LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, August 25, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

POLICE OFFENCES ACT.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: For the purpose of explaining my question, I quote two or three lines from a press report that I have from the *Advertiser* of a statement made by a magistrate in a case concerning a happening in Frome Road, in which it appears from his remarks that a crowd was referred to as "a number of long-haired louts" who said, "We know our law; we don t have to move on." At present the police have power under section 63 of the Lottery and Gaming Act to deal with mobs before trouble occurs. It has been announced that the Government intends to repeal that section. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to provide for this power in the Police Offences Act, which is not included at present?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: First, the Government does not intend immediately to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, as the Leader has suggested. Secondly, I join issue with him when he says that there is no such provision in the Police Offences Act. I do not want to go into detail, but I have been informed that the Police Offences Act gives the police all the authority they need to move people on. It is the view of the Government and myself that the police desire and need some authority to move people on in the circumstances outlined. I should like to examine the Police Offences Act to find out where we are going before I go more deeply into the details of it, but I can assure the Leader that the Government does not intend immediately to take that section out of the Lottery and Gaming Act, although it is our policy and at some time we intend to do it.

YORKE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Honourable members will be aware that, according to our engineers, extensions of water reticulation on the southern end of Yorke Peninsula have come to a final halt as far as water being brought from the Murray in the existing mains is concerned. For some considerable time the previous Government was concerned about extending supplies in that area. The Mines Department was engaged in exploratory measures to ascertain the quantities of underground water available there and whether the quality and quantities were sufficient to permit extensions of reticulated water in that area. Can the Minister of Mines give the Council any information on whether the department has been able to conclude its findings, whether there is sufficient water for further reticulations and whether, in fact, plans are being prepared for the extension of reticulated facilities on the southern end of Yorke Peninsula?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Certain investigations have been carried out by the Mines Department to find underground water supplies that could be used for domestic purposes but the department has by no means reached finality. However, I will get a report from the department on this specific case and inform the honourable member later.

DROUGHT RELIEF.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Has the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Lands, a reply to my question of August 17 regarding the remission of ton-mile tax charges on drought relief fodder being carted free of charge?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes. My colleague, the Minister of Lands, has informed me that the Government cannot remit the road tax, but it is prepared to reimburse the amount of tax paid on the carting of gift fodder, if application is made to the Department of Lands.

MESSENGERS.

The PRESIDENT: With reference to the inquiries that the Hon. Mr. Hart made yesterday in regard to messengers, I have arranged for the list of members and officers displayed in the glass case on the left of the Council entrance to be extended to show the titles of office and names of all officers and staff of the Council, and a complete list of Council officers and staff has been posted in the members' mailing room. I think this should assist both new members and visitors. I point out also that visitors to the Council should make their inquiries at the messengers' office, where a notice is prominently displayed—"Enquiries".

BETTING CONTROL BOARD RULES.

Notice of Motion No. 1: The Hon. F. J. Potter to move:

That the Betting Control Board rules, in respect of payment of bets when a horse is withdrawn from a race after scratching time, made on May 13, 1965, under the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1964, and laid on the table of this Council on June 29, 1965, be disallowed.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): These rules were disallowed in another place, and I therefore move that this Notice of Motion be discharged.

Notice of Motion discharged.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT REGULATIONS: TRAINEE NURSES.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I move:

That regulations 2 and 4 of the regulations made on July 15, 1965, under the Nurses Registration Act, 1920-1964, in respect of minimum standard of education for trainee nurses, and laid on the table of this Council on July 27, 1965, be disallowed.

This motion is moved with the approval of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, which took evidence on this subject from several witnesses and which reported earlier to this Chamber that it was of opinion that the two regulations should be disallowed on the ground that they unduly trespassed upon rights previously enjoyed under the law, which I take it is the existing regulations. For the benefit of honourable members, who, of course, did not hear the evidence laid before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I think I should briefly outline the position.

When the original regulations under the Nurses Registration Act, 1920, came into operation the educational standard for a potential trainee nurse was, under those regulations, an examination at the grade VII level of the public schools. On January 1, 1959, this provision was altered to raise the standard by providing that in lieu of the grade VII qualifications for trainee nurses there should be an examination at the second-year level of a secondary school. As it was not certain which subjects would be available for any person at the second-year level, provision was made earlier—and this was also true of the grade VII examination—that the Nurses Board would itself conduct an examination in the two subjects (English and Arithmetic) which were considered by the board to be the essential two subjects to meet the required educational standard.

The nurses' entrance examination in English and Arithmetic was continued notwithstanding the upgrading of the position in 1959, and it meant, in effect, that the nurses' entrance examination in those two subjects was lifted above the grade VII level and became of about the Intermediate standard. The position that existed prior to the introduction of the present regulations was that the nurses' entrance examination was conducted, and it has been conducted regularly, by the Nurses Board in those two subjects (English and Arithmetic) at the Intermediate standard or an approximation thereto. What is the effect of these regulations that the Council is at present considering? Briefly, the effects are to wipe out the nurses' entrance examination as it stands in these two subjects and substitute therefor a minimum requirement that every girl wanting to be a trainee nurse must have the Intermediate certificate in five subjects, including English, Arithmetic or Mathematics I or Mathematics II. If the girl has five subjects in her Intermediate examination but she unfortunately slips on the Mathematics or English, then she can still do the existing nurses' entrance examination in those one or two subjects and that will count instead of the subject that she dropped in the Intermediate.

However, the essential point is that she still must have five subjects in her Intermediate examination. As one of the witnesses said when appearing before the committee, this seems to be completely wrong and it would be unnecessarily imposing a standard on a section of people that is unrelated to the particular sphere of life that they want to enter, namely, the nursing profession. I have forgotten the name of the witness at the moment, but, in effect, he said, "You are going to insist that the girl gets needlework or drawing or something of that nature that may be totally unrelated to her nursing career". If she were successful in getting that, she would be eligible to enter the nursing profession, whereas a girl who was particularly good at the two subjects that appear to be the vital ones—English and Arithmetic or Mathematics—would be debarred if she did not pass any other subjects in her Intermediate examination.

It is interesting to note that these particular regulations were evolved as the result of an interstate conference of Nurses Board officers. Such conferences are held from time to time and those who attend discuss matters of common interest. Apparently at the two conferences that have been held this question of the minimum educational standard for trainee nurses was discussed and it was as a result of a resolution passed at these conferences that the

minimum standard was agreed to. It was agreed that the standard should be at the tenth year of schooling and that a pass in the examination at this level must include English and Mathematics as well as at least two other subjects. In other words, they have extended it to three other subjects in these regulations. It is interesting to note, too, that it is contemplated that this is to be a first step only and that ultimately the Leaving examination will be necessary before a girl can become a trainee nurse.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: Including a science subject.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yes, in the Leaving examination. The committee took evidence from Dr. Rollison, the Director General of Medical Services, on this subject.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Can you tell us his opinion on this matter?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: His opinion is that any suggestion of a minimum standard of anything above the Intermediate examination would not meet with his approval at all, but I think that he goes along with the present regulations, with some hesitation.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is just what I wanted to know.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: He points out that the moving force in these new regulations is the Nurses Registration Board, and he also points out that some of the people who are in senior positions in the profession seem to be anxious for the standards in the profession to be raised.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: They want to keep it to a select class.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: This is an argument that appears to have reference not only to this profession but also to other professions. For instance, the question of what should be the matriculation level is a live topic at universities. It is argued that more and more girls are unable to cope with the university courses and cannot pass the examinations unless they have these minimum education standards, but I am not so sure that the committee was presented with any evidence actually to confirm this. Indeed, the committee had evidence that in some cases the contrary applied—that girls coming in with the minimum standards at examinations (the existing examination in two subjects) had done equally as well as the girls with Intermediate and Leaving certificates.

It was said before the committee that the qualification for this profession was not unlike, and should be in fact analogous to, a course of apprenticeship training. That is true and is a sensible way of viewing the matter. Of course, we all know that certain minimum requirements are necessary for apprenticeship training and it would be impossible for an apprentice to be trained unless he had his requisite Intermediate certificate.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Not in all trades.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: No, but in the majority of trades this is so; but here we have a particular calling that is, I think, analogous to apprenticeship, and the argument for these regulations is that the girls need this standard to cope with the course. It is true that, with the change to the metric system and the various dosages required to be measured in that system, it is necessary these days for a girl to have some knowledge of mathematics and arithmetic. One of the biggest factors influencing the committee's recommending to Parliament that these regulations be disallowed is that it was convinced that at the present time (I emphasize that—at the present time) the implementation of these regulations would have a serious effect upon the recruitment of girls in country hospitals.

The Hon. C. R. Story: Hear, hear!

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: On this aspect the evidence disclosed that the majority of the training schools in the country were what is known as the C-class training school: there, girls are recruited and do their initial training in the country, and they are even coached there for their initial entrance examination while serving as nurse attendants in the country. Eventually, most of them go on and finish up doing very well in the city.

Of course, there is a real difference (and this was apparent from the evidence) between the situations at metropolitan and country hospitals. From the information given to us by Matron Huppatz of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, it is obvious that there is no difficulty in getting girls with the Intermediate certificate to take up the nursing profession in the city. Indeed, there are some girls on the waiting lists with the Leaving certificate. There are ample numbers of girls applying, so they need not accept lower standards. But in the country the exact opposite appears to be the case: it is difficult for country hospitals to recruit girls with a full Intermediate certificate but, with some difficulty, they can and do recruit girls who eventually pass the entrance examination. In many cases those girls go on and do very well.

So the position is that the committee is of opinion that it is not desirable at this stage for these new minimum standards to be

introduced. Most members of the committee (I speak personally about this) feel sympathy for the nursing profession in its desire to raise its standards to a level prevailing in other States, but it is a question of "when?". With some personal regret I agree that now is not the opportune time for this to be introduced in South Australia. Therefore, I move for the disallowance of the regulations.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN (Leader of the Opposition): There is no need to hold up the debate on this matter. I did desire to address myself to it but I am sure that the report of the committee and the remarks of the mover of this motion will be sufficient to convince the Council of the justification for the disallowance of these regulations. I had some years' experience as Minister of Health and know the trend to keep on keeping up with the Joneses in other professions; and so we keep on raising the standards that people have to acquire in order to qualify for participation in a particular profession. It is well recognized that nurses, trained according to the standards of our hospitals in this State, have been well equipped and able to carry on their work with distinction in any part of the world. At one time, I used to be pleased to say to the nurses who had graduated that they had received their passport to the world but, of latter years, all sorts of restrictions have crept in under the name of reciprocity. In order that we have reciprocity, if our nurses, for instance, are not approved by what is called the Nursing Council of England and Wales, they will not be recognized when they go abroad. I do not know whether the standard abroad is very much higher than here. Indeed, the resourcefulness and training of the nurses in this State make them highly qualified for work abroad and will enable them to obtain positions overseas. This is a question about which I have strong views. Here we are at a time when we have difficulty in staffing our institutions, and under these regulations we are now going to make it more difficult.

At one time there was a move to extend the time of training so that a nurse would have to serve for a greater period. Once it was three years, and it was suggested that it should be four. For what reason should it have been four? It was not to get any more nurses. In practice, we would have fewer nurses available then than we had had under the three years' system. We have to appreciate human nature to be able to understand that, if girls enter upon a nursing career in times when the popular marrying age is about 19 or 20, half of them will disappear from their profession in the middle of their training, and we shall get no more service from them. It is known that 51 per cent of these girls leave their vocation immediately they matriculate, but a qualified trained nurse never loses her capacity to return to the profession, which is one of the most stable that a woman can have. That brings me to the point that in spite of the advances made in medicine, antibiotics, etc., nurses who have trained years ago can return in a crisis and do the job. There are not many professions and trades in which that can be done. So, it seems to me that, at a time when there is a shortage of nurses, we should not try to aggravate the position by making it more difficult for nurses to qualify to even commence their careers in the profession.

I commend the Subordinate Legislation Committee for going into this matter fully. I know that the committee's time is fully occupied in examining regulations that are tabled in Parliament. The Government is fully occupied in administering the affairs of the State and the regulations are left for examination and proper treatment by the committee.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Almost automatically.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: Yes. The Subordinate Legislation Committee has done its homework and has brought in a good report on a matter on which I would feel obliged to take similar action, even without having the evidence it had, but from my experience, and as a matter of basic common sense in dealing with the problem in the nursing profession today. I have pleasure in supporting the motion that the regulations be disallowed.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I, too, support this motion for disallowance. A good deal of interesting information became available to the Subordinate Legislation Committee while inquiries were being made into these regulations. I personally contacted almost every group in the Subsidized Country Hospitals Association and found that there was complete unanimity in the objection to these regulations, for the reason given by the Hon. Mr. Potter in very ably moving the motion. It is fully realized that there is a waiting list of girls wishing to train at the big hospitals in the metropolitan area, but that position does not extend very far beyond that area.

Matrons in the city and metropolitan hospitals are able to choose girls from these waiting lists and many of the girls have an Intermediate certificate, while some have reached the Leaving certificate standard. This enables some preference to be given to the girls with the higher standard and so the qualifications of trainee at hospitals in these areas would not be affected by these regulations. However, allowance of these regulations would create a grave problem in the country. For instance, in the northern group, Group 3, 30 girls are at present either working as nurse attendants while being coached for the entrance examination or are in the process of taking the examination. In some other hospitals, nearly half the girls on the staff are working as nurse attendants while preparing themselves for the entrance examination and, if we restrict the intake of trainee nurses, we shall also restrict the number of girls who eventually become trained nurses.

Another factor is that, if there are not sufficient trainees to do the nursing work at country hospitals, it is more difficult to retain the trained staff to run the hospitals. Generally speaking, we have a serious problem throughout the country areas of the State. On Eyre Peninsula, three hospitals were advertising for trainee nurses in one issue of the newspaper and most honourable members will be aware that the Maitland Hospital spent much money last year in trying to obtain staff. Another hospital had an advertisement in the paper for six weeks without receiving an answer. These nurses are absolutely vital to the conduct of country hospitals and it seems to be agreed among the boards of these hospitals that, if these regulations were to come into effect, some hospitals would find it impossible to carry on. Many girls who do not decide to train until they are 18 or 19 years of age make first-class nurses. Some take a business course and then decide to go nursing. However, the business course would not qualify them under these proposed regulations. Other girls have taken a domestic course, which only includes mathematics in first year, and these girls, who are in the group from which trainee nurses are recruited, would not be eligible. I support the motion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Minister of Health): I think I should put the Government's point of view in support of disallowance of these regulations. I have not had the same experience as the Leader of the Opposition, but already I have met a lot of problems in the nursing profession. The position is most difficult in the country and I think that I should say that we hope, in the near future, to assist country hospitals in one part of the State in particular. The present position is not the fault of the previous Government, but the present Government has plans in relation to Port Lincoln, where it has been the practice for trainees to serve at least two years in the local hospital and then come to the metropolitan area to complete the course.

If the department is successful (and I hope it will be) a trained sister will be appointed to the tutorial staff at the Port Lincoln Hospital and the nurses will be able to complete their courses there. Such an arrangement would keep the nurses within the environment of their family and in the district in which they live. I do not believe that very high standards of education and theory are really necessary in any form of apprenticeship.

I can cite two instances, but there are many people who have not their Intermediate certificate (which is suggested as being necessary) and who will succeed in the vocation, or have succeeded. The first instance I cite deals with nursing. I know a girl who is entering the profession this year and who did a domestic course at school and got that certificate. Although that qualification would not measure up to the standard required, her lifelong ambition is to become a nurse. Immediately she left school, she obtained all the St. John Ambulance Brigade certificates, and to say that that girl would not make a good nurse would be far from the truth. She has trained herself in nursing, and that alone. She has done reasonably well at school, has obtained all the St. John Ambulance certificates she can get, and she wants to be a nurse. If the standard set out in these regulations prevails, she will be debarred. She is now working as a clerk at a hospital, which shows how keen she is.

I know a boy who failed in his Intermediate examination simply because he could not pass in English. He became apprenticed and his employer has since said that he is as good a tradesman as anyone could wish to get. Today he is holding down a most important job in a big industry. It is not always necessary to have high qualifications. Since I have been Minister of Health, in my journeys around the country I have been told that many girls who do not measure up to the required educational standard turn out to be better nurses than girls with high qualifications. Perhaps the Leader was told this during his term of office. If girls want to undertake this work, I think they should be able to do so. Once

they receive the initial training, there is plenty of opportunity for them to advance. We should go out of our way to assist them, and I think the decision of the Subordinate Legislation Committee is a wise one. Perhaps these higher qualifications will be necessary, but for the time being I think the standard of education required of trainee nurses is already high enough.

Motion carried.

TOWN PLANNING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Norman Jude:

That, in the opinion of this Council, the administration of the Town Planning Act should be placed under the care and control of the Minister of Local Government and Roads.

(Continued from August 18. Page 1082.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): In supporting the motion, I first congratulate Sir Norman Jude on the amount of work he put into this matter and the amount of detail his speech contained. I believe he has placed on record a most interesting history of town planning legislation in this State, and I commend him for the concern he has shown for this intricate problem, which is wrapped up with the future welfare of South Australia. It would have been easy for Sir Norman, as a Minister in the former Government, to remain quietly on the sidelines offering criticism when necessary, but in moving this motion he has shown that he is prepared to act constructively and put forward views on this controversial subject, not only for the benefit of Ministers but for the benefit of all members. I have always thought that the Town Planning Act should be under the care and control of the Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You have never said so in this Chamber before.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I have not had an opportunity. I have many views that I have not expressed in this Chamber yet, although I doubt whether I shall be game to express some of them. I expressed some views on the Hawkers Act Amendment Bill yesterday.

It may be asked why the previous Government did not take the action suggested in the motion. If one looks at the town planning legislation one can see that its primary concern is related to the subdivision of land. In other words, as far as town and country planning is concerned, any matters relating to the use of land are absent from the Act. As it dealt with the control of subdivision—and a very minor control—it was necessary that it should have developed through the Lands Titles Office under the control of the Attorney-General. Although there may be other reasons that I do not know of, that appears to me to be a logical reason why the legislation has been under the care and control of the Attorney-General. Some of the arguments I intend to advance in support of the motion come within the scope of the first speech I made in this Chamber, which dealt with the need to encourage local government to accept a greater responsibility in many fields.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You took responsibility away from local government yesterday.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That argument was used yesterday, and we tried to impress on the Minister of Local Government that we were not taking powers away from local government. The Minister said yesterday that he should have had time to study the matter. However, the more study he does the farther away from the point he gets. We should encourage local government to accept a greater responsibility in many fields, but at the same time it must be so organized that it can carry out the functions of its greater responsibility. The tendency is always for central government to assume a greater authority, and in many instances local government allows this to happen because of its own inability to re-organize to meet modern circumstances. There is a very marked difference between what I term "deconcentration of authority" and "decentralization of authority". Deconcentration often passes for decentralization.

Perhaps I could give an example by referring to the development of local government in Great Britain and France. The local government system that we have largely follows the pattern in Great Britain, where local government has authority to make its own budget, to levy its own rate, and to spend its own money. In other words, local government can formulate its own policy. In France, local government is purely an authority under the complete control of the central government. In other words, the central government makes the budget for the local government area, and advises what rate shall be struck and where the money must be spent. Here is the essential difference between decentralization and deconcentration of authority. Some time ago—I am dealing with the matter from memory—the Commonwealth Government directed that Australia should be divided into regional developmental zones and recommended that zones be created to assist in the development of various regions. Unfortunately, in

South Australia this idea was not well received and the progress of regional developmental committees has not proceeded as has been the case in other parts of Australia. In Victoria, for example, these committees are working to a good plan and have achieved a considerable amount of development in their areas.

For successful decentralization of authority local and central government must recognize the need for regional thinking and co-operation. Perhaps I should refer to the first time that this regional approach was recognized in Australia. It concerned the six councils along the Hawkesbury River in New South Wales, and the problem was development in relation to water hyacinth. I think it can be appreciated by honourable members that in tackling this problem of water hyacinth half of the councils approached the question of eradication while others did not do their job properly, or, if they did decide to do it, did it at a different time of the year, and because of that did not get far in administering the Weeds Act along the river. The suggestion was made that local government in the area should hand back to the central government the power in relation to weed control. Wisely it was decided to form a regional group to combat the problem. As far as I can see, this was the first time that statutory power was given to a regional group of councils to tackle a particular problem. Since that time the group has extended its power, and now, rather than being just an authority to administer the Weeds Act, it has other authorities.

This type of co-operation is appearing in South Australia, where local government in certain areas co-operates in the administration of legislation dealing with weeds, vermin and matters of health. But there is a much wider application in this regard. There is the question of town and country planning on a regional basis. It is impossible to consider any regional planning without taking local government into account. In South Australia we have looked upon future planning as applying to town planning only, and, in particular, looked upon it as applying particularly to the metropolitan area. However, the problem is applicable not just to that area but to country areas. Much future planning has already been done by the Highways and Local Government Department, particularly country planning. To make this future planning effective it is necessary that local government should take an active interest in the matter.

If the people concerned with this matter are encouraged to take an active interest in town and country planning it will be the foundation for future success of moves on such planning. If local government can be encouraged to accept a greater responsibility in relation to future planning in town and country, it will be ensuring its own preservation. I know of many councils in South Australia that have already taken a great interest in this question, not only from the point of view of town and country planning but from the point of view of tourist development. Unfortunately, it is disheartening to any local government organization far-sighted enough to take such an interest to find that the powers under the Town Planning Act are at the moment rather futile.

Perhaps I could give an instance. In one town in South Australia there were three stockyards, two belonging to agents and one to the Railways Department. The council in the area had, over a period of years, spent a considerable sum of money in getting a qualified town planner to draw up a plan on which it could work. The council sought the co-operation of the Railways Department and the two agents concerned, and the stockyards were moved to a position two miles out of town. At that stage it met with the approval of everybody—the people who wanted the stockyards moved out of the town, the Railways Department and the agents. The council decided that a green belt should be constructed around the stockyards. Everybody appreciates that there must be easy access by farmers to a stock selling centre and that houses should not adjoin the area. However, no sooner had the new yards been built than somebody wanted to subdivide land alongside the yards but the council rejected the application for subdivision. The Town Planner agreed, but on appeal it was found that the council had no power in the matter and the subdivision went ahead, thus creating an almost immediate problem because as the area had been built on there was pressure once again to move the yards farther out.

Many other difficulties are involved. A council may be far-sighted enough to spend money in producing a town plan, but within a few years that council may be changed and the new council may have no interest at all in town planning. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude dealt with town planning administration in some of the other States, and said it was under the control of the Minister of Local Government in those States. In Victoria, the Town and Country Planning Act controls the planning throughout the State and the authority is the

Town and Country Planning Board. Under this Act councils may prepare planning schemes individually, or jointly with other councils, coming down to the concept of a region being able to employ and work an overall planning scheme. In some instances, the Minister for Local Government in Victoria can direct that a council or councils prepare a planning scheme. The Town and Country Planning Board undertakes large-scale planning on a sub-regional basis for the purpose of protecting certain areas. The Melbourne Metropolitan Board of Works is responsible for the preparation of a co-ordinated master plan for the whole metropolitan area. Individual councils may prepare their own planning schemes, which are co-ordinated with the master plan. During the preparation of a planning scheme, and before its approval, the council or authority controls development by means of an interim development order, which ensures that planning will not be contrary to the overall scheme.

The position in New South Wales is somewhat similar, although the fourth form of government (regional) comes under the County of Cumberland scheme, with 41 councils involved in the planning of an area of 631 square miles in the Greater Sydney scheme. Unfortunately, this has been dispensed with and another authority has taken over the role. All these matters in Victoria and New South Wales are under the control of the Minister for Local Government. Local government, whether individually as councils or collectively on a regional basis, has a great responsibility in the matter of town planning.

In South Australia we have the Town Planning Act, and under it the Minister responsible for town planning is the Attorney-General. As I pointed out earlier, this legislation deals primarily with the control of the subdivision of land. The power to regulate the use of land, which is essential in town planning legislation, is completely absent. There are some limiting powers of control over the use of land and buildings. They are available to councils under the Building Act, which enables local authorities to make zoning by-laws. However, councils are not obliged to make them. If any improvement is to be made in town planning legislation, and if we are to have legislation that will give local government the necessary teeth to implement a planning scheme on the lines obtaining in Victoria and New South Wales, it is obvious that it will be necessary, as local government will be directly involved in this problem, for the Town Planning Act to be under the care and control of the Minister of Local Government. Therefore, I support the motion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): Neither of the two previous speakers has impressed on me the reason why the Town Planning Act cannot work satisfactorily under the present set-up. They have given many reasons why town planning should be under the Local Government Act, but not why it cannot operate just as efficiently under the Attorney-General as under the Minister of Local Government. There is no doubt that this Council has the right to present an opinion along these lines if it so desires, but the Government has the right to allocate portfolios to any Minister it chooses, without regard to an expression of opinion from this Council, especially as it now consists of a greater number of Opposition members than Government members. Possibly, it would be different if Opposition members were expressing their views to a greater number of members coming into Government from Opposition on how the Government should allocate portfolios, but, as things are, it is not the correct thing to do.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It is only a recommendation.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: And it is the right of the Government to disregard that recommendation. If it is only a recommendation, do not be offended if the Government does not accept it.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: It is an opinion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It does not matter. The mover had the right in the last Government to do something about it but, in spite of representations made to the then Government, no action was taken along these lines. Let them deny that if they can. In the Labor Party the allocation of portfolios is the responsibility of the Government acting on the recommendation of the Premier.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It is not really a matter of allocating portfolios: it is a matter of which Act shall be administered by whom.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: It is a portfolio—call it what you like. The Government has the right—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member must address the Chair.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I apologize, Mr. President. The Government has the right to allocate the portfolios for the administration of Acts as it desires.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: No. The Minister is mentioned in the Act itself.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Very well, but since 1917 it has been under the administration of the Attorney-General.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: No, it has not.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I may not have done my homework as well as the honourable member has, but I say it has been under the administration of the Attorney-General since 1917.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Sir George Jenkins was the Minister of Local Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will accept that but if we go back to the beginning it was under the Attorney-General.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: That being in the Act, it is really Parliament that puts it there.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is beside the point. The fact remains that the Government does not have to accept this recommendation or expression of opinion if it does not desire to do so. Let us get that clear.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Nobody is arguing about that.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Fair enough. The honourable member has the right to express an opinion if he wants to. This procedure of the allocation of portfolios, as I mentioned previously, was adopted on this occasion when the new Government assumed office. I understand that that was not the position with the previous Government. Then, the allocation of portfolios was the responsibility of the Premier. I could be wrong, but that is what I believe. Honourable members will recall that when we suffered the loss of Sir Cecil Hincks as Minister of Lands members of the then Government Party did not know who would succeed him, but the members of the Labor Party knew that the pay-off in the struggle for power at any price was at hand and that the portfolio would be given to a member of very short standing in the L.C.L. Party at the expense of members of that Party who had served it loyally for a long time.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: A very long standing member and a very outstanding member.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: A very outstanding member of Parliament, who should have been outstanding from Parliament altogether.

The Hon. C. R. Story: We always promote on merit, which is a very good thing.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Yes, but what a price to pay to have power at any price!

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: Mr. President, on a point of order, all this is completely irrelevant to the debate. The honourable member should return to the issues before us. Apart altogether from whether or not what he says can be justified, it is completely irrelevant.

The PRESIDENT: I must point out to honourable members that interjections are out of order.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Thank you, Mr. President. The point I have been making is that the Government has the right to allocate the portfolios. When we recall that the mover of this motion suggesting the transfer of the administration of the Act was the Minister of Local Government and Roads in the previous Government, and that his buddy in this Council—

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Is that Parliamentary language?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I appeal to you, Sir. If it is not, I will use the word "colleague" instead. His colleague in this Council was the Attorney-General and they were members of the same Cabinet. It is understandable that the former Minister should warn this Government about becoming a one-man Government; he must be smarting under the treatment handed out to him by the one-man Government in which he served.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: I thought this was a one-man Government.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: You have a lot to learn. It is not a one-man Government. The Ministers here are the Ministers in the Government of South Australia today. If former Ministers were concerned about the position when they were in office, surely it would have been a simple matter for the Attorney-General to request the transfer of town planning to the Minister of Local Government and Roads or, if the Minister of Local Government and Roads considered that the matter should be under his jurisdiction, he could have made a request to the Cabinet at that time. He had an opportunity to do so, because a request was made to the previous Government that that very thing be done.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Who made the request?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Marion council, and there was also a deputation to the Premier.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: Did your Party support it?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The deputation did not come to us, nor did the correspondence; it went to the one-man Government at that time. We were not asked to speak.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Marion council first wrote to the Premier along these lines and, at a later stage, the Municipal Association had a deputation to the Premier.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I remember another occasion concerning the Marion council.

The PRESIDENT: I must ask the Hon. Mr. Banfield to address the Chair and not take notice of interjections.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I wish that honourable members would stop interjecting and give me an opportunity to make my speech. I am grateful to Sir Norman Jude for the amount of research that he did in tracing the history of the administration of town planning. I was informed that it would not be necessary for me to do the same amount of homework, because I would be able to read *Hansard* later, and that saved me some work. However, possibly I did not go far enough and, as was pointed out to me, I made a mistake. Had Sir Norman so desired, he could have told this Council that the previous Government received a letter dated October 7, 1963, from the Marion council, asking the Government to transfer administration of the Town Planning Act to the Minister of Local Government. He could also have said that exactly 12 months later a reply was forwarded to the council, stating that while certain reasons could be advanced in support of the request, it must be realized that the administration of the Town Planning Act involved decisions on many matters of a legal nature—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: At the present time?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The letter did not say that but went on to say that, for those reasons, Cabinet considered that it would not be advisable to transfer the administration of the Act from the Attorney-General. Now, less than 12 months later, we find those who were members of that Cabinet supporting the transfer.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: And you are supporting the previous situation, are you?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No; I am in opposition to the motion before the Chair. Do not confuse me. There is before the Council a motion that some honourable members have supported, but I am opposed to it. I am expressing opposition to the motion before the Chair, and am entitled to do so. As I said, less than 12 months later, we find those who were members of that Cabinet supporting the transfer, and this suggests to me one of two things: either members of that Cabinet have had a very sudden change of heart, or the Government was more a "one-man band" than it would have us believe.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: We have great faith in the Ministers of this Council.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Thank you. The councils have great faith in the Ministers and in the administration of the Act at the present time. They have assured me of that.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: How many councils?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The association. I ask you: how many members are in the association?

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: I am asking you!

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No; you asked me, "How many councils?" You can get up and make your speech when called upon.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: You should address the President, not honourable members. We had enough evidence of lack of dignity in this Council yesterday.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We are getting it from your side. The mover of the motion could also have told us that a deputation waited upon the Premier and requested that a specific Minister be appointed to administer local government and town planning. Apparently, this request did not go to the Government because the answer was a straight-out "No".

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Because, Mr. President, the Opposition refused us an additional Minister.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We have no extra Minister today and we are prepared to allow the present state of affairs to continue. You did not give that reason to the deputation when it waited upon you.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: I still have the right to reply on this motion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: That is right. Because of the treatment received from the previous Government, it is not hard to understand why there was a division of opinion among members of the various associations and bodies interested in town planning as to which Minister should control that matter. Now, with the advent of a new Government, in which all Ministers have applied themselves enthusiastically, intelligently and with a ton of ability in carrying out their duties, those same associations and bodies now have an overwhelming feeling of confidence in the present administration. At last they can see a ray of hope. They can see that this Government is prepared

to do something about implementing the Town Planning Committee's report. As a result of the new-found confidence, there is no longer the desire to have the administration transferred from one Minister to another. As a point of interest, I should like to mention that, as far as I can discover, no similar motion to this has been discussed in either the House of Assembly or this Council since 1890. At that time, a motion was moved in another place, in the following terms:

That this House disapproves of the Commissioner of Crown Lands and Immigration being selected from the other branch of the legislature.

That motion was along similar lines to the present one, but was subsequently defeated, and I trust that this motion will receive the same treatment.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL AND HISTORIC RELICS PRESERVATION BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 18. Page 1083.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I rise to support the Bill. I have devoted some little time to reading it, in conjunction with the Bill that was before the Council during the last session. I do not pose as an expert on Aboriginal and historic relics, but I am interested at all times in preserving the history of anything, as so often valuable historic objects are lost because people do not understand the value of these things to coming generations.

I had a fairly close association with the previous Bill. In the course of the discussions on that measure honourable members pointed out to the Government the difficulty that arose in one or two clauses, and particularly in those dealing with the rights of landholders. Many of the previous objections have been covered by this present Bill. I studied what the Chief Secretary said about the history of the previous Bill, but I think there were some gaps in that history and I hope to be able to complete the story; otherwise, it will appear that the Hon. Mr. Kemp has been taking it upon himself to introduce this private members' Bill and that he has pushed himself forward. This is not so. When we ran into difficulty with the previous Bill, I was at the time the Chairman of my Party, which called a conference of people interested in this matter. These people comprised a committee of well-meaning people who had an extensive knowledge of the subjects mentioned in the original Bill. Each of these people had a vast interest in his own particular section of the matter, but they did not look at the Bill as an overall piece of legislation. As a consequence, there was no landholder on the committee, so the landholder was not looked after very well. It was a little like Mohammed's coffin—suspended between heaven and earth—and it did not have anything to hang itself to. The authorized persons were clearly defined and there was the nucleus of a board, but it was not under the responsibility of any Minister. As a consequence, an authorized person under the previous Bill had all sorts of power to spend money, enter land, buy land, preserve various pieces and objects of Aboriginal art, and do other things, but there was no provision about where he was to draw his finance from and no authority for him to own any of these things.

The Bill was not defeated; it merely lapsed because we ran out of time. Had the previous Government been returned, there is no doubt that the Bill would have been restored to the Notice Paper, probably with a few changes that honourable members had pointed out were necessary. The Government was not re-elected, however, but an undertaking was given to people keenly interested in these matters that we would do our best to ensure some protection for historic relics. The Hon. Mr. Kemp went to much trouble and used much of his own time to introduce a Bill to do almost the same as the previous Bill did. However, the present measure is simpler. I do not think anyone would deny that it has imperfections. Even Mr. Kemp, who introduced the Bill for the consideration of this Chamber, said perhaps one or two clauses could be amended. The Chief Secretary in his reply asked Mr. Kemp to lay this Bill aside to enable another Bill to be introduced by the Government in due course. I do not know how long "in due course" will be; it may be some time.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: This session, I think.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: A tremendous amount of work is before another place. I think the legislation dealing with Aborigines that has been foreshadowed will keep us going for some time, and I am interested in preserving the things left behind by Aborigines who have died. I hope the Chief Secretary will reconsider his attitude because I think that if we all assist in this matter and have the assistance of the Parliamentary Draftsman we can get into this measure practically all that is wanted by both sides, and thereby

provide protection for people so vitally interested in preserving relics. The Chief Secretary has said that he does not think this Bill can be amended, and he has also said that it needs two small improvements and two major ones.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I said there were a number of small imperfections and two major ones.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Perhaps the Chief Secretary will tell us what the major imperfections are so that they can be rectified. I think we should be given an opportunity to amend this Bill, as this would save all the trouble of going through the rat-race again with a new Bill. The Chief Secretary would not suggest that all the brains were in his Party.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You have never heard me say that. I used to criticize your Party for thinking that.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am making the humble statement that the Chief Secretary would not suggest that all the brains were in his Party; there must be a small measure left over. I think the Government should take advantage of all heads in this matter. This is not a nation-rocking matter in which policy is involved; there is not much politics in it because, after all, the people to whom we are referring have been dead for some time.

After my impassioned appeal to the Chief Secretary to co-operate with me a little I will deal now with one or two points in the Bill. I have been a little puzzled about clause 3, which provides that "Aboriginal" means any of the original inhabitants of Australia or their descendants, whether full-blood or not. That takes the place of a rather wordy definition in the original Bill, which provided that "a person of Aboriginal blood" meant a person who, being of less than a full-blood, was descended from an original inhabitant of Australia and any of his direct descendants.

Mr. Kemp has, I think, overcome this. I am interested in the meaning of the word "relic", and I would like to have some clarification from the honourable member. The Bill says that "relic" means any trace, remains or handiwork of an Aboriginal. It does not include any handiwork made by a living Aboriginal for the purpose of sale. It also means any trace or remains of the exploration and early settlement considered of sufficient importance by the Minister to warrant protection under this Act.

I have taken the trouble to look up in the dictionary the various words used by the Hon. Mr. Kemp, as no doubt he did before he included them, and the first word is "trace" which means "to delineate, mark out, sketch, write"—in that order. It goes on to say "to copy, by following and marking, such as in tracing, transparency, to follow the track or path, to draw". I was interested to see that "kicking over" also appeared in the dictionary's definition. That is probably what we did yesterday, and it refers to the plural, "kicking over the traces". This matter of "trace" also deals with harness, and would probably fit into Mr. Kemp's definition with regard to early exploration if he wanted it to be taken in that context. I have studied that and I was worried that the word probably was more limited in its implication than I find now that I have examined its full meaning.

The other word I am concerned about is "handiwork" and it means "work done, a thing made by hand or by any one person or agency". "Handicraft" is manual skill, manual art or trade or occupation. I think what Mr. Kemp has set out to do is cover all of these things, and I have no objection at all to clause 3, having studied it carefully. The queries that I have would be in clauses 15, 16, 17 and 18. Clause 15 reads:

If the Governor is satisfied in respect to any land that—

(*a*) it is expedient to reserve that land for the preservation of relics; and . . .

(*c*) satisfactory arrangements have been made or will be made for the management of the land as a prohibited area and for controlling the entry of persons into the land; and

(*d*) the consents required by this Act have been obtained,

the Governor may by proclamation declare the land to be a prohibited area.

I see some difficulties in clauses 15 and 16. I thought the previous Bill was a bit tough on landholders. As I understand it, in Mr. Kemp's Bill if a person allows his land to be declared he can at any future time revoke that declaration. I do not think that he should be able to do that because, having made up his mind and knowing that there was something of importance in the area, his decision should have to stand. Either the land should be purchased from him at the time of the declaration or it should be dedicated for the future. I do not think there should be two bites at the cherry. I think the provisions in this Bill are much better than those in the previous Bill.

I wonder whether we are not getting into difficulty as we did with the Fauna Conservation Bill that was before this Council last year in the matter of inspectors and the matter of the

identity card. I should like Mr. Kemp to give some consideration to tying this up with the Fauna Conservation Bill which was finally passed through this Council last year, perhaps not in the form that the Government intended, but at least the previous Government was prepared to accept amendments. I hope from what the Chief Secretary said the other day that his remarks are not his final word on this subject and that he will accept amendments not only to this but to other Bills. If we are to be a useful—

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I point out that this Bill was not introduced by the Chief Secretary and therefore he cannot accept amendments.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My friend has raised an interesting point when he mentions that the Bill has not been introduced by the Chief Secretary, but as a matter of policy the other day the Chief Secretary said that he would not have any amendments and that he was going to take the Bill as it was or oppose it. The point I make is that, irrespective of what he said the other day—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That we would not make any attempt at any amendments.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I am now trying to prevail upon the Chief Secretary to be a little more charitable. I am now trying to prevail upon the Chief Secretary—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I am listening!

The Hon. C. R. STORY:—to be a little more charitable. Naturally, he is a charitable man in his own right, and I am trying to get him to take this back because he said that the Government could not accept amendments to this Bill. The Government should have another look at the matter because it could be made a good Bill.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: No. I did not say that we could not accept it. I said we would not make or submit any amendments.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Would you allow us to?

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Yes.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: In conformity with past practice.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is an important point in relation to not only this Bill but other Bills. At times we need admendments. We have agreed to Government amendments. We had a compromise and we shall not argue this point. I ask the Chief Secretary to have a good look at this matter and not ask the Hon. Mr. Kemp to put it aside because a better Bill is to be introduced. It may not be as good as we expect, and honourable members may be embarrassed in trying to get amendments accepted for inclusion in another Bill if the Chief Secretary introduces one. Our amendments may not be accepted—we may not even get a Bill. I ask the Chief Secretary to come some of the way with us. I support Mr. Kemp's Bill. I shall have a few amendments ready at the appropriate time. I sincerely hope that the Government will give its blessing to this Bill because we want something now.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Are you in doubt about the numbers you have?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, but I am in some doubt about the ability of the Government to get legislation from another place for us to deal with. When I read of the immense legislative programme we are to have, I am sure—

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: We have not seen much of it yet.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, we have not, and, following the view of my friend, the Chief Secretary, we should not be rushed with a number of Bills being introduced late in the session. We should get on with Mr. Kemp's Bill and amend it. If the Chief Secretary wants to introduce another Bill later, he can do so. I support the second reading.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1175.)

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I support this Bill, which sets out to amend the Electoral Act in order to clear up a difference of opinion that has arisen between two people on the matter of interpretation. Briefly, the history of this Bill is that during the last Parliament there were, unfortunately, two by-elections. In one case the person declared elected was declared elected on the Tuesday following the election; in the other case, the Returning Officer decided there was an element of doubt and said that the result should not be declared until seven days later, which meant that the new member was debarred from sitting in Parliament on at least three sitting days.

We want to amend the Act to make sure that, where the result of an election is beyond doubt, it can be declared at any time, when it will not affect either Party. It is an anomaly that the Government has looked at; in fact, it is one of several that we think should be rectified. We do not oppose this amendment. We think it is necessary and worthwhile. It

will clarify the position for the future. We shall have an amending Bill introduced later and it would have included this provision.

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

HAWKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

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

Second reading.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

At its meeting in June, 1965, the Australian Loan Council approved a total programme for State works and housing of £295,000,000. This is an increase of only £5,000,000 above the previous year's programme, and is the smallest increase for 10 years. South Australia's share of the 1965-66 programme is £40,446,000, of which £9,500,000 has been nominated for housing under the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, leaving £30,946,000 to be used towards other Loan works. The £9,500,000 of housing moneys will be supplemented by recoveries of about £450,000, and the total of £9,950,000 will be allocated to the Housing Trust, the State Bank and building societies.

The Government faces some serious problems in framing a reasonable Loan programme this year because of the very small increase in new borrowings, and because the year started with no balances on hand, whereas the previous Government had at the beginning of 1964-65 a Loan Fund balance of nearly £1,700,000, which was used during the year. However, every effort has been made to ensure maximum recoveries of earlier advances and expenditures, and just over £6,000,000 will be available in this way to supplement new borrowings.

By a very careful review of all resources and requirements, it has been practicable to present a Loan works programme totalling £36,964,000, a little more than actual expenditure last year. I shall now give honourable members a brief description of the main proposals for which this Bill provides.

ADVANCES FOR HOMES, £350,000.—In addition to administering the Advances for Homes scheme on behalf of the Government, the State Bank also handles the detailed allocation of a large part of the moneys which the State borrows under the terms of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and which it makes available through the Home Builders' Account to finance home ownership. In 1965-66 the bank is likely to have available for lending Housing Agreement moneys, State Loan funds, carry-over funds from June, 1965, and repayments of previous advances adequate to carry out a lending programme of about £5,800,000. The bulk of the funds will be employed in new housing, but it is the Government's intention that at least £100,000 of Advances for Homes money be used in selective financing of the purchase of older houses in accordance with the election policy of the Government.

LOANS TO PRODUCERS, £600,000.—The requirement for these loans, particularly by the fruit processing co-operatives, continues to expand, and £700,000 is proposed this year so that the bank may continue to assist in financing small co-operative enterprises under the Loans to Producers Act. The sum of £600,000 is to be provided from Loan Account, and £100,000 will be raised by way of semi-governmental loans.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS, £90,000.—This amount is provided to enable the bank to make advances to settlers for farm buildings, for land clearing and development of pastures, and for water improvements.

ADVANCES TO STATE BANK, £500,000.—An advance of £500,000 is proposed in 1965-66 to assist the bank in providing its normal trading services for primary producers, for secondary industry, and for commerce.

STUDENT HOSTELS, £150,000.—This amount is provided to enable the bank to make advances under the Student Hostels (Advances) Act towards the financing of accommodation, principally for country students at various schools and institutions.

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF ADELAIDE—LOAN TO, £270,000.—In accordance with the Morphett Street Bridge Act, the Government made an arrangement with the Corporation of the City of Adelaide for the construction of new bridges in place of the Morphett Street and Victoria Bridges, and for other incidental works. The estimated total cost of the complete scheme is about £1,500,000. The work will be carried out by the council, but the Government will provide the finance in the first instance. The council will then repay half the cost over a period of 30 years. It is proposed to provide the State proportion from the Highways Fund and the council's proportion from Loan Account, to which the repayments will be credited as received. The sum of

£540,000 is estimated to be required in 1965-66 for land acquisition and construction work in connection with the re-location and widening of Montefiore Road. One half of this amount (£270,000) is therefore provided from Loan Account.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS DRAINAGE, £375,000.—An amount of £215,000 is provided this year to complete the construction of the flood control dam in the upper reaches of the Sturt River. The sum of £160,000 is provided to continue the construction of drains within the area covered by the drainage scheme.

METROPOLITAN AREA DRAINAGE, £175,000.—The Government has made an arrangement with the councils of the City of Woodville and the Town of Henley and Grange for the construction of drains and associated works to drain floodwaters at Fulham Gardens and Henley Beach. The work, estimated to cost £386,000, will be carried out by the councils, but the Government will provide the finance in the first instance. The councils will then repay half the cost over a period of 53 years. The sum of £175,000 is provided for work this year.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF SWAMP LANDS, £230,000.—Expenditure in 1965-66 will include the following: £8,000 for the installation of suction and delivery pipes to the recently installed pumping unit at Cobdogla; £15,000 for final contract payments for the pumping station at Waikerie (construction work was completed last year and the plant is now ready for full scale testing); the sum of £30,000 will be provided for the purchase of materials for a stock and domestic water supply at Mypolonga; £21,000 is proposed for enlarging and re-siting the town water supply mains to North Berri in order to improve pressure on the higher levels; and £37,000 is required for a drainage scheme at Cadell. Funds are also provided for various channels, pipelines, embankments, buildings, plant and minor works.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE, £300,000.—The sum of £32,000 is provided for the excavating of subsidiary drains and for the provision of bridges in the Western Division. An amount of £261,000 is provided to continue work on the Eastern Division drainage scheme.

RENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST—LOAN TO, £25,000.—Provision of £25,000 is made to meet the seventh and final advance to the trust as provided by the Renmark Irrigation Trust Act for the purpose of assisting with a rehabilitation programme. This is additional to an annual grant of £150,000 being made available from Revenue and £25,000 that is to be provided each year by the trust itself. The Government and the trust have consulted on the need for further finance towards improvement of services, and honourable members will be asked to consider amending legislation in due course.

AFFORESTATION AND TIMBER MILLING, £1,050,000.—For 1965-66 the more important provisions are as follows: £155,000 to meet the costs of recurring forest maintenance services, such as replanting, weed control, spraying, fire protection, etc, and £275,000 for preparation of land and planting. About 8,000 acres will be planted during 1965-66 and, after allowing for clear felling and for fire losses, the total area of State pine plantations will be about 165,000 acres at the end of June next. The sum of £40,000 will be provided for the purchase of land suitable for forestry as it becomes available; £29,000 for a further contribution to the National Sirex Fund; £50,000 for the purchase and installation of barking and chipping equipment at Mount Burr sawmill; and £180,000 to complete the replacement of the main mill building and the installation of a new bandline at Mount Burr sawmill. Funds are also provided for the installation of additional plant and machinery at Mount Burr, Mount Gambier and Nangwarry, for houses for employees, and for minor buildings and services as required at mills and in forest areas.

RAILWAY ACCOMMODATION, £2,800,000.—The requirement for this year for way and works branch is £1,002,000, the detailed proposals being: £388,000 is provided to meet the cost of sundry small works such as track re-laying, bridges and culverts, signalling and safety devices, minor buildings, and improvements to yards, as they are required; £230,000 is required to complete the construction of the new railway from Ceduna to Kevin to replace the existing railway between Wandana and Kevin; £92,000 is provided to complete the construction of the spur line to Tonsley from the Marino line at Woodlands Park; and £25,000 is set aside for the purchase or construction of houses for employees, and £267,000 for plant and sundries.

The sum of £1,798,000 is proposed for rolling stock branch in 1965-66, and the more important provisions to meet broad gauge requirements are as follows: £463,000 is provided for progress payments under contracts for the construction of 28 diesel-electric locomotives and spares. Nine of these locomotives are already in service; £207,000 is required to complete the construction of 50 open waggons, and £210,000 for the construction of brake vans; £68,000 is provided to commence work

on 10 suburban rail cars; £22,000 to complete 15 workmen's sleeping vans; and £60,000 for a further 10 motor body transport waggons; £32,000 is required for the construction of five sulphuric acid tank waggons, and £72,000 for work on four joint-stock passenger cars for the Adelaide-Melbourne service; £164,000 is provided to continue the programme of modifications and improvements to freight vehicles; and £28,000 is provided for sundry rolling stock items, including £9,000 for conversion of four passenger cars for use as mobile camp quarters.

Narrow-gauge requirements include £271,000 to continue the construction of three diesel-electric locomotives for the Port Lincoln Division. Further work will also be undertaken during the year on the conversion to 4ft. 8½in. gauge of the existing narrow gauge railway from Port Pirie to Cockburn, and the extension of the 5ft. 3in. gauge from Terowie to Peterborough and rolling stock projects associated therewith—the funds for which are being provided initially by the Commonwealth Government.

HARBORS ACCOMMODATION, £1,280,000.—Provision in 1965-66 is for the following works: £300,000 is provided to continue work on the major scheme of widening and deepening the Port River. The scheme consists of deepening and widening the present channel between the outer and inner harbour, extending the Outer Harbour swinging basin, providing beacons in new positions and reclaiming low-lying land; £170,000 is proposed for work on the construction of a new passenger terminal which will improve passenger handling facilities at Outer Harbour; £23,000 is required to complete the strengthening of dolphins at Klein Point; £253,000 is provided to continue the reconstruction of Smelters wharf at Port Pirie to provide improved facilities for the export trade of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Proprietary Limited; £42,000 is required to complete extensions to the berth accommodation at Thevenard; £82,000 is provided for final payments under the contract for the construction of a new bucket dredger and for the purchase of spare parts; £50,000 is required for the rehabilitation of three dredging barges, and £116,000 for various items of plant and equipment.

FISHING HAVENS, £21,000.—The sum of £16,000 is provided this year for the Edithburgh fishing jetty, and £5,000 for minor works.

WATERWORKS AND SEWERS, £13,100,000.—The more important provisions for 1965-66 are as follows:

Morgan-Whyalla and Iron Knob Water Supply, £2,515,000.—The sum of £2,500,000 is provided for further work in connection with the duplication of the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline, the estimated total cost of which is nearly £16,200,000, and £15,000 is for minor works.

Adelaide Water District, £3,093,000.—The sum of £1,135,000 is proposed to continue work on the Happy Valley system. The scheme is estimated to cost £3,710,000, and provides for the enlargement of the existing inlet tunnel from the Clarendon diversion weir and the construction of a new outlet tunnel from Happy Valley reservoir to Darlington to meet the rapidly-growing demand for water in the metropolitan area; £70,000 is provided for further work on the Kangaroo Creek reservoir. The capacity of the reservior will be about 6,000,000,000 gallons, and its cost is estimated at £2,650,000; £20,000 is required for minor works on the Clarendon-Belair-Blackwood scheme; and £80,000 is provided to continue work on the Elizabeth water supply scheme, which is proceeding in accordance with the development of Elizabeth and Salisbury. Funds are also provided for water supply schemes at Modbury, Salisbury, Stirling-Crafers, and Yatala Vale.

Barossa Water District, £141,000.—An amount of £90,000 is provided for work on duplicating portion of the existing Barossa trunk main between Sandy Creek and Gawler. This work is the first stage in the scheme to improve supplies in the Two Wells and Virginia area.

Warren Water District, £147,000.—The sum of £40,000 is provided to continue work on a new pumping plant, pumping main and storage tank to improve the supply to Angaston, and £20,000 is proposed for further work on a scheme to provide the township of Watervale with a supply from a bore.

Country Water Districts, £856,000.—This provision is required for water supply schemes at Booborowie, Iron Knob, Burra, Kingscote, Milang, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Oodnadatta, Penneshaw, Penola, Port Augusta, Quorn, Streaky Bay, Tailem Bend to Keith, and Whyalla.

Tod River Water District, £614,000.—An amount of £400,000 is provided for further work on the enlargement and replacement of the old Tod trunk main. The scheme, which involves the laying of 84 miles of large trunk main, is estimated to cost a total of £4,098,000.

The sum of £10,000 is proposed to commence the construction of a trunk water main from the Lock pumping station to Kimba at an estimated total cost of £958,000. The water will be drawn from the Polda Basin, and the scheme involves the laying of 68 miles of main and the construction of pumping stations. Funds are also provided for the extension of mains to various sections of the Tod River Water District.

Beetaloo, Bundaleer and Baroota Water District, £246,000.—A provision of £25,000 is made to continue work on the replacement of the final seven miles of the old steel Beetaloo trunk main, sections of which have been replaced over a period of years.

The sum of £51,000 is proposed for further work on the enlargement and extension of the Yorke Peninsula water supply system. The scheme is estimated to cost a total of £457,000 and involves the laying of 50 miles of subsidiary mains, the duplication of part of the existing main between Minlaton and Yorketown and the construction of large storage tanks. Funds are also provided for water supply projects at Moonta and South Hummocks.

Adelaide Sewers, £4,371,000.—The sum of £2,632,000 is provided for further work on the Bolivar sewage treatment works, the estimated total cost of which is approximately £11,070,000. The new plant is essential to permit the abandonment of the obsolete Islington sewage farm and to provide sewerage facilities for areas extending north to Gawler. An amount of £130,000 is proposed for reconstruction of sewers in 1965-66. Of this amount £30,000 is required to continue the reconstruction of the old sewerage system on Le Fevre Peninsula and £100,000 to commence the reorganization of the sewerage system to improve facilities for General Motors-Holden's Proprietary Limited and Actil Limited. The sum of £445,000 is required for the sewerage of many new housing areas, some of which are being developed by the South Australian Housing Trust and some by private enterprise.

Country Sewers, £795,000.—Of this amount £25,000 is provided to complete construction of sewer reticulation and a treatment works for the township of Lobethal. The sum of £330,000 is provided to continue work on the Mount Gambier sewerage scheme which is estimated to cost a total of £2,071,000. An amount of £330,000 is provided to continue work on the Whyalla sewerage scheme for which the estimated total cost is £2,325,000.

Water Conservation, £18,000.—The sum of £5,000 is provided to commence the construction of a small reservoir to maintain a water supply to Buckleboo and the surrounding area, while £10,000 is proposed to continue the sinking of a bore and the installation of a desalting plant to improve the supply of water to Coober Pedy.

RIVER MURRAY WEIRS, DAMS, LOCKS, ETC, £250,000.—This provision is to meet South Australian's share of the cost of work carried out by the River Murray Commission, including preliminary work for the Chowilla dam project.

GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, LAND AND SERVICES, £11,480,000.

Hospital Buildings.—The sum of £3,530,000 is provided for the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The sum of £2,194,000 is proposed to continue work on the rebuilding scheme for the hospital. The work, which is being carried out in stages, is estimated to cost a total of £11,900,000. It provides for the erection of an administration and kitchen block, an outpatients' block, a theatre block, a T-shaped ward block of 550 beds, a boilerhouse, and a new nurses' home. An amount of £150,000 is provided for further work on the construction of a new seven-storey central block to provide additional accommodation at the Dental Hospital.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.—The sum of £46,000 is provided for the construction of a laboratory in the maternity section of the hospital, and £13,000 for the provision of a clinic for the study of healthy babies.

Parkside Mental Hospital.—An amount of £5,000 is proposed for preliminary work on the erection of a new modern kitchen which will cater for the whole of the hospital and which is estimated to cost £250,000.

Enfield Receiving Home.—The sum of £39,000 is proposed for the provision of additional outpatient accommodation, and £70,000 to commence work on the conversion of the present laundry building to provide a self-service restaurant for the use of patients, and three occupational therapy rooms.

Group Laundry.—The amount of £326,000 is required to complete the construction of a group laundry at Islington. The new laundry is estimated to cost £1,022,000 and will serve all Government hospitals and institutions in the metropolitan area.

Apart from the expenditure upon Government hospitals which is provided for in the Bill, additional heavy provisions toward construction of a number of subsidized hospitals will

be included in the Appropriation Bill to be submitted shortly.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS, £5,700,000.—For 1965-66 the proposals for school buildings and associated works total £6,000,000 and the ways in which the funds are to be used are as follows:

	£
Work under 24 projects with a total value of £4,034,000 for new schools, major additions to schools, trade school and adult education centre, which were in progress at June 30, 1965 . ..	1,720,000
The commencement of 34 projects with a total value of £7,308,000 for new schools, major additions to schools, trade school, adult education centres and Bedford Park Teachers College ..	1,869,000
Work on craftwork centres, change rooms and playing fields	267,000
Prefabricated classrooms or classroom equivalents	600,000
Purchase of land, buildings and residences for school purposes	650,000
Minor work, including grading and paving of school yards, fencing, roadways, toilets and facilities, furniture and equipment and preliminary investigations and design	894,000
	£6,000,000

Again this year the Commonwealth has made available special grants towards buildings and equipment for science teaching in secondary schools and for technical training. Included in the proposed expenditure by the Public Buildings Department is some £300,000 for science laboratories and trade schools which I expect to be met from the special grants, so that the requirement of Loan funds is £5,700,000.

POLICE AND COURTHOUSE BUILDINGS, £400,000. —For 1965-66 funds are provided to continue construction of police stations and courthouses. An amount of £130,000 is proposed to commence work on the construction of Stage I of new and improved accommodation at Fort Largs to make it suitable for use as a Police Training Academy.

OTHER GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, £1,850,000. —The major proposals for 1965-66 are:

Botanic Garden Department.—The sum of £83,000 is provided to complete the construction of a new herbarium at an estimated cost of £126,000.

Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department.—An amount of £284,000 is proposed for further work on the construction of new buildings to accommodate senior boys at the training school at Magill, and £10,000 is provided to carry out extensions and alterations to the kitchen at Seaforth Home to provide improved facilities.

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science. —The sum of £20,000 is proposed to commence construction of a new pathology laboratory at the Berri Hospital, the estimated cost being £60,000.

Libraries Department.—An amount of £550,000 is provided to continue work on the erection of a part two-storey and part three-storey building which will give additional storage and display areas for documents and books. The scheme is estimated to cost a total of £1,544,000.

Prisons Department.—The sum of £82,000 is proposed for further work on Stage I of the scheme for the erection of a new gaol at Port Lincoln, the estimated cost being £141,000.

New Office Building, Victoria Square.—An amount of £400,000 is proposed to continue work on the construction of a multi-storey building in Victoria Square to provide central office accommodation for approximately 1,600 public servants.

Government Motor Garage.—The sum of £32,000 is provided to commence the construction of buildings in Gilles Street for a new Government motor garage. The scheme is estimated to cost £85,000.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST.—As in recent years, it is not proposed to make provision in the Bill for advances to the Housing Trust. The greater part of the trust's new money will be provided from funds borrowed under the provisions of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement at a concessional rate of 1 per cent below the current long term bond rate. For 1965-66 the allocation proposed is £4,600,000. These funds, together with the use of internal funds and loans to be raised from lending institutions, will enable the trust to finance a capital programme of £14,040,000. The general dissection of this proposed programme is £2,285,000 for rental housing, £2,984,000 for rental-purchase housing, £7,793,000 for houses for sale, £278,000 for flats, £430,000 for shops and industrial premises and £270,000 for miscellaneous items.

THE ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA —LOAN TO, £3,000,000.—In 1965-66 the trust proposes to spend £12,000,000 on capital works —£3,000,000 to be made available from State Loan funds, £3,250,000 to be raised by the trust from financial institutions and the public, with the balance of £5,750,000 to be met from the trust's internal funds.

The main proposals included in the programme are: £108,000 to be spent on the Port Augusta power station for final payments on equipment and the completion of minor works; £201,000 for final payments on the additional 60,000-kilowatt turbo-alternator and associated boiler at Osborne power station; £4,237,000 for construction work on Torrens Island and progress payments on two 120,000-kilowatt turbo-alternators and associated boilers and other equipment, arrangements having been made so that these boilers could be modified to enable them to burn natural gas should this fuel become available; £127,000 for further work on the 3,000-kilowatt diesel-alternator at Port Lincoln power station; £850,000 for construction of a 275,000-volt transmission line to improve supply into the southern metropolitan area and for the construction of embankments across the tidal flats to provide for the erection of the transmission lines that will connect Torrens Island power station to the existing transmission system; £262,000 to complete the extension of supply to major centres on Kangaroo Island; £200,000 for progress payments on the construction of a 132,000-volt transmission line to connect Port Lincoln to the main transmission system; £843,000 to be spent on various new substations and new high voltage lines other than those already mentioned; £1,053,000 for additional large transformers, circuit-breakers and other major items of plant; £1,632,000 for extending and strengthening the general distribution system, including the connection of new consumers; £666,000 for rural extensions; £513,000 for distribution transformers to be used for additions to the distribution system and for rural supply; £414,000 for metering and control equipment; and £407,000 for additional buildings, regional and district headquarters, depots, and properties for new substations.

MINES DEPARTMENT—BUILDINGS, PLANT, ETC., £160,000.—This amount is provided this year for capital items to be used in the programme of exploration and development of the State's mineral resources. A sum of £18,000 is proposed to continue work on extensions to the machine shop. The balance of £142,000 is required for new and replacement vehicles, minor additions to buildings, and for the purchase of replacement and additional plant, equipment and instruments.

PRODUCE DEPARTMENT—BUILDINGS, PLANT, ETC., £70,000.—The main provision is £63,000 for Port Lincoln freezing works, £28,000 being for further work on a scheme of major alterations to enable the works to meet treatment requirements for the export of meat to the United States of America, and £35,000 being for other improvements.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SCHOOL BUSES, £140,000.—This amount is provided for the purchase of additional and replacement buses for the transport of schoolchildren in country areas.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSIONER'S DEPARTMENT—DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, £350,000. —The Automatic Data Processing Centre for the Public Service of South Australia has been set up to process in the main commercial type work and also to perform calculations of an engineering and scientific nature. The equipment installed will progressively replace existing installations of punch-card equipment. The principal applications that the centre will process in the immediate future are water rate billing and Agriculture Department dairy herd statistics. The amount provided is for payment for the major equipment and to make provision for the purchase of ancillary items of equipment for the centre itself and for installation in those departments served by the centre.

And now, turning to the clause of the Bill, we see that clause 3 defines the Loan Fund and clause 4 provides for borrowing by the Treasurer of £30,946,000. This is the amount of South Australia's allocation for works and purposes arranged at the June, 1965, meeting of the Loan Council. Clause 5 provides for the expenditure of £36,964,000 on the undertakings set out in the First Schedule of the Bill. Clause 6 authorizes certain advances during 1964-65 for the undertakings set out in the Second Schedule. As no authority, or insufficient authority, was included in the Public Purposes Loan Act of 1964, appropriation was given by warrant by His Excellency the Governor, under powers conferred on him by the Public Finance Act. Clause 7 makes provision for borrowing and payment of an amount to cover any discounts, charges and expenses incurred in connection with borrowing for the purposes of this Bill. Clause 8 makes provision for temporary finance if the moneys in the Loan Fund are insufficient for the purposes of this Bill.

Clause 9 authorizes the borrowing and the issue of £12,000,000 for the purpose of carrying on Loan works in the early part of next financial year until the Public Purposes Loan Bill for 1966 becomes effective. Clause 10 gives the Treasurer power to borrow against the issue of Treasury bills or by bank overdraft. The Treasurer possesses and may

exercise this authority under other legislation, but it is desirable to make the authority specific year by year in the Public Purposes Loan Bill, as is done with other borrowing authority. Clause 11 deals with the duration of certain clauses in the Bill. Clause 12 directs that all moneys received by the State under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act shall be credited to a special account to be paid out as required for the purposes of the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act. Clause 13 provides for this Bill to operate as from July 1, 1965. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1173.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): In speaking to this amending Bill, I do not question a number of the proposed amendments; in fact, they appear to be minor as the Government has refused to consider other important amendments to the Local Government Act pending the findings of the committee of inquiry that has been set up to consolidate this Act. I wonder that some of these amendments have been brought forward at this stage. Others, of course, are of a more contentious nature and the Hon. Sir Norman Jude, in his speech, went through each clause in detail. As I believe that a Bill of this nature is, of necessity, a Committee Bill, I shall deal only briefly with one or two items to which I think members should give consideration.

I strongly support clause 3, where the definition of ratable property in relation to churches and church property has been more clearly defined for the purpose of administering the Act. The clauses immediately following are comparatively minor, but I wish to deal with clause 12, which I believe will be a valuable addition to our Local Government Act. This amendment was necessary because of an anomaly in the Act. Doubtless, the Act was framed many years ago before district councils and municipalities had the same problems as they have today. However, the trend these days results in many district councils having large centres of population in their areas and they now face some of the problems that in the past have been confined to municipalities. One of these has been the problem of sewerage and sewage effluent disposal.

During the term of the last Government, the Act was amended to enable district councils to borrow money for effluent disposal schemes, and the schemes that have been provided have operated successfully. I commend the Government for further considering the matter and for bringing forward these amendments, which will perhaps simplify the establishment of the scheme. I bring to the notice of the Minister the wording of clause 17 (4), which says:

> Notice in writing of the matters mentioned in the preceding subsection shall be given by the council to the owners of all the land in the portion of the area to be benefited by the scheme.

In connection with sewerage and effluent disposal schemes, I point out to the Minister that in country council areas (and this particular amendment is designed to deal with the problems of country councils on this matter) vacant blocks of land of relatively small value are in some cases owned by people who cannot be found and, if the working of this particular section is to depend upon notice in writing being served upon these people, we could well find the whole scheme held up because some landowners cannot be located. This happens frequently in country districts, as honourable members who have had experience on councils will confirm.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I would say every council experiences it.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Yes, and we could find a scheme held up because people, although only a few in number, had put up determined opposition by taking advantage of the point I have raised. I know that, in some cases, these absentee owners are never located and that the properties are sold eventually by the councils in order to recover rates owing. I think the Minister might well look at the words, ". . . to the owners of all the land in the portion of the area to be benefited by the scheme", because a handicap in the administration of the scheme could result.

Clause 11 authorizes municipal or metropolitan councils to erect flats for rental purposes and I question the advisability of this particular clause. We are entering a new field here. I notice that the clause restricts the councils to erecting flats for rental only. They are not to be permitted to build cottages and other types of building for rental purposes, because it is considered that this is the prerogative of the Housing Trust. I think there is involved here a principle or opinion that houses and cottages are the province of the trust and that the responsibility for flat development is being passed over to local government. Another point in relation to this clause is that it is confined to metropolitan councils and this could,

perhaps, in years to come bring about the very anomaly we have had in dealing with country effluent disposal schemes. We find changed circumstances throughout the whole State. Country cities are growing rapidly and, here again, country councils face some of the same problems that arise in the metropolitan area. I am not sure that I am in favour of dividing powers of councils into metropolitan and country, although I know that at present few country councils would avail themselves of the authority given by clause 11.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: This is only an extension of the present powers in the Act.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I agree, but it is a new principle to put this responsibility on the shoulders of councils and, at the same time, to exclude them from erecting other types of buildings, which are now erected by the Housing Trust. Insuring members of a council against personal injury, as contained in clause 12 and referred to in other clauses, is another matter that needs close examination. Examination is needed particularly of the manner in which the scheme can be administered, because country and city councils work under different conditions. Also, we must consider when a councillor is on duty and when he is not, and whether a council is under any liability for injuries received by a councillor when acting under the direction of the council. This clause has wide implications, and I believe that all members should examine it closely.

Another controversial provision is clause 14, which deals with the spending of revenue collected from parking meters. I have no doubt that this attempt to force councils to spend money collected from parking meters on off-street parking would have wide support from the general motoring public and the Royal Automobile Association; in fact, the R.A.A. has advocated it. The Local Government Act has many sections dealing with powers of councils, and these sections provide what they may or may not do with revenue they have collected. However, I cannot recall any other section in which councils are forced by the use of the word "shall" to spend their revenue on any particular project. This appears to be a new departure, and I believe that on this ground alone it should be examined very closely, although I have no doubt that the move would be popular with the general motoring public. We should remember that the roads, footpaths, kerbing and general amenities for motorists in all municipal areas are mostly provided and maintained by the ratepayer, and the general revenue collected from the motorist is expended on main roads, not on subsidiary roads.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think councils are spending more on off-street parking, traffic lights, etc., than they are receiving from parking meter revenue?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I have no doubt that they are spending large sums on providing these things for the motorist, and I think we should look carefully at the provision. Clause 20 appears to me to be completely undesirable; it provides:

Section 876 of the principal Act is amended by inserting therein after subsection (1) thereof the following subsection:

(1*a*) The council shall also for the purposes of this Act have power by any of its officers authorized by the council in that behalf to enter at all reasonable hours in the daytime into and upon any building or land within the area whereon or wherein any trade, business or occupation is carried on under licence pursuant to the by-laws of the council, for the purpose of enforcing any such by-law and may inspect the accounts, books and documents relating to the licence or the trade, occupation or business conducted in pursuance thereof.

I checked through the Local Government Act to see just what powers councils had in relation to licensing under by-laws, and discovered that there is a wide range of occupations for which the council may license people. This clause narrows the field considerably to "any building or land within the area whereon or wherein any trade, business or occupation is carried on under licence", so from the wide range of people licensed by councils (bootblacks, chimney sweeps and all sorts of people) we get down to those people who actually carry on their business or occupation in a building. This narrows the field to such places as premises used for storing hides and skins, child-minding centres, slaughterhouses, restaurants, etc.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Hawkers?

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Well, non-resident traders, at any rate. This is a fairly limited field, and obviously it does not apply to the person conducting business from a stall, barrow or anything of that nature; it specifies "any building or land". I will need a very much better reason than that given by the Minister in his second reading explanation for the inclusion of this clause before I will vote in favour of it, because I believe it is most undesirable that any officer authorized by a council should be able to enter premises and examine documents and papers unless a vital principle is at stake. I say this because

a council meeting is held with open doors. It can go into committee, but the council meeting itself is in public, and the officer authorized by the council must report back to council. Apart from this, any ratepayer has the right on payment of a small fee to examine the minutes of a meeting. I believe it is completely unjust that any person carrying on business should have his papers and documents examined in such a manner. This infringes the rights of the individual, who should be able to carry on his business with some privacy. Although I support many of the provisions of this Bill, I strongly oppose this clause.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I am happy to say that, unlike yesterday, I find myself largely in agreement with previous speakers. I agree with most, if not all, of what the honourable member who has just resumed his seat has said, and I agree that this is a Committee Bill. Measures amending the Local Government Act always are, because they deal with multifarious matters, most of which are unrelated to each other. I do not want to bind myself at this stage to any particular course of conduct, because, being a Committee Bill, I want to hear the debate on the various clauses. However, I have certain ideas about some provisions, but I will deal only with the main ones.

I agree with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan that most of the clauses appear to contain good amendments, and I am glad that the Government has brought them along. Some of them are very sensible indeed; the church one, for instance, and the two ratable properties divided by road or railway. I think that they are logical amendments that should be made. Clause 11 relates to the granting of power to councils to erect flats. This power is fairly limited, and properly so. I think the Minister in his second reading speech referred to the fact that the building of houses is definitely a matter for the State Government, in some instances with assistance from the Commonwealth Government, but he drew a distinction between houses and flats. He said that he thought flats were properly a matter that could come within the local government arena. I am not altogether happy with this provision. I think about two years ago, at the request of the Adelaide City Council, we gave power to assist private developers, and the Housing Trust in particular, to build flats in the city area. Although possibly the principle was not the best, I think the business aspects were, because by providing a proportion of the money needed the council involved would be able to collect fairly substantial rates and so reimburse itself over a period. That provision still stands in the Act.

The provision in the Bill is supplementary to the one just mentioned. Under it the council can expend moneys on residential flats only, and it must not do anything more than that. In other words, it can only let the flats. Properly, the clause provides that the council shall not compulsorily take land for the purposes of the section. Honourable members know that I am chary about granting any powers of compulsory acquisition. Such wide-spread powers would enable anyone to pick on a site at random for a general purpose such as this, and that could be readily abused. I do not suggest that councils would do it, but Parliament should not open the way for abuse. Generally speaking, it does not happen. I am not enamoured of this clause because I think the building of houses is a matter for the State Government. We know that local government authorities in Great Britain are the principal housing authorities, but the set-up is entirely different there. Local government takes on somewhat the role of State Government in a federal system. I am not keen to see local government empowered to spend much of the ratepayers' money on housing. We have seen how councils in England have got to the position where their rates are more than £1 in the £1 on annual values, which is a ridiculous situation. I understand that much of this has arisen because of lavish expenditure on housing in their areas. I am not keen on extending housing powers to local government. I never have been and I do not think I ever will be.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude referred to clauses 12 and 13 relating to the question of insuring members going to and from meetings. In itself I see no objection to this, but I think it is getting a little towards payment of members of councils, and I do not agree with that. I think that our voluntary system has given us excellent local government and I would be sorry to see payment of members creep in. The Hon. Sir Norman Jude made a statement that could be called erratic, because he said:

I do not smell a rat upon this occasion: I see one in full flight, and I trust that it will remain in full flight!

We know that pigs cannot fly, but I have not heard of rats flying before. He also referred, with a bit of a play on words, to an "appeal lying". I have written a little couplet—"Appeals can lie, but rats can't fly"—and

I think that paraphases the honourable member's remark.

Joking apart, I principally wish to refer to clause 14. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan once again. I think the principle of ear-marking certain revenue for specific purposes is something that should always be closely examined, but I do not say that in all circumstances it is wrong. Again, I am not keen on ear-marking revenue from parking meters for specific purposes, such as off-street parking, but if the Government wishes to do this I do not, at this stage, commit myself until I have given the matter some thought. I am rather prepared to go along with it, but I would like to see an amendment made to the clause. I will mention it later. I think the clause might not be sufficiently complete. I would like members to give thought to my suggestion. Honourable members will remember that in 1963, when this provision was inserted, we had quite a debate on the matter of whether the ear-marking of this revenue should be voluntary or compulsory. Finally it was agreed that councils could establish reserve funds, but that they were not obliged to do so. This clause obliges them either to establish a reserve fund or spend the revenue on the purposes set out in section 290d, which makes it compulsory to provide a reserve fund. However, it creates an exception by saying that councils can use the revenue from parking meters for installing and maintaining traffic lights and works associated therewith, and providing and maintaining signs and marking lines. In other words, the Government recognizes the principle that the people who contribute by means of these parking meters have some sort of obligation to get traffic devices that help them to use the council areas where the meters operate. I suggest that as the principle is established in theory councils can from the meter revenue deduct money for maintaining traffic lights and matters associated therewith, signs and marking lines. I think that expenditure from meter revenue ought to embrace more the other things associated with the actual facts of traffic.

In saying this, I am not intending that it should be extended to the making of roads, pavements and so on, which is the normal responsibility of the council; I am saying that this section should be extended to cover all expenditure that the council will find itself involved in through the increasing volume of traffic and the necessity for keeping the traffic flow going in those circumstances where traffic heavier than usual is building up in the streets. I may not have made myself very clear, so I should like to illustrate what I say by one or two concrete examples. As I have said, the section as drawn enables councils to use meter revenue to install and maintain traffic lights, and to provide and maintain signs and marking lines. This is very laudable and I entirely agree with it. For regulating and controlling traffic and maintaining traffic movement, there are other devices of a similar nature. I think they are in exactly the same category as the others, but not dealt with by the Bill.

The first example relates to roundabouts or archipelagos, as they are called. I direct the attention of members as a good example of this (possibly a classic example) to the archipelago or roundabout at the junction of Anzac Highway, West Terrace and South Terrace. I was on the Adelaide City Council when that excellent traffic device was installed. It has worked really well. If I remember rightly, that particular device, purely for controlling traffic, cost £20,000 or £30,000 by the time all the work was done. How much of that was for the actual structures, how much was for the road and so on, I do not know, but it was all necessitated, not in the way that a council normally has to spend its revenue on roads but by the tremendous volume of traffic using that place. Therefore, the whole thing is really a traffic device, in exactly the same way as traffic lights are. Perhaps "works associated therewith" could define such a device. They may be works associated with traffic lights of a lesser nature—I do not know—but it is certainly a type of expenditure similar to what is contemplated by the section as drawn.

We are getting closer to underways or subways. I know that long-term planning on Victoria Square will involve eventually running Wakefield Street and Grote Street under the square itself. Traffic will go under the square, and east-west traffic will not interfere with north-south traffic. Some experts think that this may happen in a comparatively short time. There again the particular work will be necessitated, purely and simply, by the volume of traffic flow. The roads are perfectly good and adequate—there is nothing wrong with them for the purpose of carrying present-day traffic—but the sheer volume of flow will involve the City Council in greatly increased expenditure. I think the people who cause that additional flow—in general, those who use the traffic meters and give revenue to the council—would be willing that the flow should be facilitated in that sort of way by this revenue. Another example I can give is the

median strip. The one in King William Street is, in the main, a traffic device.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Some people also appreciate it from a beautification point of view.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: One can argue it both ways; it has been argued that it was for beautification, but there had to be something in the centre of King William Street as a haven for pedestrians, whether it was a series of islands, a median strip or something marked out to enable those who could not get right across the road to stay in the centre. A median strip was decided on. It did not meet with public approbation when first mooted, but I think it has now.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It is a very useful adjunct.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes; I recognize that the Chief Secretary is happy about it. I agree with him: I think it is. There had to be something in the centre of King William Street for pedestrians and something to divide the two opposite flows of traffic, which previously had been divided by tramlines. In my opinion, although the Chief Secretary is perfectly right in saying there is a certain element of beauty in it, it is a traffic device. Will the Government consider what I say on this matter? I have asked the Parliamentary Draftsman, who has been in this Chamber this afternoon, to draw up something for me so that I can see how it looks in a comprehensive way and whether it will cover the matters that I think should be included. Particularly, I ask the Minister of Local Government to consider this matter himself before the Bill reaches the Committee stage. He may then agree that the provision should be widened, not for the purpose of altering the intention of the legislation but merely to widen it to include the matters I have referred to.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: This goes much further than the present agreement between the Adelaide City Council and the Royal Automobile Association.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think it does, but it is a form of compulsion. I know there is a motion on the files of the council considerably more comprehensive in the expenditure it embraces than what I am suggesting. I have tried to limit my suggestions to the intention of this clause as drawn but at the same time to point out some things that I think may not be covered by it. The archipelago that I instanced may be associated with the working of traffic lights. The one that used to be at Eastwood, near the new Electricity Trust building, and where there were no traffic lights, certainly would not be comprehended by this section. The roundabout at the corner of Ward Street and Jeffcott Street in North Adelaide has been an excellent device. It is an isolated roundabout not associated with traffic lights, but it is just as much a thing for regulating traffic as are traffic lights. That is my point.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Is the amount of money being spent on those things greater than that being collected from parking meters?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I think I can speak for the Adelaide City Council, because, although I have not been a member of it for about 15 months, I do know that the amount already expended and the amount it has in view to expend is considerably more than the revenue from meters, and that is likely to be the position for some years. I cannot speak for other councils, but I am sure that the same thing is on their doorsteps. They have not yet had to face the traffic problems that the capital city councils have but they are gradually meeting them and facing up to them. This is going to be a confused process and I think that whether or not councils are at the moment spending more than the revenue is really immaterial to what we authorize them to deduct from revenue, because when this Bill becomes law it will operate for a goodly time, as I see it, and I think we ought to get it right at the outset. I think I have made the point I wanted to make there.

The only other clause on which I want to comment is clause 20. I agree with what the Hon. Sir Norman Jude and the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan have said; and this clause has caused me concern. It amends a section of the Local Government Act that relates to inspection of buildings, and it concerns structural matters. This proposed enlargement of the section relates to the private and intimate business affairs of the occupiers. Like the Hon. Sir Norman Jude, I do not know who suggested this particular amendment but I do know that most amendments to the Local Government Act, if not all of them, are normally suggested to the Government by various local governing bodies or organizations. I should like the Minister to tell us later where this amendment came from. I imagine it was suggested by some council or local government group. I do not like the idea of the investigation of the affairs of private people, although I realize that it could be helpful to local government.

On the other hand, the security of a local government investigation would not, by its

very nature, be as great as that of an investigation, for instance, by a Government department, because local government is much wider open to the public view than a governmental investigation (and this is the point Mr. Gilfillan made). I can see the reason behind this clause, particularly from the experience I have had in a local governing body in trying to ascertain what licence fees ought to be charged in certain cases when information could not be obtained from people about what they were charging. Frankly, I do not like the principle involved and hope that the Minister will have a further look at it.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: That arose from a court case.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I like to keep an open mind about these things. Indeed, I have one, and I should like to hear the Minister tell us more about that, either in his reply on the second reading or in Committee. It is obvious from the interjection that he has information on it and is prepared to tell us about it. I think it will help us all to have that information, and what it is going to involve. I think I have made clear the points I wanted to raise at this stage. This is a Committee Bill and we shall all be able to have a further look at the clauses in Committee. In the meantime I support the second reading.

The Hon. L. R. HART secured the adjournment of the debate.

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Ajourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 24. Page 1174.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): A simple amendment is contained in clause 3 of this Bill. I think the Impounding Act was first introduced in 1920, and honourable members, in considering this Bill, will agree that we have come a long way since then. In those days, it was the custom for most of the stock, over short distances, to be moved on the hoof whereas now stock are now usually transported by road or rail. The Act was amended about six times in the 1920's and 1930's and it has been amended once or twice since then. The most recent amendment was in 1962, when, amongst other things, it was provided that straying stock could be conveyed to the nearest pound in a vehicle, but no provision was made at that time that a ranger could charge fees or for any fees to be charged for transporting the stock from where they were found to the nearest pound. This matter has been brought forward by Local Government Association meetings and was, in due course, as is the custom, referred to the Local Government Advisory Committee and I am quite sure that the matter came from there to the Government.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It was *vice versa*. It came to me and I forwarded it to the advisory committee.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The matter came to the Minister and he referred it to the advisory committee and it is now before us. Clause 3 (2) of the amending Bill says:

> Where any such cattle are conveyed by any vehicle to a pound or place to be impounded the ranger or person so conveying them or causing them so to be conveyed may claim the cost of such conveyance and such cost may be recovered in the same manner as a pound-keeper's fees and charges.

In my view, that is a sensible amendment and I believe it will enable a better system to be adopted. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.36 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 31, at 2.15 p.m.