditions to a grant, and clause 6 contains the usual financial provision.

Clause 4 provides that, if any institution, which has received a grant, is wound up or goes out of existence or ceases to operate a club, all of the assets used in connection with the club (less outstanding liabilities) are to be transferred to the local governing body concerned. The object of this provision is to ensure that the assets, to which the Government and the local governing authority have contributed, do not become dissipated or perhaps applied by the institution for other purposes. I draw attention to the definition in clause 2, which will enable the benefits of the Bill to be available in parts of the State outside the normal local government areas.

From time to time there have been requests for some form of Government assistance towards the provision of clubs for our senior citizens, and a number of such clubs already exist. That they have great value is, I think, accepted by all sections of the community, but no club can function without club rooms which involve land, buildings, furniture and equipment. Many of the existing clubs have been established by or with financial assistance from local government authorities. Their funds are, however, limited, and the Government has decided that if it were to subsidize the initial capital cost on a pound-for-pound basis this would assist very materially in the formation of more of these very worthy institutions.

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

PHYLLOXERA ACT AMENDMENDMENT BILL.

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

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes several amendments to the principal Act of a varied but generally administrative character. Under section 38 (7) of the principal Act, all vines introduced into the State for planting in nurseries established by the Phylloxera Board must be resistant to the disease of phylloxera. It is considered desirable for the virus indexing of South Australian vines that certain varieties, not resistant to phylloxera, be introduced by the board (under strict controls). Clause 13 of the Bill therefore amends section 38 (7) by abolishing the requirement that imported vines be phylloxera-resistant.

Section 23 of the principal Act constitutes a special fund to meet the expense incurred in dealing with the eradication and prevention of phylloxera should an outbreak occur. The fund at present stands at some £50,000, which represents contributions by vignerons, wine-makers and distillers at rates prescribed by the section.

There has never been an outbreak of phylloxera in the State and the fund has been applied solely for meeting the expenses of preventing phylloxera. No levies have been made for some 15 years, nor is there any present need to augment the fund. However, it is desirable that in place of the minimal rates fixed by the section there should be a more flexible procedure so that, should there be an outbreak of phylloxera, the Minister may fix contributions that are more in keeping with present-day costs. The present amount of the fund is more than adequate to meet the expenses incurred in the prevention of phylloxera but would be inadequate to deal with any outbreak of the disease. Clause 6 of the Bill therefore re-enacts section 23 so as to provide for contributions to be fixed by the Minister. Clauses 8, 9, 10 (*b*) and 14 make consequential amendments. As another consequential measure, clause 7 provides for the repeal of sections 24 and 25 of the principal Act, which deal with the board's power to suspend contributions to the fund when it reaches £5,000, either generally or in respect of vineyards on which rates have been paid for 15 years.

Clause 4 provides for the name of the board to be formally included in the principal Act. The Reserve Bank has asked that this be done to enable it to deal with the accounts of the board. Clause 5 provides for the fees (now fixed by section 16) for members of the board to be determined by the Minister, so that the fees may more readily be adjusted from time to time. Clause 11 (*a*) amends section 36 of the principal Act so as to empower the board to quarantine all areas of a vineyard to prevent the spread of disease (without being limited to an area of two chains' radius, as provided by that section). Clause 11 (*b*) enables the board to treat vines suspected of disease otherwise than by destroying and burning them. Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment.

Clause 12 re-enacts section 37 of the principal Act so as to enlarge the board's power of destroying vineyards that are unused or neglected by removing the requirement that

they must have been unused or neglected for two years. In the past the board has found it very difficult to enforce the destruction of vineyards because of this requirement. Provision is also made for a maximum penalty of £100 if an owner of a vineyard does not comply with an order for destruction within eight weeks. Clause 15 provides for the repeal of section 51 of the Act. This section provides a penalty for an inspector who contravenes any provision of the Act. It is considered unnecessary.

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

ADJOURNMENT

At 5 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, October 30, at 2.15 p.m.