LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, August 17, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

GROUP LAUNDRY.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question concerns something that has been very dear to me over a long period and that I have been trying to bring about—the establishment of a group laundry and ancillary services. I understand that that project is now well on its way and nearing completion; it was to have been completed this year. Can the Chief Secretary tell me when it will be completed and whether members of Parliament will have an opportunity of inspecting the organization?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I inspected the group laundry project some time ago (I think it was four or five weeks ago) and it is a fact that it is well advanced. It is expected that it will be in operation in October. I have discussed with the Director-General of Medical Services the question of its opening, and I think it is the idea that there will be an official opening, to which all members of the South Australian Parliament will receive an invitation.

TIMBER FOR MILLING INDUSTRY.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to a question I asked on July 27 last about supplies of timber for industry in the Barossa Valley?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Forests, reports that the available log supply at Mount Crawford forest is apportioned as fairly as possible to licence holders who have been with the department for many years. It is true that at the present time the overall demand for pine log timber exceeds the supply but the maximum possible amount on a continuing basis is being made available. Licences were recently increased following a comprehensive survey of the forest but, because of limitations on planting land, any further increase in log supply will not be possible for some years.

TOMATO CASES.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of July 27 regarding alternative containers for tomatoes?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, reports that tomatoes are normally packed in a half-dump size wooden case, but cartons of several types are available and quite suitable for tomatoes. Half-dump size cartons (17¾in. by 8½in. by 7½in. deep) of either telescopic or envelope type are available. There are also several types of half standard case size, which are 17¾in. by 11½in. by 5¼in. deep and are very good for small fruit, such as tomatoes or mandarins. If the tomatoes are size graded or pattern packed properly, the shallow wide half standard case shape is preferable to the half-dump case shape from the point of view of quality retention during transport. However, two reasons why cartons are not being used are that they cannot be used as an "open package" and capped like the wooden half case and that they are slightly higher in price (3s. 1d. against 2s. 10d.).

BORDERTOWN RAILWAY YARD.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my question of August 5 regarding the Bordertown railway yard?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes, I have a reply in the following terms:

The improvements to the Bordertown railway yard are being undertaken in three stages. Stages one and two have been completed and stage two, which was brought into operation early this month, provides for an additional 500ft. of holding sidings. Outward trucks can now be held on this siding instead of on the loading sidings. Stage three provides for an additional 600ft. of loading siding and, subject to the limitations of finance, every effort will be made to complete the work during the current financial year.

EYRE PENINSULA LAND.

The Hon. C. C. D. OCTOMAN: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked on August 3 regarding two blocks of land in the hundred of Murlong near Lock?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. The Minister of Lands has advised that 34 applications were received for section 19, hundred of Murlong, and 32 applications for section 26, hundred of Murlong.

CIVIL DEFENCE.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: On July 22 this year, at the opening of the Returned Servicemen's League conference, the Premier made the following statement:

We are endeavouring to revive and encourage greater training and create more interest in civil defence.

In the light of the current threats to Australia's security, will the Chief Secretary inform the Council what active plans are being pursued to educate the public of South Australia on civil defence preparations?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: A conference regarding civil defence was held a fortnight ago, but it did not take us any further than the present position. The position on civil defence within the State is that the Commonwealth Government only provides enough money to have one full-time member on the staff. His title is Deputy Director of Civil Defence and the position is occupied by Mr. Nicholls, and some typing assistance is provided. The Director in South Australia is the Deputy Commissioner of Police, Mr. Leane. The conference did not last very long, because all sides (and we were no exception) thought that this was a national project and that if it were to be taken further the Commonwealth Government should provide more money to enable it to go on. Arising from the conference the Commonwealth Minister—I think his name is Mr. Anthony—said that he was not able to commit his Government, and it was decided that there should be a further conference of Directors of Civil Defence to find out what the Commonwealth Government actually wanted the States to do and what money it was prepared to provide to assist them to carry out this work. We are now in the same position as has prevailed for some time, as this State is limited to one full-time public servant for this work. He is doing his best and arousing the enthusiasm of councils, but nobody wants to foot the bill. I am sure it is not the responsibility of the State Government. If the Commonwealth Government comes to the aid of the States, I am sure they will all be prepared to attempt to give effect to whatever is needed.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I would like, following upon the reply given by the Chief Secretary today regarding civil defence, to ask him whether the Government will consider approaching the appropriate authority with a view to having conducted for members of State Parliament another course similar to that attended by the Hon. Mr. Bevan and me some years ago. I think this would be of great benefit to members at the present time. Will the Chief Secretary take the matter up?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be happy to do so.

PARKING.

The Hon. L. R. HART: On July 27 I asked the Chief Secretary a question about better parking facilities for nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and students attending the trade school. Has he obtained a reply?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Only to the question as it affects nurses at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the position is not as bad as we were led to believe. Normally, no member of the non-resident nursing staff is called upon to commence or cease duty, apart from Sundays at times when public transport is not available. Non-resident nursing staff required to commence or cease duty at times when public transport is not available would include only early Sunday morning staff or those engaged in recovery wards or the transfusion service. In the latter two areas, two or three would cease duty at a time near or after departure of last buses. For those rostered to finish duty after public transport has ceased and who do not have private transport, it is the custom to arrange times of departure in the few instances concerned to permit transport by public transport. This could affect only two or three persons. On Sundays there is ample space for parking close to the hospital for those who commence duty before public transport is available. When non-resident nursing staff is called in for temporary duty, such as for specialist operating theatres, it is normal practice to provide transport by taxi at Government expense and to pay overtime rates for the period employed. Therefore, I cannot see that there is any general problem regarding car-parking facilities for nursing staff required to commence or cease duty at times when public transport is not available.

ROAD SIGNS.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to a question I asked recently about speed signs and pine reservations on the Tailem Bend road?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I understand that the honourable member asked the Chief Secretary a question about this matter last week in my absence from this Council. He prefaced his original question by saying:

About 12 months ago it was promised that road signs would be erected between Wellington and Tailem Bend to protect the tract of native pines adjacent to that road but this promise seems to have been overlooked.

I draw the honourable member's attention to his own statement that "about 12 months ago" he made inquiries about this matter. It was apparent from his statement that he had not received a reply to his satisfaction, as he said that something had been promised but had not been done. I suggest to him that it was his duty, if he so desired, to have followed up his question and not to have used the term he used in this Chamber last week in my absence. He asked a question of me a fortnight ago and thought that therefore the Chief Secretary should have had a reply to it last week. As the question was asked of me and not of the Chief Secretary, I should think the appropriate thing would be for me to answer it. The delay has been caused because my officers have been doing considerable research into these allegations.

Regarding signs to protect native pines between Wellington and Tailem Bend, it is understood that this matter was originally dealt with by the Woods and Forests Department. We have no record of previous correspondence on the subject. My department has no records at all, and that is the reason for the delay in answering the question. I requested an investigation to ascertain why there had been the delay and why an answer had not been given. I feel that this answers the criticism levelled by the honourable member last week.

Concerning advisory speed signs, the signs on the main South-East road between Nairne and Kanmantoo were erected only five months ago. A speed study was carried out on this road prior to the installation of the signs and a similar study will again be undertaken at a later date to determine the effect of the signs on vehicle speeds and accidents. Insufficient time has elapsed to gauge the effectiveness of the signs to date. It is considered that a period of at least 12 months is necessary before a significant result can be determined. It is not intended to erect advisory speed signs at the same time as future warning signs are installed, because speed studies are first necessary to determine a safe speed for a particular curve. Isolated hazardous curves, such as the "Devil's Elbow", are currently being investigated for the purpose of erecting advisory speed signs. In addition, a proposal for a similar investigation of the whole of the State main road system is in course of preparation.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: In view of the reply just given by the Minister of Local Government, will he refer this matter to his colleague whom he represents in this Chamber, as these pines should be protected? Secondly, can the Minister reply to the question I asked about the African daisy? I hope it does not have to be as heated as it was last time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If I am to answer the honourable member's question, I say that the African daisy is a different matter altogether. If he wants an answer to his question about the African daisy, I can supply that. If he is asking me a question relating to the answer I have just given, I will say that I have given an answer to that question and there is nothing to add to it. Does he want an answer to his question on the African daisy, or what does he want?

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I must apologize to the Minister of Roads for the form of a recent question. It will be recalled that when this matter was raised before, there was considerable uncertainty as to just whose responsibility these road signs covering the timber reserve on the Tailem Bend to Meningie Road were. This matter went through the hands of the then Minister of Roads, who was also the Minister representing the Minister of Forests. This very valuable patch of timber is still completely unprotected and the road signs are still completely illegible.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member wishes to ask a question, he must ask it, not debate it.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Will the Minister of Roads refer this matter to the Minister of Forests, to ensure that effective action is taken as early as possible?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, I will certainly do that.

ROAD MAINTENANCE.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question of August 3 regarding the amounts of grant money available to metropolitan and country councils?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: During the financial year 1964-65 the department allocated ordinary grants to metropolitan and country

councils amounting to £81,660 and £1,691,761 respectively. The corresponding allocations incorporated in the works programme for the current financial year are £85,000 and £1,705,000. These figures include any allocations to councils from funds received in accordance with the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act.

DROUGHT RELIEF.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Many landowners throughout the State are contributing fodder free of cost to pastoralists in the drought-stricken areas of the North. I understand that the Railways Department is carrying this fodder to the northern areas free of charge. However, to get the fodder to the railheads requires some form of transport and in many cases this transport is being provided by certain carrying firms and farmers free of charge. In cases where this fodder is being carted free of charge, can the Minister of Transport say whether these carriers are still required to pay the ton-mile tax under the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act and, if this is so, will the Government consider remitting such charges where the fodder is being carried free of charge?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: As this is a matter of policy, I would have to refer it to Cabinet. As regards the paying of the road maintenance tax, I believe they would have to pay it; but, if that is true, the matter of relieving them of this charge is one for Cabinet to decide, just as it was in respect of free transport on the railways. I will get a reply for the honourable member as soon as possible.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Agriculture an answer to a question I asked on August 3 about drought relief and transport of fodder?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Lands, has advised that the present arrangement is for donated hay from Lower Eyre Peninsula to be carried by the *Troubridge* from Port Lincoln to Port Adelaide. The owners of the *Troubridge* have offered to use their trailers to bring this hay into Port Lincoln at a nominal cost, and carry it free of charge on the ship. The Government has agreed to meet these trailer charges and the railage costs from Port Adelaide to centres nominated by the Stockowners Association.

Offers and distribution of hay are in the hands of the Stockowners Association which will collate supplies and arrange for dispatch to centres where hay is required. The most economical and convenient means of transport will no doubt be used. However, the matter raised by the honourable member will be considered should circumstances so require. Two loads of hay, totalling 1,350 bales, have been road-transported to Port Augusta, and the Government appreciates the generosity of the carriers in those instances.

PARLIAMENTARY DRAFTSMAN.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Has the Chief Secretary a reply to a question I asked on August 10 about the services of a Parliamentary Draftsman?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think we already have proof of the accuracy of the answer I shall give, which is that endeavours will be made to provide a Parliamentary Draftsman at the House during Committee stages of Bills likely to call for drafting amendments. A draftsman will attend Parliament House during sittings, but at some stages, as under the previous Government, one draftsman will have to cover work in both Chambers. The legislative programme of the Government is very heavy and it is not possible to provide draftsmen to draft private members' Bills at this stage. As under the previous Government, Government business takes precedence. Most of the drafting work for the Labor Party when it was in Opposition had perforce to be done by its own members.

NURSES.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question concerns a report appearing in last week's *Sunday Mail* about the shortage of nurses, particularly in country hospitals. Will the Minister of Health obtain from the Nurses Registration Board a report on that matter?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes; I shall be happy to obtain a report.

UNDERGROUND WATERS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Can the Minister of Mines say whether the Government plans to legislate for the preservation, conservation and prevention of pollution of the underground waters of the State in the present session?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Here again, as this is a question of policy for the Government to consider, I ask the honourable member to put his question on notice.

BROKEN HILL TO PORT PIRIE RAILWAY LINE.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Minister of Transport an answer to a question

I asked on July 28 about a survey of the Broken Hill to Port Pirie railway line?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The survey work undertaken hitherto in the vicinity of Gladstone has been aimed at establishing ground controls for aerial mapping. In order to maintain the progress of work on the project, it will shortly be necessary to embark upon detailed surveys. To this end, notices relating to entry for this purpose have already been issued. Additional notices will be issued as the work proceeds. From the practical point of view, it is desirable that detailed surveys be undertaken subsequent to harvesting of crops, and this course will be followed wherever possible. It may well be, however, that in order to ensure continuity of work it will be necessary to enter land under crop. In such instances, every precaution will be taken to restrict damage to the crops thereon.

METROPOLITAN AREA.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: On June 17 last I asked a question about hospitalization and the building of hospitals and, in so doing, I expressed my pleasure at the decision of the Government to proceed with the extensions to the Gawler Hospital. I also asked a question about the continuation of the suggested Tea Tree Gully hospital, and the Minister of Health made the following statement in reply, which I quote:

> The only reason why it was decided not to proceed with the proposed site at Tea Tree Gully was that it was believed that it was not large enough to meet the growing requirements of the district. As soon as it is humanly practicable to have the plans for the hospital drawn up and money is available, it is our intention that the first new hospital in the metropolitan area will be established there.

In view of that statement and his mention of the fact that Tea Tree Gully is, in fact if not officially, in the metropolitan area, can the Minister say whether he will seriously consider recommending to the Government that Tea Tree Gully and similarly located areas be placed within an enlarged metropolitan area?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I have had some Dorothy Dixers, but that is about as good a one as I have heard: the honourable member asks about a hospital and finishes up talking about the metropolitan area.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You started talking about the metropolitan area.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: If he wants to be funny, I do not know whether the honourable member thinks we are without intelligence. I am not going to be caught on that one. If he wants to know something about Tea Tree Gully hospital, I am prepared to tell him. If he wants to know what is to be done about the metropolitan area, he had the answer last week. In due course, we shall consider the extension of the metropolitan area.

WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Mines a reply to my question of August 10 in relation to water found on pastoral leases in northern areas?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN. It is my department's policy and practice to fully inform leaseholders in advance, wherever possible, of pending investigations on their leases. In regard to information on water supplies found during any departmental investigation, it is, again, the practice to inform leaseholders of any useful supplies struck. It should be appreciated, however, that shot-hole drilling for seismic surveys is not normally suited to discovering water supplies.

GUY FAWKES DAY.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Has the Chief Secretary an answer to my question of August 11 in regard to Guy Fawkes Day?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Cabinet discussed the question of the date of celebrating Guy Fawkes Day (I understand it is November 5) and decided to make no alteration in the date.

SOUTH-EAST AIR SERVICE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Last week, Airlines of South Australia announced the discontinuance of the Adelaide-Millicent-Naracoorte air service. An advertisement appearing during the election campaign indicated that the Labor Party, if returned to Government, would see that a better air service was given to this particular area. Can the Chief Secretary, as the Leader of the Government in this Chamber, say what steps the Government will be taking, not necessarily to improve the service but to retain it?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Again, I ask honourable members to be a little considerate. I am told by the Minister of Transport that the honourable member has already asked that Minister a question concerning this matter, and common decency would suggest that, having asked one Minister a question on a subject, it is not right and proper to ask another Minister the same question.

ELIZABETH TRAFFIC LIGHTS.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Local Government a reply to my question of August 4 in relation to traffic lights at Elizabeth?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The answer is as follows:

When the traffic signals were first installed on the Main North Road, Elizabeth, flashing amber signals were used during the hours of darkness and red, green and amber lights during daylight. The latter type of signals were considered to be unsafe during hours of darkness because street lighting had not been installed at the intersections in question and it was difficult to observe the red and green signals against the general background lighting of Elizabeth. At that time the Elizabeth corporation did not agree to pay for the street lighting of the intersections. Street lighting was subsequently installed at these intersections and the board approved the use of the red, green and amber signals 24 hours a day. The board is prepared to approve the use of flashing amber traffic lights during periods when traffic flow at a particular intersection is very light (*e.g.*, during night time) if undue delays have been occurring to traffic. Such delays would only occur, however, where fixed time interval signals are used. The signals on the Main North Road, however, are actuated by the vehicles approaching the signals, with a result that very little traffic delay would occur. The board considers that steady red, green and amber signals should continue to be used.

SOUTH AFRICAN DAISY.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Roads an answer to my question, asked fairly recently, on South African daisy?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: My colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, states that the possibility of obtaining biological control of African daisy was referred to the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization some months ago. Prior to this, the C.S.I.R.O. had considered the feasibility of establishing a research station in South Africa to investigate the possible use of this method of control in regard to a group of Australian weeds of South African origin. The question as to whether the necessary resources could be found for this proposal to be proceeded with was raised by South Australia at a recent meeting of the Standing Committee on Agriculture. It was resolved that a technical sub-committee comprising a representative from the C.S.I.R.O. and one from each of the interested State departments be established to examine the matter further and prepare a report for the next meeting of the standing committee.

SALISBURY COURTHOUSE.

The Hon. L. R. HART (on notice):

1. Is it a fact that alternative accommodation to the present courthouse is available in Salisbury?

2. If so, for what reason is this alternative accommodation not being used for court hearings?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: The replies are:

1. No alternative accommodation providing permanent court facilities has been found to date. The Attorney-General has inspected accommodation at Salisbury and has arranged for the next court sitting on September 14 to be held at the Masonic Hall, Salisbury. A survey of all judgment debtors will be taken that day for the purpose of determining the venue for further sittings.

2. See 1.

POTATOES.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (on notice): Does the Government intend to preserve the present South Australian Potato Board organization, or will it follow the wishes of potato growers and instruct the board itself to discharge all of its functions?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Government intends to make changes in district representation of grower members on the board. These changes are being sought by grower organizations. The Government is not aware of any failure by the board to discharge its functions.

ELIZABETH.

The Hon. L. R. HART (on notice): Is it the intention of the Government to investigate the possibility of satisfactorily defining the permanent outer boundaries of the city of Elizabeth with a view to preventing continuing acquisitions of surrounding areas by the corporation of Elizabeth?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It is not the intention of the Government to define the permanent outer boundaries of the city of Elizabeth. The Government has no power to alter any local government boundaries unless a petition is received from ratepayers or a joint-petition is received from both councils concerned or an address is presented from both Houses of Parliament. The recent annexation of portion of Elizabeth Vale from Salisbury to Elizabeth was made after the receipt of a petition from ratepayers of the area and after careful consideration of all relevant facts. The Minister of Local Government is not bound to refer such matters to a magisterial inquiry, but does do so if he considers it necessary. It was not

considered necessary in this case. If petitions are received in the future for further alterations—and this is quite possible—then such proposals will be considered on their merits.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: SOUTH-EAST AIR SERVICE.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have addressed a question to the Minister of Transport on the South-East air service, largely on the improvement of the service, as was promised in the advertisement referred to in my question to the Chief Secretary. Since last week, the service has been discontinued. Therefore, I considered that I was justified in addressing a further question on the matter.

EMPLOYEES REGISTRY OFFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 939.)

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill is rather interesting, as it is the first amendment made to an Act which has been in existence for 26 years and which established architecture as a profession. That measure had the usual provision that those who were in practice at that time were automatically entitled to registration provided that they applied within a certain period. I have looked back to the 1939 *Hansard* and have found that I moved the second reading of the Bill on November 2, 1939. I think the first paragraph in that speech is not without interest. It is:

Its object is to provide for the registration of architects and to enact that no person who is not duly registered will be entitled to call himself an "architect". In this underlying principle the Bill differs from most Acts dealing with the registration of members of professions. In other Acts Parliament has usually seen fit to enact provisions saying that unregistered men are not to practise at all. The architects, however, have not asked for any legislation to prevent people from doing architectural work, and the Bill contains no provisions for this purpose. Its real object is to enable the public to know who are registered architects and who are not, and to ensure that registered architects will be persons of experience or competence. Unregistered persons will still be entitled to do architectural work so long as they do not use the forbidden title, nor hold themselves out as registered persons. This has some relation to a clause of this Bill that deals with the use of the word "architectural". This clause goes a little further than the generous attitude displayed in the previous legislation, as it provides that that word must not be used by unregistered persons, who, however, may call themselves "housing designers" or any sort of designer but must not use the word "architectural"; so it seems that this clause has been inserted to tighten up the 1939 legislation.

This sort of thing is not unusual; we have had much of this sort of legislation in the past. Once a profession is established someone is always pulling the cord a bit tighter to make sure that nobody but a registered person can practise. I am not criticizing this; I am merely pointing out that this is the trend. In this case I think this is a safe provision, as these people we are dealing with can use other terms such as "designers" or "house designers" without giving the impression that they have the qualifications of architects.

I express my personal admiration for the prestige of the architectural profession in South Australia. I think architects have given good and reliable service. We have not had any calamities occur here in work undertaken by South Australian architects, and I think the standard of their work is so good that I will support anything that will ensure that it will be preserved in the future.

Clause 4 provides that the residential qualification is no longer to be required. The original Act provided that to be registered a person must be 21, must reside in the State, and must have had certain experience and qualifications, most of which were to be prescribed by the Architects' Board. Conditions have changed since then. Interstate architects have operated here on big projects, but I understand that they have had to indicate on the buildings that they are from other States and are not registered in South Australia. I understand that this is not required of South Australian architects doing work for a South Australian firm that operates in more than one State and uses its architects in other States. The South Australian board has agreed that this is a little one-sided, and it is happy for the restriction to be removed. I have no criticism to offer of this clause.

Another condition regarding registration is length of service. Under the Act there must be three years' practical experience, which means two years after graduation. That period is

reduced under the Bill to two years. I understand that the explanation is that one year's practical work is done during the graduating period, and that consequently there will be only one year's practical experience after graduation, and I believe that this position applies throughout Australia. I am assured by the Chairman of the Architects Board that the proposal in the Bill will not lower the standard of the profession in any way, and that the South Australian position will become uniform with that applying in other States.

Clause 5 deals with examinations and by-laws. It enables the board, instead of setting a standard of examination, to accept the standard set by the Institute of Technology when registering a person as an architect. As this will simplify the position, it is a proposal we can support.

Another provision deals with fees and says that where there is a special examination the cost of it may be recovered. I have examined the Bill and feel that everything contained in it, and supported by the Architects Board, is reasonable. Therefore, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Obligation to register."

The Hon. L. R. HART: We all appreciate that under this clause an architect will not be allowed to use the description "architectural" except under certain conditions, but is he permitted to practice as an architect without putting the description after his name?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): As I see it, a person is not prohibited from carrying out work similar to that of an architect provided he does not hold himself out to be an architect or use the word "architectural". If he wishes to call himself a house designer and do architectural work, he can do so.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

HAWKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 943.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): We have had some enlightening speeches on this Bill and we have heard about the price of apples rising from 15s. a case to the grower to 50s. a case to the consumer. We have been reminded of the days when Afghans, Syrians and Chinese hawked their wares around the country, as well as the unhygienic methods of hawkers of icecream, toffee apples, etc. Broadly speaking, those were the days when there was little council control over hawkers, but the position has changed over the years. I could tell members of some of the experiences I had when I was a hawker in the days when other work was not available, and that experience was worth while. The Bill brings the fees more into line with present-day values.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: You are in favour of increasing the fees?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes. When the fees were set in 1934 the basic wage in this State was about £3 a week. Today it is more than £15 a week. The legislation dealing with hawkers was amended in 1948 when the basic wage was £5 8s. It was amended again in 1960 when the basic wage had increased to £13 11s., but no move was made at that time to increase the 1934 fees. This year the basic wage is almost five times what it was in 1934, yet the Bill merely doubles the fees. Surely an argument could be advanced to make the fees more than is proposed in the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Does the hawker pay any wages?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: He has to take the money home to Mum. The hawker has to pay wages if he employs somebody to take his wares around the district.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: Does Mum tell him that?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Sometimes Mum goes out with Dad on the cart and if the children are granted a school holiday by a leading politician they go, too. I see no undue hardship imposed if these suggested amendments are adopted. If the local trader had to be protected when the original Bill was introduced, he is entitled to similar protection today. I think that the suggested provisions do afford him some protection. For these reasons, I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I agree with much that the Hon. Mr. Banfield has said. His approach to this Bill is much the same as mine, except that I have not had his practical experience.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You don't know what you have missed!

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: In my innocence I had thought that this was a Bill merely to double the fees but, since listening to the various speeches and becoming much

more enlightened, I find that it is not just that. It seems to be a Bill dealing with almost everything in the universe. If the fees were fixed in 1934, there is certainly every justification for doubling them. Indeed, if the Government saw fit to do more than that, I should find it difficult to oppose it. The Hon. Mr. Banfield has applied one criterion to the value of money these days, a good one—the basic wage. I think it is generally accepted that the value of money differs by a multiple of about four times today, so certainly a doubling of the fees is something with which, on the face of it, no-one could possibly quarrel. Admittedly, the hawker's occupation involves all sorts of things. That has been mentioned by honourable members. I have heard many Bills thrashed out in this Chamber but have never known of one that seemed to me so trifling yet received so much attention from honourable members as this one.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It may be that they have had nothing more serious to think about.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That may be right, that it is early in the session and we are waiting for legislation to come from another place. We are disappointed that nothing more important has come before us. We have to keep in practice so that we have our minds well tuned to coming consideration—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: What do you think we are using question time for?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: —of some of these important Bills that appear, eventually, to be coming to us from another place. The signs, symbols, symptoms and portents are not yet readily visible but I hope that the Government will be able to give us a little more important legislation to deal with.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You will have some tomorrow.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am glad to hear that.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It will be local government legislation tomorrow.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am sure all honourable members are impatient to get on with more important issues in this Chamber, and that is the reason why honourable members have dealt with this Bill in so much detail. Had it come along later in the session, I imagine that such a comparatively trivial Bill as this would have received scant consideration, because I do not think it justifies much more than that. I support the Bill in its entirety. It is proper for the Government to introduce it. I only wonder that a similar Bill has not reached us long ere now.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I want to say that I was surprised at the length of the debate on the Bill but some arguments have arisen and my only reason for speaking in closing the debate is to say that I have asked for some advice on the arguments for and against. Unlike the Hon. Mr. Banfield, I have no experience as a hawker and am not conversant with these things. I do not know about the merits of it, and anybody with thoughts similar to mine may be confused. There is an amendment on the files in the name of the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan, but I saw it only a short time ago. I do not want any honourable member to make a decision unless he is fully informed on the matter. I say frankly that I am not as yet fully informed on this Bill. I suggest that Mr. Gilfillan move his amendment and then that we report progress. I hope we shall have tomorrow a complete answer to what has been said during the debate.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, section 20."

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I move:

To strike out "the words 'two pounds' in the second and third lines of the second paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'four pounds'," and insert "therefrom the passage commencing with the words 'Any such by-laws' and ending with the words 'breach of any by-law' and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsection (the preceding part of the section being redesignated as subsection (1) thereof):—

(2) Any such by-laws—

(*a*) shall fix the fees payable for a licence thereunder, not exceeedng four pounds per day or portion of a day;

(*b*) shall state the fees to be payable only in respect of such days as are specified in the licence being the days on which the holder of a licence is authorized by his licence to sell or expose for sale or take or solicit orders for the sale by retail of any goods, wares or merchandise; and

(*c*) may provide for the imposition of fines not exceeding five pounds, recoverable summarily, for any breach of any by-law."

My reason for moving this amendment follows an investigation into several council by-laws that have been submitted under this Act and the Local Government Act. I agree that the by-laws drafted and submitted by councils are affected by both Acts, and possibly both Acts should be amended; but at present this is the only Act

we have before us. Whether the Local Government Act is ultimately amended or not, it will still be necessary to amend this Act to provide for the points that we have raised, because section 20 of the Hawkers Act does place a limitation upon the fees that can be charged by any council under a by-law, and it appears, from an opinion we have received, that the councils are charging a larger fee—up to £20 in many cases. It appears that, under the existing section 20, this can be done. The finding says:

It is appreciated that it is possible that this fee could amount to not more than £2 per day in certain cases, but on the face of the Bill, the statutory maximum is not reached.

The Hon. C. R. Story: That is not a finding; it is an opinion, isn't it?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I consider that in fixing these fees at varying amounts up to £20 a quarter, the spirit of the Act, as intended when it was framed, is not being complied with. It says specifically that the maximum fee shall be £2 a day and the remarks that were made when the Bill was introduced indicate that all members at that time considered that the maximum of £2 a day should be for the days on which the trader was actually trading. It was not considered that there should be some blanket fee or quarterly fee or a fee for any longer period of time when a trader was only intending to trade for, perhaps, one or two days. To carry this further, it could be said that an annual licence could be issued at £4 a day, and the annual fee then would be about £1,000, a ridiculous amount. I am not moving this amendment with any intention of creating more competition for residential traders, but I think that we have to see justice done and that, while active competition is maintained, it should be on a fair and just basis. My view is that if the amendment is not carried, then I could not vote for clause 3, because I consider that the fee of £4 a day could amount to an extremely large amount if there was no qualifying clause such as is contained in my amendment. I, therefore, move that the words I have indicated be struck out and give notice that, if this is carried, I will move the remainder of my amendment.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I support the Bill in its present form, because I consider that there is some confusion at the moment in relation to the matter. I point out that, in my opinion, the amendment on members' files has nothing to do with the licensing of hawkers under this Act. If anomalies occur, perhaps the Local Government Act should be amended to cover the people about whom the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan is concerned. These clauses have been contained in the Hawkers Act for a considerable time and, if there has been conflict, no action has been taken to remedy it. However, it is suggested that there is conflict at present. Section 3 of the Hawkers Act defines "hawker" as:

Any person who travels either personally or by his servants or agents by any means of locomotion (whether by land, air, or water, and whether with or without a vehicle) from place to place or from house to house carrying or exposing goods for sale by retail: Provided that the term "hawker" shall not include a person who sells goods or exposes goods for sale only from premises such as a house, shop, room, stall, tent, or marquee.

That definition shows what a hawker is, and the Bill now before us deals with the fees which a hawker is charged under the Act. Section 5 of the Hawkers Act is rather interesting, and I think it shoots holes in a lot of the suggestions that have been made in this Council during the debate. Under that section, no hawker's licence is required:

for the sale of printed papers, fish, fruit, victuals (not being tea, coffee, or cocoa), timber, fuel, vegetables, hay, straw, or other food for cattle:

It goes further and says that a hawker's licence is not necessary so far as a manufacturer of goods is concerned. A manufacturer can hawk his goods without a hawker's licence, and so we find certain exemptions under the Act. The only people who will be affected by the amendment on members' files are the very people who are exempted under the Act. They are the only people on whom a particular fee can be imposed by councils under their by-law making authorities. Section 10 of the Hawkers Act says:

Every hawker's licence shall contain a condition that the holder thereof shall comply with all by-laws relating to hawking (other than by-laws requiring hawkers to be licensed or to pay any fees) which are in force in any district or municipality in which he hawks.

Therefore, this Act debars any local government authority from imposing a fee on a licensed hawker. Restrictions can be imposed in relation to streets where he may hawk by virtue of powers contained in the Local Government Act but, other than that, a fee cannot be charged by a local authority. I am submitting that the only people who can be affected by this amendment, and the people with whom the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan is concerned, are those who are exempt under the Local Government Act. The instance of Mr. Whippy

has been mentioned in the debate and, under the Act, Mr. Whippy does not have to obtain a licence. Therefore, as far as he is concerned, the council, in terms of the by-law making authority, can make a charge not exceeding £2 a day. I am fully aware of what certain councils have been doing. They have said, "We will charge so much a quarter." A hawker who is not a resident of the district concerned may be in the district only one day in three months and could have to pay £20 for that one visit. This amendment does not remove that anomaly.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Do you think we should have one that does?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This is another reason why the Local Government Act should be brought up to date to remove anomalies. That should have been done years ago. Section 20 of the Hawkers Act was amended in 1960 by adding the following paragraph:

Any such by-laws may fix the fees to be paid for a licence thereunder, not exceeding £2 per day or portion of a day, and may provide for the imposition of fines, not exceeding £5, recoverable summarily, for any breach of any by-law.

The by-laws referred to are those made by councils under the authority given in another Act. However, this affects only those who are exempt from the Hawkers Act. This amendment does not remove the anomaly, as these people are still exempt under the Hawkers Act, which still contains the provision that notwithstanding any other Act a council has no power to charge a fee of a hawker, so a council has no jurisdiction over hawkers except to say, "You can hawk in this street but not in that street." The person who must have a hawker's licence because he sells fresh fruit or other perishables is the only person the honourable member seems to be concerned with. If that is so, I suggest that the Local Government Act should be amended. This amendment is not necessary, as it will not achieve the honourable member's aims. There is nothing wrong with the Bill as drafted. All it does is increase fees payable by people who must be licensed as hawkers. I ask the Committee to pass the clause as drafted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I support the amendment. I am sorry that the Minister was precluded through illness from being in this Chamber last week to hear the discussion that took place. If he had been here he would have been much more enlightened on this subject and would not have made one or two of the statements he made. He has said that a hawker does not have to pay any other fee to a council, but that is not so. Having obtained a licence, a hawker is bound by any other by-law of the council. If a council sets out in a by-law that he must obtain permission to operate in the district, he must conform to that by-law. If it has established certain stalls and facilities and provided that selling must be done only at these places, it is entitled to charge a fee for the stall, so it can be seen that a hawker can be charged other fees.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: He is not a hawker under the Act.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: He is. In some by-laws made recently stringent conditions have been placed not only on itinerant hawkers but on travelling salesmen, or whatever they are called, and on some hawkers. If a council wants to be difficult it can also bring hawkers into a restricted category, for which a fee of £4 is charged at present.

During the second reading debate I asked if the Minister would say whether a person who wished to hawk fruit could obtain a hawker's licence. If a person can obtain a hawker's licence he can go around the country and carry out his business for £4 a year, but if he cannot obtain a licence because of this exemption he can be up for all sorts of fees at the whim of a council. Some by-laws at present on the table of this Chamber provide for a fee of £20, but the period is not stated. That is quite different from section 20, which now provides for a fee of £2 a day or part thereof. If a person cannot obtain a hawker's licence he is at a distinct disadvantage. These people are being asked to pay a fee much higher than that prescribed in the Act, and this is not right. We should see that when Parliament passes a law it cannot be circumvented. Under section 667 (50) councils are given a general power to make by-laws. That section provides a blanket power to cover anything not mentioned elsewhere in connection with the power of local government to make by-laws. Section 20 of the Hawkers Act is vital to the matter before us. Persons, other than those holding licences as hawkers, are at present charged, in some areas, a fee in excess of that set out in the Act. If it is possible to get around that provision we should amend the legislation. The Minister will have to talk long and loud about section 20—

The Hon. L. R. Hart: He won't do either.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Perhaps he has been called off. He was going well a few minutes ago before he sat down.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I thought you were talking about me.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, the Minister who assumed charge of the Bill at this point. Section 20 of the Hawkers Act sets out the fees payable, and they are related to provisions in the Local Government Act. If the opinion read by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan is the opinion of the legal advisers to the Government, I suggest that they have another look at the matter. I do not believe the position is as it is set out. I am not prepared to accept any increase in the fees under the Hawkers Act until some difficulties have been cleared up, because under section 20 of that Act visiting traders will be penalized.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I do not agree with Sir Arthur Rymill that this matter has received more consideration than it should have received. I have been tangled up with it for many years and I can assure members that it is a live matter, particularly to country councils. I am sorry that the Minister of Local Government did not hear earlier speeches on this Bill. He said almost exactly the same as has been said by other members. He dealt with the definition in the Hawkers Act and said that in certain cases no licence as a hawker was required. He also referred to section 10 which says that the holder of a hawker's licence shall comply with all by-laws, other than by-laws to pay any fees. Local government has the authority under the Local Government Act and the Hawkers Act to make by-laws, first, to ensure that any licensed hawker must, first, get the written permission of the council in whose area he wants to operate, and, secondly, that the council cannot charge a fee but can regulate and prohibit in certain circumstances. The Minister of Local Government said that section 20 of the Hawkers Act dealt with persons not licensed as hawkers, and I agree with that. Under the Local Government Act this person can be charged a fee. It has happened that a council making by-laws, instead of charging a daily fee to the non-licensed hawker, has charged a quarterly fee. This could be carried to absurdity, because an itinerant trader under section 20 of the Hawkers Act, as interpreted now, could be charged at the rate of about £1,000 a year even if trading for one day only. The Hon. Jessie Cooper gave an accurate description of the position when she said that it would mean the punitive annihilation of the itinerant trader. Therefore, I must support the amendment. Looked at in this way, I think that a fee of £4 a day cannot result in anything else than punitive annihilation.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: What about £2 a day in 1934?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. I have said that, as interpreted now, the legislation could affect the itinerant trader to such a point that he could be driven out of his trade. I support the amendment, but I am not happy about raising the fee to £4 a day, because it could completely annihilate a trader coming to a country town but in a metropolitan council area the trader could recoup the extra amount he had to pay.

The Hon. L. R. HART: After listening to the Hon. Mr. Banfield give his experiences as a hawker one rises to speak on this measure with some diffidence. I was interested to learn why we have this amending Bill. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that it had been requested by the Federation of Chambers of Commerce of South Australia, and pointed out that the fees in the schedule have not been changed since 1934 and no longer reflect the present-day costs that have to be borne by local traders in such matters as the payment of wages to employees, rent for their premises, etc. One wonders whether the amendment is to get more revenue for the Government, or, as aptly described by the Hon. Jessie Cooper is a move for punitive annihilation. To become a hawker a person must be registered as a shopkeeper under section 31 of the Early Closing Act. Section 33 says that the fees payable in respect of registration and annual renewal of registration shall be those prescribed by the Fourth Schedule to the Act. If we look at the Fourth Schedule we find that the hawker, who is required under the Department of Labour and Industry regulations to hold a shopkeeper's licence, is required to pay the following fees: for every shop at which not more than two persons are engaged per annum, he pays a fee of £1; for three to four persons, a fee of £1 10s., and so the scale increases until it gets to £24 per annum for more than 50 persons and less than 100 persons. In excess of that number, he is required to pay £12 for every 50 persons.

We are inclined to think of a hawker in terms of his being a lone trader, but that is not necessarily the case. I know of instances where a hawker has been a shopkeeper employing a considerable staff so, in addition to paying the hawker's fee, he is also required to meet other expenses. But at present we have an amendment before us which I think is being inserted for the specific purpose of defining the exact fees that a council can charge an itinerant trader, a person who is not a

hawker. We all appreciate that an itinerant trader is not required to have a hawker's licence. We may agree with the Minister that it is the Local Government Act, not the Hawkers Act, that requires amending. I suggest that both Acts may require amending because, if we do not do that, we could well have another Statute Law Revision Bill before us wherein we shall be required to deal with certain Acts overlooked in amending a previous Act. So it is necessary at this stage that we pass this amendment and if necessary (and possibly it is necessary) amend the Local Government Act when it comes before us shortly, as we have been advised it will. So I am inclined at this stage to support the amendment.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: In view of the discussion, I ask that the Committee report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ABORIGINAL AND HISTORIC RELICS PRESERVATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 11. Page 938.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): This is the third Bill of this type to come before this Chamber in a period of 12 months. I commend the Hon. H. K. Kemp for the concern he has shown for the necessity of this kind of legislation being on the State's Statute Book. I also commend him for his industry and, shall I say, tenacity in introducing for a second time a Bill of this nature. As I have said previously, I support the principle contained in the honourable member's Bill and I would support any Bill assisting the preservation of historic relics in this State. The previous Bill before us, in 1964, bore a long title:

An Act to provide for the preservation of certain objects of ethnological, anthropological, archaeological and historical interest and value.

The title of the present Bill has been reduced to:

An Act to provide for the preservation of Aboriginal and historic relics.

One regularly receives reports of damage, destruction and defacement of many objects of historic interest. We receive not only such reports but also others about the removal and sale of such objects not only in other States but also overseas. This is a matter of some urgency for this State as much of this material while of great historic value is also, by world standards, unique.

In the last session a Bill was passed in another place in respect of which I think six speeches were made when it came to this Chamber; but it lapsed here for several reasons. The first reason I can think of is that no real protection was given to the amateur anthropologist who does a lot of fossicking as a hobby and has indeed been responsible for the preservation of many relics in this State. Secondly, it lapsed because no real protection was given to the landholder upon whose land these historic relics may be found. Also, other honourable members raised the question of the power vested in an authorized person under that Bill. It lapsed in this Chamber, in my opinion, rightly.

Two members of the Labor Party spoke on that Bill in another place, neither of whom raised any objections. The only person raising any objection to this measure in another place was the Hon. Mr. Teusner. It is urgently necessary to have some legislation of this nature upon the Statute Book, but full protection should be given to the landholders and the amateur anthropologists. After that Bill lapsed, a Bill prepared by the Hon. Mr. Kemp was introduced late in that session, and that, too, lapsed. But in the second reading explanation of this Bill, Mr. Kemp compared it with the previous Bill, saying:

The Bill before us properly appoints to administer the Act a Minister who delegates his authority but remains responsible for actions carried out under its provisions.

I agree with the honourable member that this is an improvement on the previous Bill. He continued:

The scope of the Act has, at the same time, been widened to cover not only relics of the Aboriginal population but relics of the early settlement and exploration of the State where protection is considered warranted.

I do not altogether agree with the honourable member that this Bill has a wider application. In the previous Bill of 1964, a prescribed object was defined as follows:

(*a*) an object relating to Aborigines which is of ethnological or anthropological interest or value;

(*b*) an object relating to the State which is of archaeological or historical interest or value.

Then there are two or three other definitions. It winds up with a rider:

but does not include an object or an object included in the class of objects specified in the regulations to be an object or class of objects to which this Act does not apply.

In the previous Bill, any object relating to the State that is of archaeological or historical interest became a prescribed object and it remained so until it appeared in the regulations

as not being such an object. In the Hon. Mr. Kemp's Bill a relic is defined as:

Any—(*a*) trace, remains or handiwork of an Aboriginal. It does not include any handiwork made by a living aboriginal for the purpose of sale; (*b*) trace or remains of the exploration and early settlement considered of sufficient importance by the Minister to warrant protection under this Act.

To me, this means that many of these traces or remains of the early exploration of South Australia do not become relics until the Minister thinks that they warrant protection. The provisions of the previous Bill gave them protection until they were exempted. There is evidence of a great number of articles, relics, Aboriginal artefacts, implements and tools that have gone out of South Australia. Perhaps I could give as an example the petrified Aboriginal that disappeared from the cave at Naracoorte at about the turn of the century. That had been a great tourist attraction to the Naracoorte Cave. Many articles belonging to the early settlers have found their way overseas and a letter that the Hon. Mr. Kemp received from a prominent gentleman indicated that many coins, probably dropped by members of an exploration party, went outside the State, possibly overseas.

The point I am worried about is that these relics of the early history of South Australia are not protected under the Bill until the Minister says that they should be preserved. However, the Bill overcomes many of my objections to the previous measure, in that it takes into consideration the position of the landholder, who did not appear to have much protection previously. In this Bill, the landholder is virtually invited to become an assistant in the preservation of these relics and I think that that is a much saner approach. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. Kemp may explain clause 22 (2) later. It says:

If the owner of any land being whole or part of an historic reserve makes request in writing to the Minister that the land cease to be an historic reserve or part thereof the Governor shall thereupon make such proclamations as are necessary to provide that the said land shall cease to be such an historic reserve or part thereof.

I take this to mean that where a landholder agrees that his land should become an historic reserve, the problem can be met, but then, if the landholder decides that he no longer wants it preserved as such, the Governor shall thereupon make the necessary proclamations providing that the land shall cease to be an historic reserve, or part thereof. It appears that if there are objects on someone's land that need preservation, as soon as application is made that the land cease to be an historic reserve, the reserve is lost. Some provision should be made for a carry-over period, whereby these objects can be preserved or dealt with in the meantime.

I am hazy about clauses 15, 16, 17 and 18, but perhaps those matters can be dealt with in the Committee stages. Generally speaking, I support the Hon. Mr. Kemp's Bill. I commend him for his industry and tenacity in preparing a measure along these lines. Before I leave the Bill, I should like to refer to one other matter, and that concerns the definition of "Crown land". This is defined in the Bill before us, but I should like the definition extended by the addition of the words "within three miles of the coast of South Australia" because a number of wrecks on the coast of our State could have items of historic interest on them.

I come now to the speech made by the Chief Secretary on this Bill, and I must admit that I was rather disappointed with it. First, he said:

I say openly in this Chamber that if this Bill were withdrawn or the debate adjourned for a time, and the Government given an opportunity of introducing a Bill as suggested by the Committee, which Bill would go further and do the job better than the measure now before the Council, the Government would be prepared to introduce its own Bill during this session.

We have before us a Bill that I believe is capable of being amended and that overcomes many of the objections we had to the Bill introduced in the last Parliament. I doubt whether another Bill would go further and do a better job, because the previous Bill went further, but objections were raised by members in this Chamber. Secondly, I refer to the part of the Chief Secretary's speech where he said:

As far as the Government is concerned, it agrees in principle with what he wants to do but, in conformity with the practice adopted over the years, the Government is not prepared to introduce amendments or suggested amendments to a private member's Bill.

First, I think every member of this Chamber and of the Government would admit the urgency of legislation of this type. This Chamber is not over-worked at present and it could give extensive attention to any measure placed before it. Secondly, the Government agrees in principle with the matters contained in Mr. Kemp's Bill. I think the Chief Secretary mentioned earlier in his speech that there were some minor omissions from it and that there were two major omissions. I think the Government should make those omissions known to this

Chamber. Why not? Also, on this particular matter, the Chief Secretary said that in conformity with the practice adopted over the years, the Government was not prepared to introduce amendments or suggested amendments to a private member's Bill. I do not know where this idea arose. However, I did take the opportunity of checking back on previous Parliaments to see what was the position regarding amendments moved by the Government to a private member's Bill. First, I refer to *Hansard* of 1963-64, page 1372. At that time a private member's Bill dealing with an amendment to the Excessive Rents Act was being debated and the Premier at that time, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, in his second reading speech, dealt with four matters that the Government could not support in a private member's Bill. When that Bill was in Committee, Mr. Dunstan moved four amendments that had been suggested by the Premier during the second reading debate, so this was an instance where the Government indicated its objections to a private member's Bill and the private member moved amendments to bring it into line with the Government's thinking. That was the first case I could find where the Government tried to assist a private member. The next I found was the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill introduced in the same year by the Leader of the Opposition. Here again the Premier gave a lead on what the Government would accept. He said:

The Act provides that the court must be satisfied that the person can afford to pay and that he ought to pay, but the Bill provides that no repayment shall be made unless "special circumstances" exist.

He then asked what "special circumstances" were and indicated that he would agree to the provision if the word "special" were deleted. Mr Frank Walsh said that he accepted the Premier's suggestion, and moved to delete the word "special". They are two cases where the Government did everything possible to allow a private member to bring his Bill into line with the Government's thinking.

The Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin: It was not unusual.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It has not been unusual up to the present.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Tell us something about Bills that the Government would not have anything to do with. They far outnumber those the honourable member has mentioned. He has picked out two examples and has said, "That is the practice." They are only two cases.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have not made a full survey, but I am referring to this statement made by the Chief Secretary:

In conformity with the practice adopted over the years, the Government is not prepared to introduce amendments or suggested amendments to a private member's Bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I stick to that.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I looked back to 1963 and found that on two occasions in that year, although the Government did not introduce amendments, it suggested to a private member what amendments it would be prepared to accept, and the private member then introduced the amendments. I think this would have been the correct thing for the Leader of the Government in this Chamber to do on this occasion. He admits that the Bill has two major omissions and several minor omissions. If he had told us what they were, I am sure the Hon. Mr. Kemp would have considered them and if necessary introduced amendments to rectify them. I refer now to another case that I think is a classic in this regard. In 1952 the Hon. Mr. Condon introduced in this Council a Bill for an Act to amend the Margarine Act.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What has this to do with this Bill?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I am referring to the Chief Secretary's statement that in conformity with the practice adopted over the years the Government is not prepared to introduce amendments or suggested amendments to a private member's Bill. I am attempting to refute that, and I have every right to do so. In his Bill, Mr. Condon sought to have the margarine quota lifted by 100 per cent. The Attorney-General (Hon. R. J. Rudall) said:

I propose to move an amendment to the Bill providing that the quota increase will be 50 per cent instead of 100 per cent.

That is a case where the Government actually introduced an amendment to a private member's Bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Well done!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is an interesting case that we could study. On page 1260 of 1952 *Hansard* the amendment was moved by the Attorney-General. When the Bill went to another place a further amendment was moved by the member for Onkaparinga. The Bill came back to this Chamber, but the amendment was not agreed to here. Later, in another place, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. O'Halloran) moved, "That the House of Assembly do not insist on its amendment", and said:

When the Bill came here from another place it represented the considered opinion of members there and was in the best interests of all concerned. I said last night that the amendment agreed to here would detrimentally affect the community and the manufacturers of table margarine. In fact, I believe it would end the industry here.

The other place did not insist on its amendment, as the whole of the Ministry voted with the Opposition. I am pointing this out to show that the statement of the Chief Secretary is not borne out by fact. The Government could, if it wished, introduce amendments to this Bill or make known its objections. If it did so, I am certain that the Hon. Mr. Kemp and other members would be only too pleased to consider the suggestions and if necessary introduce the necessary amendments. I support the second reading.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.23 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, August 18, at 2.15 p.m.