HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 26, 1974

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

HOUSING LOANS REDEMPTION FUND ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS

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

MONARTO

In reply to Mr. WARDLE (March 13).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Relating to expenditure at the site of Monarto, expenditure on land acquisitions to February 28, 1974, has been $1 167 447. All other expenditure to that date amounts to $241 177, and therefore total expenditure is $1 408 624.

FESTIVAL CENTRE FLOODLIGHTING

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (March 7).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Floodlighting was included at the time of erection of the building so as to present the Festival Theatre attractively at night. Unfortunately, the lights used have been very susceptible to vandalism to the extent that all 12 lights have had to be replaced twice. A further set has been installed, and we are continuing our investigations towards installing an effective guard to prevent further vandalism.

SUPERANNUATION

In reply to Mr. DEAN BROWN (March 12).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The additional cost previously quoted of $3 400 000 being the extra cost in the first year of the new superannuation scheme, included all amendments contained in the Bill. At the meeting referred to by the honourable member and at a subsequent meeting between Mr. Knight and the Public Actuary, no further concessions were granted and therefore no further commitment of Government money was made. As previously stated, this extra cost is subject to considerable variation, because of the various options open to members and the fact that we cannot at present make a reasonable estimate of which options will be utilized.

LAND VALUATIONS

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (March 6).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Unimproved value of land means the capital amount that an unencumbered estate of fee simple in the land might reasonably be expected to realize upon sale, assuming that any improvements thereon (except, in the case of land not used for primary production, any site improvements), the benefit of which is unexhausted at the time of valuation, had not been made. Improvements (other than urban land site improvements) refer to those improvements within the boundaries of the land either done to the land or upon the land by the operation of man to make it more valuable than if it were left in its natural state. The definition is most emphatic that the unimproved value must be determined assuming that only those improvements which actually add value to the land had not been made.

Improvements can only be given value to the extent by which they increase the selling or market value of a property. This is made very clear in the definition of unimproved value by the inclusion of the words "the benefit of which is unexhausted at the time of valuation". If improvements done to or upon the land, no matter how costly they may have been, contribute nothing to the highest and most economic permitted use of the land, their benefit is exhausted and they are not to be considered as improvements in determining unimproved value. The practical application of this principle is most important when the valuer is analyzing property sales to determine how much of the purchase price was attributable to the added value of improvements and how much to the unimproved land. The question which the valuer must answer is, "How much of the purchase price, as agreed between the vendor and the purchaser, was paid for everything included in the sale other than the unimproved land?" What the valuer has to determine is not the actual cost of effecting the improvements, although this will have some bearing on the matter, but what added value does each improvement contribute to the land in developing it to its highest and most economical use.

In practice the usual approach to valuing improvements is their present replacement cost less depreciation but, as suggested above, while the cost of replacing the improvements may be relevant, their value does not necessarily coincide with their replacement cost for several reasons:

1. They may be very old and obsolete.
2. They may no longer be beneficial for the highest and most economic use of the land.
3. They could be more than are required for full economic development of the land.
4. Their physical condition could have considerably deteriorated.

When on land are erected buildings of a nature far in excess of that needed for the most economic return from the land, then the beneficial or added value (if any) of those buildings to the land must be greatly discounted in relation to their current replacement cost. Similarly excessive clearing or draining of rural land could be considerable over-improvement of the land. Cost and value will equate only when the money spent upon the improvements provides a return commensurate with the capital outlay. Before he can arrive at his opinion of the added value of the improvements then, the valuer must do much research and collect up-to-date information with regard to present day costs of effecting those improvements.

Some of this information he gathers as he goes about his task in the field of questioning contractors who are clearing and pasturing new land, or constructing drains and levee banks, or erecting fencing and buildings and so on. Other information he obtains from the suppliers of materials, and still more information is obtained from landowners who have recently effected new improvements. The records of the Valuation Department are updated on a continuing basis, so that at all times when general valuations, whether of unimproved capital or annual values, are being made, the latest factual data is used in determining the added value of improvements to land.

PUBLIC LOANS

In reply to Mr. BECKER (March 12).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When the original Budget was framed it was estimated that payments should be about the same as in 1972-73. After the issue of Special Bonds Series 2C in October 1973, which carried a much higher rate of interest than previous series, the Australian Treasury advised that previous series to a considerable value were being cashed by holders at the relevant premium.

South Australia's share of the cost of this premium, beyond that estimated in the original Budget, could amount to $150 000 by the time final advices are received. In addition, it is now expected that advices will be received in 1973-74 concerning the refinancing from Series 2C of Special Bonds Series N, which matured on March 1, 1974.

If these advices are received, the premium due to holders will amount to about $200 000. No allowance was made in the original Budget for Series N refinancing. Expenditure on expenses of conversion and public loans amounted to $182 000 at February 28, 1974, but there is a large number of advices from the Australian Government outstanding. It is expected that these advices will be received, and the appropriation sought (added to the original provision of $400 000) is expected to be sufficient to make the necessary payments.

WATER PUMPING

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (March 12).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The total provision in the Estimates for electricity for pumping for metropolitan waterworks was $1 045 000, and for country waterworks it was $1 237 000, a total of $2 282 000. The amounts now expected to be expended for this purpose during the current financial year are as follows: metropolitan waterworks, $700 000, and for country waterworks, $950 000, a total of $1 650 000. The anticipated saving is therefore $632 000.

RURAL UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

In reply to Mr. VENNING (March 12).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In late June, 1973, the Australian Government advised that further reduced grants would be made under this scheme until the end of September, 1973, only. It was agreed, however, that surplus funds from the metropolitan scheme could be used to phase out beyond this time in areas of significant unemployment These areas were determined in consultation with the Commonwealth Department of Labour and were as follows:

District councils: Berri, Barmera, Central Yorke Peninsula, Crystal Brook, Kadina, Lincoln, Loxton, Millicent, Mount Gambier, Murat Bay, Pirie, Tumby Bay and Yorketown.

Corporations or cities: Gawler, Kadina, Moonta, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie, Renmark, Wallaroo, and Whyalla. By the end of December, 1973, funds were sufficient to maintain employment in the following areas only:

District councils: Millicent and Yorketown. Corporations or cities: Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, and Port Pirie.

These areas again were determined in consultation with the Commonwealth Department of Labour, and it is unlikely employment will continue beyond the end of next month. The attached table shows those grants approved for councils to maintain employment beyond September 30, 1973:

Grants approved for those councils maintaining employment beyond September 30, 1973

	$
District Councils:	
Barmera	2 250
Berri	2 210
Central Yorke Peninsula	3 000
Crystal Brook	2 000
Kadina	1 500
Lincoln	7 200
Loxton	7 000
Millicent	23 800
Mount Gambier	1 500
Murat Bay	8 000
Pirie	9 000
Tumby Bay	8 000
Yorketown	11 500
Corporations and cities:	
Gawler	5 000
Kadina	2 000
Moonta	2 792
Mount Gambier	3 000
Port Augusta	35 000
Port Lincoln	32 000
Port Pirie	125 000
Renmark	8 000
Wallaroo	2 500
Whyalla	20 000

Grants approved for those councils maintaining employment beyond September 30, 1973—continued

	$
District Councils—*continued*	
Tumby Bay	8 000
Yorketown	11 500
Corporations and cities:	
Gawler	5 000
Kadina	2 000
Moonta	2 792
Mount Gambier	3 000
Port Augusta	35 000
Port Lincoln	32 000
Port Pirie	125 000
Renmark	8 000
Wallaroo	2 500
Whyalla	20 000

MURRAY RIVER SEWERAGE

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (March 13).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There are 17 locations along the Murray River in South Australia that are proposed sites for river vessel waste disposal stations. These are at lock 6, Renmark, Berri, Loxton; lock 3, Waikerie; and lock 2, Morgan, Blanchetown, Swan Reach, Walker Flat, Mannum, Murray Bridge, Tailem Bend, Milang, Meningie and Goolwa. Work is in progress on the prefabrication of units to be installed at an initial series of 12 of these sites, which are all but those at lock 2, Walker Flat, Tailem Bend, Milang and Meningie. It is intended that regulations to control the disposal of sewage and refuse from the larger vessels using the Murray River in this State will be introduced under intended amendments to the Control of Waters Act. It is expected that these regulations will be made effective following the commissioning of the initial series of stations, which is now planned to be in the first quarter of 1975. A grace period of a further 12 months is intended to allow owners of craft existing at that time to comply with the intended requirements.

BOWKER STREET LAND

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (March 13).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Following the decision to make Bowker Street land available to the Brighton council for use by the community outside school hours, discussions have been held between officers of the Education Department, the Headmaster and school council of the Paringa Park Primary School, the Town Clerk of the City of Brighton, and a representative from the Public Buildings Department, with a view to drawing up a master plan for the development of the land. Several preliminary plans have been produced and modified after discussion in which these parties have been represented. The latest plan, designed to incorporate suggestions made at previous meetings and providing for a master planned developmental scheme, has recently been received from the Public Buildings Department. This plan has been discussed by the Education Department with the Chairman of the school council and the Headmaster, who have expressed satisfaction with it. The plan is at the moment with the Brighton corporation for consideration. If the corporation agrees steps will proceed for implementation of the plan.

HOTEL GLASSES

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (March 7).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The food and drugs regulations provide that drinking vessels be washed in either an approved glass-washing machine or an approved single-unit double-bowl sink. One bowl is required to be provided with a specified brush and to contain an effective cold water detergent sterilant. The second bowl is required to have continuously running cold water where it is available or, where running water is not available, the

water is to be changed regularly. Two microbiological surveys have shown that these methods properly operated will produce clean glasses. Provision is also made in the regulations for refilling of glasses for use by the same person if the refilling is carried out in full and clear view of such person in such a way that there can be no confusion of the glass with that previously used by any other person. It is also provided that a drinker can demand a clean glass rather than have his glass refilled. In view of recent comments on these procedures, it is intended to resubmit this matter to the Food and Drugs Advisory Committee for further consideration.

TAXI-CABS

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (March 7).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No Government inquiry is being held into the operations of the Metropolitan Taxi Cab Board, nor is any inquiry being held into the operations of taxis generally.

LOAD EXEMPTIONS

In reply to Mr. RUSSACK (March 13).

The Hon. G T. VIRGO: As the legislation to which the honourable member has referred will not become operative until January 1, 1975, the Road Traffic Board has not yet determined its policy in administering same. However, it seems that superphosphate could not be considered as "primary produce", but legal opinion will be obtained to confirm this attitude.

DERNANCOURT LAND

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (February 28)

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For some years now the Government has not used the powers for compulsory acquisition as set out in the Public Parks Act, 1943. Provision is made each year in my departmental estimates for a sum of money to enable me to make subsidies available to councils towaids the cost of acquiring recreation lands. The usual subsidy paid to a council is half the Land Board valuation of the land to be acquired. I point out that the Tea Tree Gully council has the necessary powers under the Local Government Act to compulsorily acquire the land referred to. Following application by the council, a Land Board valuation of this land has been obtained and, if the council so desires, I will consider the subsidy based on this valuation.

CHLORINE SUBSIDY

In reply to Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (February 21).

The Hon. G. R. BROOM HILL. In view of the enormous task ahead of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department in providing assistance for capital works such as swimming pools, as well as a multitude of other sport and recreation activities, it is not intended to diversify into the payment of subsidies to assist in meeting running costs.

BELAIR RECREATION PARK

In reply to Mr. EVANS (March 6).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Design work for the golf course layout, reticulation system, and the water supply has been completed. To date an amount of $27 260 has been spent, comprising mainly:

(a) the cost of clearing the area for new fairways (I understand that a few large tree stumps still remain on the site but these will be cleared away in due course);

(b) cost of irrigation equipment.

A contract has been let for the supply and installation of irrigation equipment for the reticulated water supply. The reticulation system has been delivered; work will commence in the next few weeks on the construction of a 50 000-gallon (2 273 040 L) cement water storage tank, following which the reticulation equipment will be installed. Initially water will be provided through the Engineering and Water Supply Department mains supply but negotiations are continuing with the Mines Department concerning a suitable supply of bore water to supplement mains supplies About 2 500yds. (2 286 km) of soil and rubble have been stockpiled and next month it is planned to commence forming four or five tees and greens in the area recently cleared, using this material plus other in the course of delivery. It is hoped that these tees and greens will be planted during this autumn, with the new fairways being seeded in the spring. It was hoped that all work on the tees and greens could have been undertaken concurrently, but this has not been possible due to the lack of availability of filling material.

HOUSING PROGRAMME

In reply to Mr. COUMBE (March 19).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD. The South Australian Housing Trust has had the amount of $15 500 000 appropriated under the Housing Agreement for 1973-74. The trust's total programme for the whole of the financial year has been geared to equal this appropriation. In addition to new housing and land purchases, the trust planned to proceed with its project of purchasing older housing in the city of Adelaide and the inner metropolitan area for the purpose of upgrading them to meet present day standards. This is provided for in the Housing Agreement. Furthermore, a substantial capital proportion is being spent in the upgrading of the trust's older houses.

It is pointed out that these two latter features of the trust's programme are closely associated with the labour-intensive sectors of the building industry. New stoves, baths, basins, hot water services, etc, are all required in the upgrading and renovating programme, and these are obtained through locally based manufacturers. The trust will spend the total allocation of agreement money, and will probably be the only Australian housing authority to achieve this. The trust intends to purchase a substantial quantity of land in country centres where there is a strong demand for low-cost housing. It is the trust's intention to initiate an increased building programme in these country areas over the next 12 to 18 months.

Possible constraints would be the availability of services to building sites, the ability of other service departments to provide services such as water and *sewer,* the availability of suitable on-site labour, and, in some cases, the shortage of materials. These labour shortages have been a limiting factor for a considerable time and, in an endeavour to overcome them, the trust has planned a style of development termed "Home Parks" in which it is able to site factory-built houses at a fairly rapid rate and at relatively short notice. These houses may be constructed in one or two parts by any number of manufacturers in Adelaide, and transported to any site. This type of development can be rapidly expanded. Summarizing, although the trust will spend its allocation, there will be less new houses completed during this financial year than was originally contemplated, but to some extent this will be off-set by the purchasing of older dwellings and making more use of industrialized housing.

POLICE FORCE

Mr MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What warrant has been issued as a result of the allegations of brutality made by Senator Cavanagh against a South Australian policeman?

2. Against whom has such warrant been issued and when was it issued?

3. Why was the warrant issued and what has been the result of its issue?

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

1. No warrant has been issued as a result of the allegations of brutality made by Senator Cavanagh against a South Australian policeman.

2. and 3. Not applicable in view of above. There has been a warrant issued for the arrest of the motor cyclist to whom Senator Cavanagh has referred as having been assaulted. This was not taken out because of Senator Cavanagh's allegations. It was issued on March 12, 1973, following inquiries that failed to indicate the motor cyclist's whereabouts. Inquiries have been continued since its issue but without it being possible to execute the warrant.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. EVANS (on notice): What percentage of the land set aside for national and conservation parks during each of the years 1970-71, 1971-72 and 1972-73, was formerly privately owned, and what percentage was already held by the Crown?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The details are as follows: for 1970-71, privately owned 55 per cent, Crown lands, 45 per cent; for 1971-72, privately owned 92 per cent, Crown lands, 8 per cent; and for 1972-73, privately owned 97 per cent, Crown lands 3 per cent.

REDWOOD PARK SEWERS

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): What future plans does the Engineering and Water Supply Department have for sewering such streets as Catherine Drive, Sunhaven Road and Ronald Road, at Redwood Park?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Approval has been given for the construction of sewers in Catherine Drive, Sunhaven and Ronald Roads, and surrounding streets at Redwood Park. This work will be included in the 1974-75 financial year programme.

ENVIRONMENT STUDIES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What guidelines have been laid down for the conduct of environment impact studies in respect of South Australian projects?

2. Has any privately arranged system, already in use in this State, been considered or accepted as adequate for the Government's needs?

3. If no decision has been taken when can a full report or a Ministerial statement, or both, be expected?

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

1. The Environmental Protection Council has recommended to the Minister of Environment and Conservation guidelines for the introduction of an environmental impact system. The Government has considered these guidelines and accepted them in principle, and they are now being circulated to many interested organizations for comments. It is expected that this system would be applicable to both Government and private developments.

2. No privately arranged system has been considered for use in this State.

3. See 2.

CHAIN OF PONDS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. On what dates were notices of acquisition, pursuant to section 10 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, issued against property owners in the Chain of Ponds area?

2. Who authorized the issue of the acquisition order in each instance?

3. What were the specific reasons for acquisition in each instance at the time of the notice?

4. How many of the acquisitions have been finalized?

5. Are there any particular reasons why those negotiations not yet completed have been unable to be completed?

6. What has been the price of acquisition in respect of each completed transaction?

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

1. Notices of intention were issued on the following dates: February 26, 1971; September 17, 1971; September 29, 1971; January 17, 1972; February 3, 1972; March 17, 1972; March 17, 1972, March 22, 1972; March 22, 1972; March 22, 1972; March 22, 1972; March 22, 1972; April 24, 1972; March 22, 1973; June 29, 1973; November 16. 1973; February 7, 1974; and March 1, 1974.

2. The Minister of Works.

3. The Government is compelled under section 10 of the Land Acquisition Act to issue a notice of intention to acquire land. Notices were issued to give effect to Government policy to purchase the township of Chain of Ponds.

4. A total of 10.

5. Notices of intention on two properties have only recently been served, and negotiations are continuing. Negotiations on four remaining properties are not settled because parties are unable to reach agreement on valuation.

6. This is considered to be confidential.

MODBURY HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs BYRNE (on notice):

1. When will the project to erect a two-storey complex at Modbury High School proceed?

2. For what uses is this building being designed9

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The additional building for Modbury High School is at present included in the 1975-76 tender-call programme. At this stage it is not possible to give precise information as to the time that it will become available for use.

2. The building would include a Commonwealth standard library resource centre, a language suite, eight flexible open-space teaching areas, a science laboratory and associated general activity, and art/craft areas.

MUSEUM ACQUISITION FUND

Mr MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is there a Museum Acquisition Fund and, if so, when was it established?

2. How much money is in this fund?

3. What has been acquired with money from the fund9

4. If there is no such fund, why not?

5. Is it intended to establish such a fund and when?

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

1. No.

2. See 1.

3. See 1.

4. Specimens are purchased by the Board of the South Australian Museum from funds made available as a grant from the Government, moneys received from trust funds held by the board, contributions received from the general public and, when necessary, special grants have been made by the Government to cover the purchase of specific specimens.

5. See 4.

LAND AGENTS BOARD

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many inquiries have been conducted by the Land Agents Board quarterly since July 1, 1972?

2. How many inquiries have not been completed, and what is the reason for delay in completion of the unfinished inquiries?

3. What is the length of time each of the uncompleted inquiries has been proceeding?

4.If any inquiries are now more than six months in arrears, what are the circumstances which preclude an early resolution?

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

1. 1/7/72 to 30/9/72, 3; 1/10/72 to 31/12/72, 2, 1/1/73 to 31/3/73, 2; 1/4/73 to 30/6/73, 3; 1/7/73 to 30/9/73, 3, l/10/73 to 31/12/73, 3; 1/1/74 to 21/3/74, 2.

2. One; in three other inquiries the hearings have been completed but the board has not yet given decisions. The decisions are expected to be completed soon.

3. The uncompleted inquiry commenced on March 1, 1974, and was continued on March 8 and 15, and is now awaiting counsels' written submissions, which are due by April 19, 1974.

4. Not applicable.

TEA TREE GULLY INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): In accidents at the intersection of North-East and Hancock Roads, Tea Tree Gully, over the period from January 1, 1968 to date:

(a) How many people have been killed?

(b) How many people were injured?

(c) How many accidents have been reported?

(d) How many vehicles were involved?

(e) How many pedestrians were involved in these accidents?

(f) Are additional safety measures intended for this intersection, and when will the work be carried out?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Recorded accident statistics at the intersection of North-East Road and Hancock Road over the period January 1, 1968, to December 31, 1973, are as follows:

(a) Number of people killed, 1.

(b) Number of people injured, 26.

(c) Number of accidents reported, 53.

(d) Number of vehicles involved, 109.

(e) Number of pedestrians involved, nil.

(f) Statistics from January 1, 1974, to the present, are not yet available. Minor improvements to the safety bar layout at the intersection should be carried out in May, 1974, in conjunction with current construction works on the North-East Road. No further work at this location is intended for several years.

MONITORING PROGRAMME

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government plans to monitor radio and television programmes and, if so, what programmes are to be monitored, and why?

2. What methods of monitoring will be used?

3. What will be the total cost and how is this made up?

4. When is it expected that such monitoring will begin?

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

1. Yes. All programmes connected with the news or having a public affairs content will be monitored in order that correct statements may be issued as soon as possible. There is a great deal of uniformed comment on programmes at present.

2. The method of monitoring has not been determined conclusively, but it is likely to be an electronic system.

3. Costs are still being examined.

4. It is not known when operation will begin.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government plans to establish land lines or coaxial cables or other means of direct communication, and which, between Ministers' offices and radio and television stations?

2. If such direct communication is to be established, why, and at what total cost and how is this cost made up?

3. Which Ministers' offices will be so linked and when is it expected that such links will be in operation?

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

1. Yes. The decision has not yet been taken as to whether land lines or coaxial cables will be used.

2. Direct communication is to be established in order to enable a monitoring system to operate in relation to programmes having a public affairs content. The question of costs is still under examination.

3. The Premier's office will be linked. It is not known when the system will be operational

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What action does the Government intend to take to persuade the media to publish or broadcast the Government's direct-line statements prepared under the proposed media monitoring scheme?

2. Will the media be given the necessary incentive by way of ultimatum?

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

1. None.

2. No.

MAINTENANCE ORDERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the total number of maintenance orders at present payable through the Community Welfare Department?

2. How many of such orders are in arrears, and in how many is the amount in arrears more than $300?

3. What is the total amount of such arrears on these orders?

4 How many warrants of non-payment of maintenance have been issued in each of the years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 and also the present year to date?

5. How many of these warrants have been served, and how many have been satisfied by payment of the arrears of maintenance?

6. How many of the unsatisfied warrants does the Community Welfare Department regard as current?

7. How many complaints for non-payment of maintenance are at present awaiting hearing, and in which courts is it intended to proceed with the hearings and when?

8. Are there any matters in which it is intended to lay complaints for non-payment of maintenance and, if so, how many?

9. When are such complaints to be laid?

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

1. About 7 800. This figure includes those maintenance orders transferred to this State by other State and overseas authorities for the purpose of enforcement.

2. A reply to this question cannot be provided without extensive research. It would be necessary to carry out such research when the ledger accounts are not in use for daily transactions. This is not practicable.

3. A reply to this question cannot be provided without research, as referred to in the reply to the preceding question.

4. In 1970-71, 207 warrants were issued for non-payment of maintenance pursuant to court orders; in 1971-72, 194 warrants were issued; in 1972-73, 167 warrants were issued, and in the present year to date, 98 warrants have been issued. These figures relate to warrants of commitment and warrants of apprehension.

5. A total of 300 of these warrants have been executed. Further research is necessary to ascertain the number of warrants of commitment issued during these years and satisfied by payment of the arrears.

6. The department regards as current, about 260 of the total number of warrants issued in the years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 and the present year to date.

7. There are 82 complaints for non-payment of maintenance awaiting hearing. These complaints are set for hearing in the Family Court section of the Adelaide Magistrates Court on various dates up to May 27, 1974.

8. There are about 400 known cases at present of defaults in maintenance payments under orders made pursuant to the Matrimonial Causes Act. Complaints will be laid in these matters, subject to further instructions, in certain cases, from persons entitled to receive payments.

9. Complaints being processed at present will be laid during the next week. In other matters, it is expected that the laying of complaints will proceed over the next four to six weeks.

REFERENDUM

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Does the Government advocate a "Yes" vote to all questions to be put at the coming referendum and if so, why?

2. If not, what is the policy, if any, of the Government in respect of each of these questions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The policy of the Australian Labor Party is for a "Yes" vote on all questions.

PREMIER'S DEPARTMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many persons are now employed in the Premier's Department and, of these, how many are:
   (a) press secretaries
   (b) information officers
   (c) executive assistants
   (d) public relations officers
   (e) publicity officers
   (f) research officers or
   (g) personal assistants?

2. How many persons were employed in the Premier's Department on March 26 in each of the years 1971 to 1974 respectively?

3. How many persons have left the department in the last 12 months and how many have joined it in that period?

4. How many persons are employed in the Industrial Development Division, and in what capacities?

5. How many were so employed on March 26, 1973, and 1974, respectively?

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

1. There are 185 persons employed in the Premier's Department, including weekly-paid employees at the Immigration Hostel. It must be pointed out that officers responsible to other Ministers are part of the Premier's Department.
   (a) There are two press secretaries, namely, Mr. A. Baker and Mr. M. Zaknich. Miss A. Koh is a research assistant who undertakes some press work.
   (b) There are no information officers.
   (c) There is one executive assistant, Mr. P. Ward.
   (d) There are no public relations officers.
   (e) There is a Chief Publicity Officer in charge of the Publicity Branch. He is Mr. J. A. Correll.
   (f) There are 13 research officers. Two are in the Economic Intelligence Unit. There are two in the Industrial Development Division and the remainder are in the Committee Secretariat.
   (g) There are no personal assistants.

Other Ministerial staff comprises Messrs. Hansford and Richards, who are employed as inquiry officers attending to persons who call to see the Premier with various complaints, and a private secretary, Mr. S. Wright, and two shorthand typists, Miss P. Mulberry and Miss N. Rankine.

2. Because of changes in Ministerial responsibilities and transfers of departments, gross figures are not relative or comparable. No figures are available to indicate how many persons were on the Premier's Department staff on March 26, 1971. However, on November 5, 1970, there were 76, and on July 31, 1971, there were 98 (these figures include Government Motor Garage employees in respect of the first date and State Planning Office employees in respect of the second date). On April 30, 1972, there were 82 employees, including 14 weekly-paid officers at the Immigration Hostel. On March 31, 1973, there were 149 officers, including 14 weekly-paid officers at the Immigration Hostel. This figure also includes staff at the Planning Appeal Board, Ombudsman's office, and the Committee Secretariat. At the present time 185 persons are employed. These officers are distributed as follows:

Administrative Division	41
Economic Intelligence Unit	5
Publicity Branch (that is, Government publicity section of Tourist Bureau)	18
Committee Secretariat	14
Policy Secretariat	10
Planning Appeal Board	25
Ombudsman's office	6
Industrial Development Division	31
Builders Licensing Board	9
Immigration	12
Immigration Hostel	14
	185

3. Accurate figures of staff transfers and resignations in the last 12 months are not readily available. It seems that 46 persons have left the department in this period, including transfers to other departments. The net gain was 36 persons.

4. There are 31 persons employed in the Industrial Development Division, less five in the office of the Minister of Development and Mines, leaving a total of 26 who are employed in the following capacities:

Director	1
Assistant Director	1
Promoting industry	4
Industries services (project officers)	6
Trade officers	3
Decentralization and development planning	3
Typing and clerical	5
Secretary to I.A.C., I.D.A.C., etc	1
Supernumeraries	2
	26

5. The total employed on March 26, 1973, was 14. The total employed on March 26, 1974, is 26.

PRESS OFFICERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How many press officers are at present employed by the Government and who are they?

2 To whom is each responsible and what is the salary of each of them?

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

1. Al present, 10 press secretaries are employed by the Government They are as follows:

Mr A. E. Baker, press secretary to the Premier.
Mr. J. Martin, press secretary to the Deputy Premier.
Mr. K Crease, press secretary to the Chief Secretary.
Mrs. I. Brown, press secretary to the Minister of Education.
Mr. R. Clarke, press secretary to the Attorney-General.
Mr B. Turner, press secretary to the Minister of Transport.
Mr. B. Muirden, press secretary to the Minister of Environment and Conservation.
Mr. R. Sullivan, press secretary to the Minister of Labour and Industry
Mr C. Bell, press secretary to the Minister of Health.
Mr. M. Zaknich, press secretary to the Minister of Development and Mines.

2 All press secretarial salaries are based upon the Metropolitan Dailies Journalists Award. The following press secretaries are classified as Special A journalists earning $12 102 a year: Messrs. A. E Baker, J. Martin, and K. Crease, Mrs I. Brown, Messrs. R. Clarke, B Muirden, R Sullivan, C. Bell, and M. Zaknich Mr. R Turner is classified as an A Grade journalist under the Metropolitan Dailies Journalists Award at an annual salary of $10 224. All press secretaries receive an overtime allowance of 10 per cent of their total award salary, with the exception of Mr. A E. Baker and Mr. K Crease, who receive an overtime allowance of 25 per cent of their total salary and Mrs I. Brown who receives no overtime allowance at all.

Dr TONKIN (on notice)

1. How many members of the staffs of each Government department are now involved in any way with publicity and media relations?

2 What are the total salaries of these officers in each department?

3. What are the specific duties of the most highly paid such officer in each department?

4. What was the comparable situation in relation to these matters as at May 1, 1970?

The Hon D A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's question is far too vague Many clerical officers have at times to deal in some way with inquiries from the media. It is quite impossible to answer the question meaningfully.

Mr HALL (on notice):

1. Are Messrs. Anthony Baker, Peter Ward, and Kevin Crease employed by the Government?

2 If they are so employed, in what capacity and at what salary, respectively?

3. Do they receive any other Government remuneration and, if so, what is it?

4. Have they performed any other duties and if so, what duties?

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

1. Yes

2. Mr Baker is a press secretary. He is paid at the rate of an A Grade journalist, namely, $232 a week, plus an overtime allowance of 25 per cent. Mr. Ward (executive assistant) is paid at the rate of an A Grade journalist, namely, $232 a week, plus a seniority allowance of $1 000 a year and 25 per cent overtime allowance. Mr. Crease (press secretary to the Chief Secretary and media co-ordinator) is paid at the rate of an A Grade journalist, namely. $232 a week, plus an overtime allowance of 25 per cent.

3. No.

4. They perform the duties allotted to them from time to time.

LOAN FUND

Mr. COUMBE (on notice): What was and is likely to be the position of the Stale Loan Fund on July 1, 1973, February 28, 1974, and June 30, 1974, respectively?

The Hon. D A. DUNSTAN: There was a surplus in the Loan Fund as at June 30, 1973 of $8 523 000 At February 28. 1974. the surplus had increased to $14 185 000. The Loan Budget provided for a surplus of $2 930 000 for 1973-1974 to give a surplus on Loan Account at June 30, 1974, of $11 453 000. A revised estimate suggests that the current surplus may reduce to $1 400 000, which would give a surplus on the Loan Fund at June 30 1974 of $9 923 000.

TAPLEY HILL ROAD

Mr BECKER (on notice):

1. What was the result of the traffic and pedestrian count taken recently on Tapley Hill Road, Glenelg North?

2. What action is intended on Tapley Hill Road for the siting of.

(a) a monitored school crossing, and

(b) a pedestrian crossing?

The Hon G. T. VIRGO The pedestrian and traffic count conducted in February, 1974. confirmed previous surveys that there were insufficient children crossing Tapley Hill Road near St. Leonards Primary School to justify the provision of a school crossing. However, the count did indicate that a full-time pedestrian crossing catering for both schoolchildren and other pedestrians could be warranted at MacFarlane Street. The matter is being taken up with the local authority concerned, and no decision has yet been made.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham) moved.

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable him to move a motion without notice.

The Hon D. A. Dunslan: What is it?

Mr. Millhouse. I'll give it, if you want it.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House. I accept the motion for suspension.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Tell me what it is.

Mr Millhouse: I will tell you, when I get the chance

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. HALL Yes, Sir

Mr. MILLHOUSE. The Premier has asked me to let him know what is the motion that I intend to move. I am only too happy to let him know straight away. The substantive motion is as follows:

That this House censure the Premier for his flat refusal, so that he may go on his trip overseas, to agree to an extension of the sittings of Parliament beyond this week to deal with the very large number of current controversial issues, such as the rocketing rise in the cost of living, the continued determination of the Government to control the media, the widespread resentment of the Government's

boating legislation, the disastrous economic effect of the fruit-fly infestation, the apparent willingness of the Government passively to accept the paltry amount for grants for South Australia proposed by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads, and the meat strike at the abattoirs; and secondly, the many items of unfinished business still on the Notice Paper.

I now proceed to explain the reason for my motion to suspend Standing Orders This morning the Premier was asked (and this is reported in this afternoon's *News)* whether he would allow the sittings of the Parliament to continue beyond this week. It is reported (and I believe accurately) that he rejected this proposal out of hand. In part, the report in the *News* states:

The Premier (Mr. Dunstan) today rejected three Opposition calls to extend the present session of State Parliament. Then there' is reference to the Leader of the Opposition, who, typically enough, based his suggestion for an extension of the sittings of Parliament on the position in the Legislative Council. Then the Leader of the Liberal and Country League in the Legislative Council (Hon. R C. DeGaris) is reported as saying that Bills should not be rushed through. Finally, my colleague, the member for Goyder, is reported to have said that important questions needed to be discussed at greater length. Those were the three calls

Again, typically enough, the Premier, in rejecting all three, ignored the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the L.C.L in the Upper House and said:

If Parliament is not meeting, Mr. Hall cannot put on turns to get headlines This is purely Senate electioneering.

I assure the honourable gentleman that my motion for suspension is not purely Senate electioneering. I believe that even in the past few days the issues that I have enumerated in my motion have come up and required time for debate in this House, as well as the number of things on the Notice Paper. If one looks at the Notice Paper, one finds that there are today five Government Notices of Motion and 18 Orders of the Day, so there are 23 pieces of Government legislation still to be considered by the House. There are also 10 matters of private members' business to be considered by the House. Therefore, there are 33 Orders of the Day yet to be dealt with by us before this session ends. The Premier nevertheless rejects the call which has been made by members on this side that we should continue to sit. Why does he do this? We all know the reason he wants to go away on his overseas holiday on Friday.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: A holiday?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course it is a holiday. He is going to the south of France What else would he do there? We get this absolute poppycock about seeing new towns—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —but does anyone not believe that this will be an eight-week holiday for the Premier at the taxpayers' expense? Does anyone believe—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has 10 minutes in which to advance the reasons why he seeks a suspension of Standing Orders. This is not an open debate, and the honourable member can only express his reasons for seeking the suspension of Standing Orders. That is all he can do in the 10 minutes he is allowed

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Right, Mr. Speaker. I cannot help feeling very angry when I think of the reasons which I was canvassing when you, Mr. Speaker, interrupted me a moment ago. There is no need for me to go on, because it is pretty well known in the community why the Premier is going, and he is even coming back here for 10 days in the middle of it. It is good enough to come back for Senate electioneering but it is not good enough to be here for—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: I rise on a point of order Mr Speaker. Despite your ruling that the member for Mitcham was out of order in pursuing this line of debate, he is continually being downright rude and stupid in relation to the proposed visit of the Premier, and I ask you, Sir,—

Mr. Millhouse: I won't go on with it, anyway.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO. If the honourable member does not want to go on with it, I suggest that the motion be put, the sooner the better.

The SPEAKER: I have pointed out to the honourable member for Mitcham (who should understand Standing Orders, having such a long record in this House) that the 10 minutes can be used only for the purpose of explaining why he considers that Standing Orders should be suspended. I repeal that this is not an open debate, and the honourable member must confine his remarks to his reasons for seeking the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: With respect, Sir, I point out that it will be three or four months before we get any further chance to debate the matters which I have enumerated in the motion and many others which are matters of current controversy in the community. There is no earthly reason why we should not continue sitting. In years gone by we have sat even into Holy Week, that is, the week before Easter Indeed, we did it last year and the year before. Why cannot we sit at least next week to continue the work of this House in the interest of the people of this State? I believe that we should, and that is why I have moved this motion. Otherwise, we will have at least a three-month break before anything more can be done. I am fairly confident in my mind (unless the Premier has changed his in the last week) in moving this motion, because when my colleague the member for Goyder moved a similar motion last week, the Premier referred to the Government's practice always of allowing (the suspension of Standing Orders, and I believe I have given him a full and frank explanation of the reasons why I want Standing Orders suspended. The Premier said:

I support the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders

He went on to refer to the constant tradition of Governments in this State and said:

I do so in accordance with the constant tradition . . . always observed by this Government—

that is, his own Government—

that, if any motion of no confidence is proposed, an immediate way will be made for it to be moved and debated.

Relying on that, I have so moved, because I believe that his refusal today to allow this House to sit on, despite the calls from members on this side, deserves the censure of the House, and I hope that it is not too late even now for the Premier to change his mind and for his Ministers to back him up and to allow the House to sit next week at least, so that we can finish the 33 Orders of the Day that remain on the Notice Paper up to this time, because obviously it is impossible, with them and the controversies that we will have with the Upper House, to get through them all this week. I believe that we should have adequate opportunity to debate the matters I have enumerated in the motion, what matters are in addition to the 33 Orders of the Day on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer); I oppose the motion.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you agree? You let us do it last week. No, it doesn't suit you now. How do you justify that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has a disgraceful record in this House of so manipulating and abusing—

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you answer with some argument?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —its procedures that changes in the procedure of the House have had to be made because of the way he, as a member, has acted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, I very much resent the Premiers suggesting (indeed, saying straight out) that I have abused the processes of the House. I have not done that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have acted entirely in conformity with Standing Orders, and I ask the Premier—

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —to withdraw that statement.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham, in accordance with Standing Orders. I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable Premier—the honourable member for Mitcham.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Oh, you don't want it, either. Right, you get the Premier to agree to this motion.

The SPEAKER: I warn the honourable member for Mitcham for the second time, in accordance with Standing Order 169. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask you, with very great deference, to uphold the point of order that I have raised. The Premier has said that I have—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —abused the processes of this House.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is untrue.

The SPEAKER: I name the honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. HALL: I rise on a point of order.

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

Mr. HALL: We'll see how democracy goes this week With your 185 staff in the Premier's Department, you throw him out!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You're scared—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: —of this issue.

Mr. Hall: You just throw him out.

The SPEAKER; Standing Order 171 provides;

Whenever any such member shall have been named by the Speaker or by the Chairman of Committees, such member shall have the right to be heard in explanation or apology, and shall, unless such explanation or apology be accepted by the House, then withdraw from the Chamber . . .

The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In conformity with that Standing Order, I desire to give an explanation of what I have said. I will not give an apology, because I do not believe an apology is warranted, but I very much resent what the Premier has said about me, and I believe you should have upheld my point of order. For the Premier to say that I have abused the processes of the House and to go on to say that that was the reason why Standing Orders—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're abusing them now.

Mr. Hall: That's a lie and you know it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am speaking in conformity with Standing Order 171. How am I abusing the processes of the House by doing that? The Minister of Education can interject when he wants to but he will not answer when he is asked to justify it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have not abused the processes of this House, and I have not done so today. I have acted entirely in conformity with the processes of this House, as I have done on other occasions. For the Premier to say that Standing Orders were altered because of me is disgraceful and he says it without justification.

The Hon J. D. Corcoran: Rubbish!

Mr MILLHOUSE: As the Premier knows, he has certainly not produced any justification. Why should I not resent the Premier's saying that of me? Why should I not ask that it be withdrawn? I am surprised that you. Mr Speaker, who are here to protect all our interests, should immediately come down on the Premier's side and not protect me as a private member when I am criticized in that way Now, I ask you again whether you would be kind enough to ask the Premier to withdraw what he has said about me, because it is entirely unwarranted and unjustified, and I believe I am entitled to persist in that request. It was during my persistence in that request that you saw lit to name me.

Having given that explanation, I now ask you to withdraw the naming, to uphold the point of order and to ask the Premier to withdraw, so that we can get on with what is the important matter in this motion, namely, the suspension of Standing Orders so that we may debate a motion of censure against the Government. This is a snide way of getting around a motion of censure, when the Premier has said that the Government will always make the way clear for a motion of censure to be debated. I know how much resentment there is of those on the eleventh floor of the State Administration Centre among members of the Labor Party. I know what has gone on inside, and those members do not want that information made public. They are afraid that that is the sort of thing that will come out in the debate on this motion. So it will, and so it ought to. Having given that explanation, I ask you to—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Mussolini would be proud of you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is all you ever do. You always call them to order but you warn us and then name us. Why do you not warn some members on the Government side? The Minister of Education is one of the most persistent interjectors in this place but, because he is a Minister, he gets away with it time after time. That is not fair, Mr. Speaker, and you are here to uphold the rights of all members, including those on this side. Time after time, we see the Minister of Education being told by the Premier to shut up but he does not take any notice and you do nothing about it. Now, I do not know what else I can say in explanation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Go on, say anything!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether you have been listening to my explanation; I hope you have been. However, I will repeat it in summary. I believe that the

Premier has said something of me which was entirely unjustified and which was, within the confines of this House, a bad thing to say, namely, that I have abused the processes of the House on this occasion and on other occasions so that Standing Orders had to be altered to suit my case. I resent that. All I did was ask you to protect me and to invite the Premier to withdraw, and when yon refused to do that you named me because I persisted. That is not fair conduct in the Chair, and that is why I became angry. I ask you now to accept my explanation that that is so and to allow me to continue with what is the important matter before the House, that is, the suspension of Standing Orders so that we may debate a motion of no confidence in the Government.

Mr HALL (Goyder) moved:

That the explanation of the honourable member for Mitcham be accepted.

The SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The question is that the motion moved by the honourable member for Goyder to accept the explanation given by the member for Mitcham be agreed to. For the question say "Aye", against "No". The Noes have it.

Mr Hall: Divide!

The House divided on Mr. Hall's motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold and Nankivell. Noes—Messrs. Langley and Wright.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

While the division was being taken:

Mr. BLACKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A point of order can be made only in accordance with the vote being taken:

Mr. BLACKER: Is it correct that the member for Mitcham should be in the House?

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Orders, yes, until the House has made up its mind on the motion.

Motion negatived.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Order 171. I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to leave the Chamber.

The honourable member for Mitcham having withdrawn:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): In accordance with Standing Order 171, I am now required to move the following motion:

That the honourable member for Mitcham be suspended from the service of the House for the remainder of this day's sittings.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I second the motion.

The House divided on the Hon. D. A. Dunstan's motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Langley and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Arnold and Nankivell.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Mr. Speaker, I move—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is a motion before the Chair for the suspension of Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! At this stage there is no motion before the Chair, because the previous motion before the Chair to suspend Standing Orders so that an urgency motion could be moved has now lapsed.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport) moved:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable him to move a motion without notice.

The Hon. D. A Dunstan: What's the motion?

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House, I accept the motion for suspension. Is that motion agreed to?

Several members: Yes.

Mr. Hall: Be careful, or they'll throw you out.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member for Goyder disregards the authority of the Chair when the Speaker is on his feet, he knows how Standing Orders deal with that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My substantive motion is as follows:

That this House view with grave concern the present critical situation of fruit fly infestations in the Adelaide metropolitan area, and urge the Government to immediately adopt suitable quarantine measures to stop future infestations from occurring; furthermore, that this House call for a Government inquiry into the organization of the fruit fly eradication programme.

I point out that, before the House sat today, I informed the Premier that I intended to move this motion. I believe that Standing Orders should be suspended to enable me to move this motion, for the following reasons: Within the metropolitan area, we have a critical situation, to say the least, with regard to the fruit fly infestation. Last Thursday, 19 infestations were found in the Vale Park area. Last Friday, six infestations were found, and yesterday three new infestations were found. The situation is critical. It was obvious from the fact that the outbreak was so widespread that some of those fruit fly were second generation or third generation flies. Therefore, the infestation has been present for a period of between four and six weeks. I have moved the motion to suspend Standing Orders on the ground that the infestation of fruit fly in South Australia will have serious economic consequences for the fruit industry. Already, we have seen an announcement in the *Advertiser* that South Australia will lose about $4 000 000 worth of fruit normally exported to Sydney and Melbourne markets. We have within the metropolitan area a total fruit production of about 25 000 tons (25 400 t) a year, all of which is in jeopardy unless the fruit fly infestation can be controlled. I have moved the motion because the recent infestations reported at Vale Park and St. Peters are the seventh and eighth infestations in the declared regions within the metropolitan area. This is the worst fruit fly outbreak that Adelaide can remember.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has a limited time in which to explain why he believes Standing Orders should be suspended. He does not have the right to debate the subject matter of the motion that he intends to move if Standing Orders are suspended.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was pointing out to the House that the current infestation of fruit fly in the Adelaide metropolitan area is the worst that we have experienced for many years. For this reason, I should like Standing Orders to be suspended to allow this

matter to be debated I will give further reasons why I believe Standing Orders should be suspended Ths measures taken by the Government to control the entry of fruit into South Australia are obviously not working, and it is important that the Government re-assess these measures—

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable members that he can now only say why he considers Standing Orders should be suspended Again, I point out that the subject mailer of a motion intended to be moved later cannot be debated when an honourable member is explaining his reasons for the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you. Mr. Speaker. I was pointing out to the House (I think quite lightly) the urgency of reviewing our present quarantine measures For this reason, I should like to see Standing Orders suspended. They should also be suspended to enable the House to debate the issue referred to in the motion: that quarantine measures be established around the metropolitan area. The whole fruit industry in the Barossa Valley, the Murray Valley and other areas—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not continually advise honourable members of their rights. If honourable members cannot be told of, and understand, their rights, they should not continue The honourable member for Davenport has moved a motion to have Standing Orders suspended. He cannot debate the matter that will be the subject of a further motion if Standing Orders are suspended.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you for drawing that to my attention, Mr. Speaker. I was pointing out the economic consequences of the present critical situation obtaining in South Australia. With this in mind, I should like Standing Orders suspended to enable the motion that I have foreshadowed to be debated.

Dr. Eastick: It's an important one to South Australia

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The situation is critical. The whole South Australian fruit industry depends on this House, and Standing Orders should be suspended—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport is continually referring to the subject matter of a motion that he intends to move later He cannot continue along those lines. He must merely explain to the House his reasons for seeking the suspension of Standing Orders If the honourable member persists with this line of debate. I will have to rule him out of order.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was simply trying to point out to the House the urgency of this matter, which is an important one on which, I hope, Standing Orders will be suspended. This matter has risen only during the last week and over the weekend, and members now suddenly realize the magnitude of the problem, which is of critical proportions and which requires urgent and dramatic action by the Government. I have therefore moved that Standing Orders be suspended to enable the House to debate the substantive motion. It is urgent that this be done today. At the end of this week, Parliament will be prorogued for, to say the least, an extended period, and it is apparent that this will be one of the last chances members will have to debate this critical matter. With this point in mind I have moved the motion. I emphasize again the critical situation facing us. I refer to the recent outbreaks in the Vale Park and St. Peters areas. Obviously, some of the measures that have been implemented are not working.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Davenport cannot continue along those lines.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) I ask the House not to agree to the suspension of Standing Orders. The Opposition knows perfectly clearly what the tradition and procedure has been in this House for the debating of matters of urgency or motions of no confidence.

Dr Eastick: We know. We know we get the gag pulled on us

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has not had the gag pulled on him. Indeed, the honourable gentleman knows perfectly well that on matters of urgency there is a proper procedure. He did not follow that procedure. He did not send the necessary letter to you, Mr. Speaker, and he did not rise in his place on an adjournment motion and gain the support of members. That is the proper procedure available to him.

Mr. Coumbe: The last urgency motion was gagged.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it was not The last urgency motion proceeded in accordance with Standing Orders.

Mr Coumbe: It was gagged.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not gagged. No urgency motion that has been moved in this House has had the motion "That the motion be now put" moved in relation to it.

Dr. Eastick: Would it make any difference?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course it would. The honourable member would have his full time on an urgency motion. However, he did not move an urgency motion. What he did was to do what the Opposition has repeatedly been told will not be permitted in this House. The business will not be taken out of the Government's hands on a suspension motion to debate anything that comes into a member's head. That has never been allowed by any Government in this State and. indeed, it was never allowed by the previous Government when it was in office

Mr Dean Brown: Isn't fruit fly an urgent matter?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not say that the fruit fly outbreak was not important. Indeed, the Government regards it as extremely important, and it is taking action on it.

Mr. Gunn: What was the position in 1953?

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is being silly, as usual.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That wasn't silly.

The Hon D. A DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows that what I am saying is correct, because this matter was discussed in the House earlier this session. The Opposition was clearly told that a suspension motion to take business out of the Government's hands would not be permitted any more than it had been permitted by previous Governments.

Dr. Eastick: Are you frightened of the consequences?

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN. No. It is not part of the traditional procedures of this House available to an Opposition or a private member to move a motion of urgency, but he may debate a matter in a grievance debate. More generous provision is given in this House in relation to questions, grievance debates and urgency matters than is given in any other Parliament in this country. Honourable members know that perfectly well. Indeed, I discussed with the Leader of the Opposition what the tradition of this House had been, and I said that the Government intended to follow exactly the procedure that had been followed by every previous Liberal and Country League Government On one other matter, I made the Government's position perfectly clear. We have always allowed no-confidence motions to be moved in this House, but we will not allow

any member merely to come in here, put up any subject matter that he likes (regardless of whether it involves a matter of confidence in the Government), tack a censure motion on to it, and say, "That is how we will go about taking the business out of this Government's hands."

The Opposition can forget that one. If a no-confidence motion is genuine, debate will be allowed, but, if it is an abuse of the proceedings of this House it will not be allowed, because we do not intend that the business of this House shall be delayed while we have that business on our hands. We have much work to do. Early in the session we had complaints about there not being enough work and, now that there is work to do, members opposite do not want to do it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: You've got five new Bills for today.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg understands Standing Orders, I presume.

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: Members know perfectly well the procedures available to them, but they have not used them. They cannot use procedures that no Government has ever agreed to in this House.

Dr. Eastick: Yes, they have been agreed to

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: No, they have not been. In my absence on a previous occasion, a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders was accepted, but that was not in accordance with what had been previous precedents.

Dr. Eastick: Is that an admonition?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader was told clearly what the future position would be on this subject.

Mr. Coumbe: You accepted one from me

The Hon D. A. DUNSTAN: That was done on a warning that in future it would not be agreed to.

Dr. Eastick. It was agreed to, wasn't it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was agreed to simply because there had been an understanding by the Opposition, on the basis of a previous allowance of a motion to suspend Standing Orders, that the Opposition could proceed in that way Because that happened, I wanted to facilitate the right of the Opposition in those circumstances, but I warned the Opposition that previous procedures would be adhered to in future. I believed that that was perfectly clear to the Opposition and I tried to help members opposite. As to the warning supposed to have been given to me today, the honourable member came here at one minute to two o'clock and said, "I want to move a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders." I said, "About what? He said, "About fruit fly." I said, "That's not on."

Mr. Coumbe: At least he had the courtesy to come and tell you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He had more courtesy than someone else had, but I would expect that: I would not suggest to the honourable member that he get down to that level. Members have means available to them, as they know, to raise matters in Question Time and in the traditional grievance areas and to move a motion of urgency. The only other way they may initiate in this House a debate that takes from the Government time that would otherwise be used to complete the Government's programme is by moving a no-confidence motion that is genuinely a motion of no confidence.

Mr. Mathwin: You've cut Question Time down.

The Hon. D. A DUNSTAN: I remind those members who have been here long enough to remember that the position that I am taking on this matter is exactly the position that Sir Thomas Playford took, as Leader of this House for 27 years.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The honourable member has moved a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. What is the point of order?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Premier implied that I had informed the Government at only one minute to two—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot raise a point of order at this stage. We are dealing with a motion to suspend Standing Orders, and the only point of order that can be taken is one dealing with the question that the House is considering. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I now put the question "That Standing Orders be suspended." For the question say "Aye"; against "No". As I hear a dissenting voice, it will be necessary for the House to divide.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen and Arnold. Noes—Messrs. Langley and Wright.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

PRICES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what action the Government intends to take under the Prices Act to bring about more effective control of food prices in South Australia? Once again, South Australia has featured prominently as regards the increased cost of living, even though there is price control in this State, the recent increase here being 2.2 per cent compared to the national average of about 1.3 per cent. Having regard to the oft-quoted comments by the Premier that South Australia is a better State in which to live, because of its controls—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader is now commenting.

Dr. EASTICK: I ask the Premier what action the Government intends to take to maintain effective control over food prices in South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader quotes not the total of the C series index but the food price element in it, and I point out that the major increase in food prices has once again been in respect of meat The Leader well knows that there is no means whatever of exercising effective price control over the price of meat in this State. The reasons for this are obvious and have been repeated often International meat prices are rising constantly There are very high international prices for meat, and there is constant international economic demand for this commodity. However, there is no control over the sale of meat from South Australia to killing areas other than South Australia, in view of section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution. If we implement wholesale meat price controls at the sale yards in South Australia, that will simply mean that meat does not reach the South Australian market: it will go to other sale yards. The Leader, whose Party is associated with primary production, knows that perfectly well. The only control that South Australia could conceivably exercise is in relation to retail margins on meat.

Dr. Eastick: You don't think it's anything to do with the massive increases in killing costs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not at all. In fact, any examination of the changes in killing costs in South Australia will show that those who have worked in accordance with the new procedures have been able to contain any cost increases and, indeed, from the new killing procedures to gain an advantage.

Mr. Hall: That's not so.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is so, and the report on this by the South Australian Meat Corporation was made in considerable detail after consultation with the retail meat industry. What we have done, of course, is cut out the cost incurred as a result of a certain number of butchers going out and spending a day at the abattoirs.

Mr. Hall: Why don't you deal with the general increase in killing charges?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Goyder knows that during Question Time a member can ask a question and that a reply can be given to that question. Interjections are out of order and will not be tolerated, and only the reply to the question will be given. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In this quarter it had been expected that there would be a fall in the price of potatoes, but because of the seasonal situation that fall has not occurred. The Leader, with his connection with primary industry, well knows why that is so. The wholesale prices of most grocery items are increased in other States, and there is no means under a one-State price control system of controlling wholesale prices in those States. The Leader well knows that, too. We have controls only in relation to the retail margins in South Australia, and in most cases these are very competitive. If the Leader can show us that we ought to be looking at a certain margin in the retail area, I should be grateful if he would tell me the specific instances, but otherwise why in the world does he ask me this question when he went out and advocated a "No" vote to stop the control in other States of those very wholesale prices that are now affecting members of the South Australian public?

Dr. Eastick: Whom are you trying to fool?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has asked a question, to which the honourable Premier is replying, and he knows that he cannot continue to interject and seek further replies to the question already asked.

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think you will appreciate that Standing Orders require that, when replying to a question, a Minister cannot make comments that make it necessary for an interjection to be made in order to correct a wrong impression given.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order, because during Question Time, when a question is asked and a reply is given, there is no need for interjections. Standing Orders prevail, and they provide that a member can ask a question and someone else can answer that question. However, they do not permit interjections, and that situation shall continue during replies to questions. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have answered the Leader's question.

JURY FEES

Mr. SLATER: Can the Attorney-General say whether it is likely that any consideration will be given to increasing the current payment made to persons required to attend for jury service and, in addition, whether, in the light of present-day circumstances, the extra payments made to certain jurors are considered adequate?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The fees payable to jurors have recently been increased in the sense that provision has now been made for a juror to be paid the amount actually lost by him up to a maximum of $30 a day The base rate now for jury service is $10 a day. A juror, on establishing that he has actually lost an income greater than $10 a day, may receive up to $30 a day. In order to do this, he must produce evidence of his actual loss and, if he is an employed person, he is provided with a certificate to be signed by his employer. If he is a self-employed person, however, he is required to give his own certificate of the amount lost. This provision has been made recently, although I cannot give the honourable member the precise date offhand, and it is thought to be adequate at present Of course, with changing wage rates it will be necessary to keep the matter under review, and I will certainly do that. There is no immediate plan, however, to vary the rate which, as I say, has been adjusted only recently.

SCHOOL FACILITIES

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Education say what is the Government's policy on encouraging ethnic groups to use primary schools for the purpose of receiving tuition in their own language at the end of the school day? It has been brought to my notice by members of the Greek community that there have been variations in the charges made by primary schools for the teaching of the Greek language and of religious instruction in certain cases, the amounts being charged by the respective schools under the appropriate regulations varying from about $20 a year for a room to between $240 and $320 a year, and this seems rather excessive. I had hoped that the policy would encourage this type of activity within schools and, therefore, while asking about policy I would be willing to give the Minister privately the material I have in this regard so that he can investigate the matter in order to provide some relief.

The Hon HUGH HUDSON: The policy is one of encouragement, and I have been completely dissatisfied with some charges that have been proposed at some schools to ethnic groups wishing to conduct language classes outside school hours, although I have not heard of charges as high as $240 or $320 At present, this matter is being investigated and I am awaiting a report from my department. When I receive that report, I intend to set an upper limit on any charge that can be made by a school for this purpose, and to make clear that this is an activity of interest to ethnic groups that schools must encourage by providing the use of school facilities outside school hours.

MOUNT GAMBIER INTERSECTION

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Transport discuss with officers of the Highways Department the question of providing some form of traffic control at the intersection of Commercial Street West, Sutton Avenue, and White Avenue, Mount Gambier? This intersection has been considered dangerous for many years and many accidents have occurred at this locality. Despite the fact that traffic islands have been installed in the past two years, accidents still occur, the latest one being yesterday morning. It is imperative that, in the interests of safety at this intersection, it should be controlled by traffic lights or a similar installation that will compel traffic to reduce speed.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have this matter investigated and obtain a report for the honourable member.

INFORMATION OFFICER

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say why applications are being called for the position of Information Officer to the Public Service Board, and what deficiencies in the activities of the board does the Premier consider will be overcome by appointing such an officer? Furthermore, is it a fact that the Premier's Executive Assistant (Mr. Ward) is one of the members of the interview board examining applicants? In reply to a Question on Notice received today, it seems that there are now about 185 employees in the Premier's Department. Also, we find that many press officers are employed, some of them receiving a salary of more than $15 000 a year. It is generally believed in the community that there has been much too large a build-up of Government press officers, but now a position is being advertised for an information officer for the board on the salary range of $9 228 - $9 685. I should like the Premier to explain why this position is considered necessary.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain for the honourable member a report from the Public Service Board.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Minister of Education intend to negotiate with private bus operators who at present provide school bus services? In this morning's press the Minister is reported to have said:

We are not going to negotiate under a threat of them pulling out services.

To me, the Minister's words seem to constitute a threat. On radio this morning, the Minister said that he knew very little of the matter and that he thought it would have been better if the case for increases had been put to him earlier. I remind the Minister that this matter has been raised many times in the House by the member for Murray—

At 3.15 *p.m., the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! Call on the business of the day.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1973. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Mr. Gunn: No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This Bill makes miscellaneous amendments to the Crown Lands Act, and it will be convenient to explain it in terms of its various clauses. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 makes various amendments to the definition section of the principal Act. The first set of amendments relates to the definition of Crown lands. At present Crown lands are defined as all lands in the State except—

(a) lands reserved for or dedicated to a public purpose;
(b) lands lawfully granted or contracted to be granted in fee simple by the Crown; or
(c) land subject to any agreement, lease or licence granted by the Crown,

but includes land which, having been alienated, is subsequently acquired by the Crown.

It is not intended, however, that lands subject to a lease or licence granted under the Mining Act should cease to be Crown lands by virtue only of that lease or licence. An amendment is therefore made to the definition accordingly. The amendments also exclude from the definition land that has reverted to, or has been acquired by, the Crown where the lands are comprised in a certificate, grant, or other muniment of title that has not been cancelled in pursuance of the principal Act Some lands, which are technically Crown lands within the meaning of the definition, arc in fact administered by other authorities. A practice of long standing has existed under which such lands continue to be comprised in the old certificate or grant, with a notation showing that the lands have reverted to the Crown.

The discretionary power to cancel the certificate was not always exercised. It is not intended that these lands should be subject to the administration of the Crown Lands Act. The effect of the amendment therefore is to exclude these lands from the provisions of the Crown Lands Act. The definition of "public map" is amended to provide that only maps deposited in the Lands Department as public maps shall come within the definition. A new definition of "vermin" is inserted in order to make the Crown Lands Act consistent with the Vermin Act. Clause 4 makes a metric conversion to the principal Act.

Clause 5 amends section 9 of the principal Act. This section empowers the Minister to withdraw Crown lands from sale or lease, and re-offer those lands for sale or lease after advertisement in the *Gazette.* At present paragraph (c) of section 9 provides that the lands must be advertised for one month in the *Gazette.* This limitation of time is considered to be inappropriate. The Government believes that the extent of advertising should depend on the value of. or demand for, the land. Clause 6 repeals the present section 19 of the principal Act and enacts sections in its place. Under these new sections the board is granted more extended powers of entering land and of examining documents for the purposes of making surveys and of inspections and obtaining information in relation to the land.

These clauses together with clause 7 which follows reflects the Government's decision that the Land Board should control and co-ordinate valuations in regard to the acquisition of land and buildings required by Government departments, and to arrange for the disposal of land and buildings no longer required by Government departments. The provisions are roughly comparable to existing provisions of the Valuation of Land Act. Clause 8 makes a drafting amendment to section 27 of the principal Act which is complementary to amendments made to the Act by the amending Act of 1969.

Clause 9 is to be read in association with clause 14. The new subsection inserted by clause 9 does not actually involve the grant of any new power, but it does draw attention to the fact that the Government may in appropriate cases issue a perpetual lease on terms limiting the lessee's right of compensation in the event of resumption of the land. The amendments made by clauses 9 and 14 are proposed in relation to the issue of leases to sporting bodies

and the like. Provided that the lease is issued subject to more limited rights of compensation than are included in the standard form of lease, it will be possible to make the land available at rentals related to the use to which the land is put

Clause 10 amends section 41d of the principal Act This section deals with the purchase of town lands at Whyalla The first amendment repeals a provision dealing with personal residence It is consequential on amendments that were previously made in 1969. The second amendment does away with the condition that plans and specifications of building work on those lands should be approved by the Minister It is felt that the Corporation of the City of Whyalla now has adequate power to deal with the building work that may be carried out on the Whyalla town lands. Clause 11 makes amendments that are consequential on metric conversion of the principal Act Clause 12 amends the provision relating to minimum rental under a lease or agreement. It is felt that a minimum rent or instalment of an amount less than $5 cannot be economically justified when the cost of administration is considerable Clause 13 amends section 50 of the principal Act. This section enables the Minister to reduce the purchase money or rent payable under an agreement to purchase or a lease The present provision provides that where reduction is granted any amount overpaid shall be credited against future commitments. It is considered equitable that, in cases where a substantial sum is involved, the money overpaid should be returned

Clause 14 is complementary to clause 9. Clause 15 repeals section 54 of the principal Act. This section deals with the reservation of minerals and is inconsistent with the Mining Act. 1971. Clause 16 repeals section 55 of the principal Act. This section also is redundant in view of the provisions of the Mining Act. Clause 17 amends section 64 of the principal Act This section deals with the service of notices, and the effect of the amendment is to make the procedure for serving nonces on Licensees the same as for lessees Clause 18 amends section 66a of the principal Act. This section empowers the Minister to add small areas of Crown land (not exceeding $2 000 in value) to the land comprised in a lease. It is felt that the restriction of $2 000 is too limiting and the amendment therefore raises that amount to $4 000.

Clause 19 makes a corresponding amendment to section 66b of the principal Act which deals with the addition of Crown land to land granted in fee simple. A further amendment is made to subsection (4) of this section for the purpose of facilitating administration. Clauses 20, 21 and 22 make metric conversions Clause 23 amends section 102 of the principal Act. The amendment exempts the irrigation works under the control of the Lyrup Village Association from statutory rates and taxes This exemption is similar to exemptions available to similar bodies such as the Renmark Irrigation Trust. Clause 24 makes a metric amendment. Clause 25 makes amendments consequential on the metrication of the principal Act Clause 26 amends section 206 of the principal Act. This section deals with the conditions of a new lease issued on the surrender of an old lease. The effect of the amendment is to clarify the obligation of lessees under these leases. It is not appropriate in all cases that the conditions should be those governing the old lease, and amendments are made accordingly. Clause 27 amends section 225 of the principal Act. This section deals with the transfer of Crown leases. The provision that the notice of application for consent to transfer must be published for two weeks in the *Gazette* is deleted and a provision that consent shall not be granted before the expiration of one week from the publication of the notice in the *Gazette* is inserted in lieu thereof.

Clause 28 amends section 228 of the principal Act. This section deals with the sale of Crown lands. The present provision providing for the sale of any land not exceeding $400 in value is unnecessarily restrictive, and the sum is therefore increased to $4 000. Clause 29 amends section 228a of the principal Act. This section provides that any town lands may, if the Minister so determines, be offered at auction on terms that the buyer may at his option purchase the lands for cash or on agreement for sale and purchase This provision is expanded to cover any lands offered for auction pursuant to Part XIII of the principal Act. Clause 30 amends section 228b of the principal Act. The right of the Governor to sell Crown lands for cash to certain statutory bodies is expanded to cover the State Planning Authority and the Monarto Development Commission. Clause 31 enacts section 228c of the principal Act. This section enables the Governor to sell to the holder of the licence lands that have previously been held under licence. On occasions it is desirable to grant the fee simple to the licensee where he has erected substantial improvements or proposes to make substantial improvements to the land. Clause 32 amends section 230 of the principal Act. This section provides for the publication of a notice of an auction to be made in the *Gazette* for not less than four consecutive weeks. The reference to "four consecutive weeks" is deleted for reasons to which I have previously referred in relation to corresponding amendments.

Clause 33 amends section 232h of the principal Act. These amendments correspond to previous amendments made by the Bill and are inserted because the Corporation of the City of Whyalla now has adequate power to deal with building development within the city. Clause 34 deals with the conditions subject to which town land may be sold. The conditions that the Minister may impose consist of a condition that the purchaser shall make improvements of a specified kind on the land, or a condition regulating or restricting the manner in which the land may be used Clause 35 enacts section 234b of the principal Act. This section deals with the forfeiture of land to the Crown where a purchaser has failed to comply with a condition subject to which it was purchased. In case of such forfeiture, it may be just that the Government should make some refund of purchase moneys, and this section accordingly empowers the Minister to do so. Clauses 36 and 37 make metric amendments to the principal Act Clause 38 provides for the annual renewal of a licence. At present, if the Act is strictly interpreted, a new licence should be granted in each year. This would be administratively very cumbersome.

Clauses 39 and 40 make metric amendments to the principal Act Clause 41 deals with the case where land has previously been granted in fee simple and reverts to the Crown In such a case the certificate of title may be cancelled under section 268. It would be administratively convenient to be able to revive the certificate if the land is subsequently granted again The amendment enables this to be done Clause 42 makes metric amendments to the principal Act. Clause 43 enables the Governor to make regulations in relation to the survey of land subject to the provisions of the principal Act. Clause 44 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clauses 45 to 50 amend the schedules to the principal Act. These amendments are consequential on the metrication of the principal Act and on certain previous amendments thereto.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee). The debate on this Bill was left on motion at my request, because the Crown Lands Act is a complicated one which involves examining many volumes to ascertain the amendments made to it. I am grateful to the honourable member who made a reprint available to me. It helps one to understand the amendments being made by the Bill now before us. Having spent the limited time I had available in studying the legislation. I realize that three main issues are covered by the Bill, apart from the fact that certain amendments have been made to bring the legislation more into line, such as the redefinition of "Crown lands", and in the definition of "vermin" to bring it into line with the Vermin Act

The main clauses are 9 and 14, which will permit the Minister to issue leases to sporting, and other bodies at reduced rental This provides a restricted lease at a reduced rental to enable people such as sporting bodies to have use of the land at low cost on the understanding that if it is resumed they will be compensated only for what improvements they may have made or for what the Minister decides. They will be able to recover nothing for any increased value of the land

The second aspect is clause 23. which relates specifically to the Lyrup Village Association. I am pleased to see this clause, because I received correspondence from the Minister only a couple of months ago in reply to a letter from me agreeing to the irrigation easements in the association being exempt from rates and taxes. Clause 23 validates that exemption and makes it proper for any of the irrigation easements to be exempted specifically from the Act for the purposes of rates and taxes The third thing the Bill does is to effect metrication changes. In many of the clauses the amendment is basically that of changing from acres to hectares and from other forms of standard measurement to metrication.

One or two other matters contained in the Bill facilitate its administration. Clause 28 provides for the sale of land. Previously there was a restriction of S400 on the value of land that could be auctioned, this sum has now been increased to $4 000. which is considered reasonable. Clause 29 is much the same as clause 28, because it also amends section 228 of the principal Act Clause 30 also amends section 228 of the principal Act to enable statutory bodies, such as the State Planning Authority and the Monarto Development Commission, to be included, together with a number of other statutory bodies that may hold Crown lands.

The important provision to my colleague, the member for Eyre, is clause 31, which provides that a person holding land under licence may have his licence converted to fee simple if he has carried out sufficient improvements to the land for the Minister to be satisfied that they are substantial and that the holder has reasonable grounds for seeking a more permanent tenure. Instead of having to go through the cumbersome procedure of applying for an agreement to purchase, then finally being granted fee simple, the Minister may transfer the land directly from a licence to a fee simple title.

The next important area is clauses 34 and 35. Clause 34 changes the condition under which town blocks may be sold. In many cases it imposes the requirement that a purchaser must undertake certain improvements within a prescribed time

Hitherto, if the purchaser has been able to carry out the conditions of the lease or purchase, he may be called on to surrender the lease and whatever capital improvements he has made or whatever money he has spent on the block. Under clause 35, which amends section 238 of the principal Act. in the event of such a sale or purchase breaking down, it is now possible for the licensee or lessee to obtain a refund from the Minister, which would be considered to be just compensation for the surrender of the block and just compensation for whatever had been spent by that licensee or lessee in developing the block. That is a reasonable proposal. It is a good amendment. As I said at the beginning of my speech, most of the amendments, other than those dealing with restricted compensation for land under special Lease with respect to the provision to exempt from rates certain land under the control of the Lyrup Village Association, are to assist in facilitating the administration. They are the principal clauses and principal amendments in this Bill. In the time I have had to look at it, I have discovered no objections to the Bill. I believe the amendments to be advantageous and I support the Bill.

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

The Hon J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr NANKIVELL (Mallee): The House has just passed 50 amendments to consolidate the Act I suggest to the Government that it might be appropriate to have a new look at the Crown Lands Act and, if possible, to bring it up to date, as many of its terms and conditions are ancient and not applicable to today's situation

Bill read a third time and passed.

RATES AND TAXES REMISSION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the remission of rates and taxes upon land for certain persons; to amend the Waterworks Act, 1932-1973, the Sewerage Act, 1929-1974; and Land Tax Act; 1936-1972; the Local Government Act, 1934-1972, and the Irrigation Act, 1930-1971 Read a first time

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Mr. Coumbe: No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Minister of Works.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This Bill gives effect to the Government's policy in regard to remission of rates and land tax outlined prior to the last election. There is no doubt that there are sections of the community to whom the payment of rates and land lax is a heavy burden and it is just that some remission of this burden should be granted. The present Bill provides that the Minister, or his nominee, may by instrument in writing declare a certain person to be eligible for the remission of rales and land tax This will normally be done where an application is made in the prescribed form setting out facts and circumstances which, according to criteria established by the Minister, show that a person is within a class of ratepayer to whom the payment of rates and taxes is likely to be a heavy burden. Where such a declaration is made, the person liable for rates and taxes obtains the remission prescribed in the various rating or taxing Acts.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 establishes the procedure under which a person may be declared to be eligible for the remission of rates and land tax. Where

he is liable for rates and land tax jointly with some other person who is not so eligible (not being his spouse) the declaration may state that he is entitled to a proportionate remission. Clause 6 provides that an eligible ratepayer is entitled to a remission of 60 per cent of his water rates or to a remission of $40, whichever is the lesser. Clause 8 provides a similar remission in respect of sewerage rates. Clause 12 provides a remission of 60 per cent of land tax or $80, whichever is the lesser. The provisions of section 58a of the Land Tax Act, providing for the remission of the metropolitan levy in certain cases of hardship, are abolished.

Clause 15 deals with the remission of rates under the Local Government Act. In this case lhe remission is 60 per cent of the rates or $80, whichever is the lesser. "Rates" are, for this purpose, defined as the aggregate of the rates payable by virtue of any general rale, special rate, separate rale or minimum amount payable by way of rates, declared or fixed under Part XII of the principal Act, and include any fees fixed for garbage disposal under section 537. Where a council fixes an effluent rate under section 530c of the principal Act, the eligible ratepayer will be entitled to a remission of 60 per cent of those rates or $40, whichever is the lesser. Where a council remits rates under the new provisions, the Minister reimburses the council from the general revenue of the State. Clause 18 enacts similar provisions in the Irrigation Act. The remission is again 60 per cent of the rates or $40, whichever is the lesser.

Dr EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, which honours a promise that was made by both Parties at the last State election. Indeed, it goes a step further than was first intended, the rebate on pensioners' rates being increased from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. I accept what the Minister said: that, after reviewing the escalation in valuations that has occurred in local government and other taxation areas, it was necessary, if the concession granted to pensioners was to be meaningful, for the rebate to be increased to this extent. This is the situation that the Government, working through the Treasury, can accept as being tenable or otherwise. Only the Government is able, with the information available to it, to say how it can financially sustain this amendment

Although I cannot quibble with the Bill, because it will benefit many people in the community, I ask certain questions regarding it. Clause 4 (1) provides that the Minister, or a person nominated by him. for the purposes of making declarations under this provision, may by instrument in writing declare that a person is eligible for the remission of rates and land tax. Subclause (2) refers to the Minister or a nominated person, the clear inference being that the Minister himself will not be involved in the decisions that must be made regarding the legislation. I realize that this is sensible administratively. However, I should like the Minister to say what type of person will make decisions on his behalf. Will it be clerical staff; is it intended that the person to be nominated by the Minister will occupy a certain niche in the administration, or will a senior departmental officer be charged with this responsibility?

I note that no opportunity is provided in the Bill (and I have checked this through) for a person to appeal against the decision of the Minister or his nominee to refuse his application. Why did the Minister consider that a measure of this nature could be proceeded with, when much discussion could ensue regarding those who will benefit, and when the Bill does not give a person who believes his case has not been adequately considered the right to appeal? Perhaps the Minister believes that a person who believes his case has not been considered adequately has the right to go to the Ombudsman. It would have been reasonable to include in the Bill a provision that persons could go to an authority and say, "I have not been successful in my appeal, although I believe that I fulfil all the necessary qualifications. My circumstances have not been clearly understood by the Minister or his nominee, and I do not believe that I should be denied this consideration." I would like to hear from the Minister in this respect before being able to give my unqualified support to the Bill.

Certainly, the amendments in the Bill are consequential on the real crux of the measure: the determination of the eligibility for remission of rates and land tax. Two other aspects are causing considerable concern in the community, one of which was highlighted in this House during the debate on the Appropriation Bill. It was pointed out then that local government was reacting to the direction given by the Minister of Local Government regarding the repayment to pensioners of the 10 per cent over-payment in rates. When the measure was first mooted, and before this Bill was introduced, local government and the public generally were given to understand that the concession would be 50 per cent. Subsequently, however, it was increased to 60 per cent, although many pensioners had made payments to councils at the 50 per cent rate. The 10 per cent extra benefit is now to apply to those persons. The Minister directed that this repayment be made in cash, as opposed to the councils being given an opportunity to decide whether to retain the difference as an advance payment on next year's rates.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There could be a death.

Dr. EASTICK: That is so, but in such a case there would be a pay-out in due course. The figures that were given to the Treasurer during the debate on the Appropriation Bill showed (and many members have received this type of representation from councils) that, at a time when councils are trying to reduce costs as much as possible, they are being directed to forward many cheques to ratepayers, the costs for which councils must bear. I have asked the Government to reconsider the matter and to give the council an option as to whether the 10 per cent that it holds on behalf of the pensioner will be repaid or whether it will be held against the rates for the next year.

Only small amounts of money are involved. The pensioners are pleased to receive the benefits and that small amount of money is not likely to cause them embarrassment. However, representations have been made about a real problem that has arisen. I know that the member for Fisher has received correspondence on this, and a letter that I have received from a person in the Mannum area states:

With reference to the pensioner concession of 60 per cent of water and land rates granted by our State Government, I applied in June, 1973, to the department concerned for this rebate. I received the grant for water back-dated to June but no word from the Mannum District Council, I eventually received an account of $32 being full rates. Since then I have waited for an amended account. Finally, on February 28, the last day to pay, I sent my cheque for $12 80, deducting 60 per cent. I then received a letter dated March 5 to state that my name appeared on week 19 at page 73 and that my eligibility is August 1, 1973. They also tell me that since the council rate was declared on July 26 I am not eligible.

When the council had prepared all the documents so that it could declare the rate early in 1973-74, the persons concerned applied but did not receive acceptance until after the rate was struck and is now denied the benefit for that year.

Mr. Payne: There's the case of persons who happen to purchase the day after the declaration of the council rate.

Dr. EASTICK: I am pleased that the member for Mitchell has made that point. Is this an anomaly, or do we say merely that these people are unfortunate? I support the Government's intention that all persons eligible during the council year 1973-74 should benefit by the full 60 per cent during that time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There must be a cut-off date.

Dr. EASTICK: I appreciate that, but the person to whom I have referred had applied in June, 1973. If a person becomes a pensioner in August, the benefit should apply for only part of the 12 months. However, in the other case there should be an adjustment There is no difficulty with quarterly water and sewerage rating, because a person will at the most pay for only three months at the higher rate, although this benefit does not apply to land tax.

I should like to know whether this matter has been considered thoroughly and whether the Government has decided that the amount of work involved in correcting it is so great that it should not be done at the expense of the authorities. If the Government has considered this, I cannot quibble at the decision, but it should be stated clearly whether the difficulty was recognized and action was taken.

In the case I have mentioned, the person paid, on the last day for payment, only the portion that she thought she was required to pay, and now she is saddled with not only the balance but also the 5 per cent fine from March 1. A council that is told of the difficulty can waive the fine, but it must apply it in the first instance Many people who are old enough to obtain the pension become frustrated and upset at having to go backwards and forwards inquiring about what they thought was their right. I should like to know why there is no provision for appeal by a person whose application is rejected by the Minister or his nominee.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): First, the matter of to whom the Minister is likely to delegate authority is a matter for administration, and in his case it will be the Director and Engineer-in-Chief, whose department will administer the scheme. Regarding an appeal by a person who is refused a concession, the responsible Minister will publish in the *Gazette* the criteria on which a declaration may be made, and the intention is clear regarding eligible persons. The criteria laid down will show that there is no need for an appeal. The Commonwealth Government, not the State Government, issues medical entitlement cards or pensioner concession cards. If there is to be an appeal against whether such cards should be issued, it would be to the Commonwealth Government. These criteria will involve a decision not by the person to whom I delegate the authority but by someone else. Either people will be receiving the pension or they will not be. This assistance, however, will apply to people in necessitous circumstances. The question of a person being eligible after a council has issued its rate has been considered from the point of view of administration, but there must be a cut-off date. Many people may become eligible for pensions during the year, and this causes many problems.

Mr. Coumbe: What about a change of residence?

Mr. Mathwin: What if they sell the house?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They would receive the concession if they were eligible, but many difficulties and anomalies could arise in administration. The Government intends to provide concessions wherever possible, and we have increased the rate by JO per cent because of the increase in values.

Mr. Evans: Why not make the cut-off date February 28?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That also causes a problem. Generally, if we try to overcome some anomalies, others are created. This matter has been given much consideration, but there seems to be no overall solution to the problem However, if the fault is with the department in not dealing with an application so that the delay causes the rates to be paid, a remission will be granted after the matter has been considered. If any member has a problem brought to his attention he should refer it to the Government, because each case will be considered on its merits.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Eligibility for remission of rates and land tax."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the Minister for his explanation and for inviting members, who are told by pensioners of mistakes that are not the fault of the pensioner, to apply to his department. Is it intended that the entitlement for concessions for water and sewerage rales will apply on a quarterly basis, or will it apply to the assessment date, that is, July 1?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I understand that it will be based on the assessment date rather than on a quarterly basis, but I will inquire and give the Leader details later.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 18) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIBRARIES AND INSTITUTES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Libraries and Institutes Act, 1939-1967. Read a first time.

The Hon HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I realize the difficulties of the Opposition in this matter!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mathwin: We want to hear your explanation. We haven't got copies.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Honourable members have been given copies. The object of this Bill is to put into effect the Government's undertaking to make the State Librarian an *ex officio* member of the Libraries Board. Numerous advantages will, of course, accrue from the creation of this liaison between administration and the governing body. Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 fixes the commencement of the Bill on a day to be proclaimed. Clause 3 increases the membership of the Libraries Board from seven to eight, so as to include the State Librarian as a member.

Mr. CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

KINGSTON COLLEGE OF ADVANCED EDUCATION BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to reconstitute the Adelaide Kindergarten Teachers College as an autonomous college of advanced education under the name of the "Kingston College of Advanced Education"; to provide for its administration and define its powers, functions, duties and obligations; and for other purposes Read a first time

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it

Mr. Goldsworthy. No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused The honourable Minister of Education

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It appears that members opposite are abominable "no-men"

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I have already pointed out once this afternoon that Ministers are not permitted to be directly provocative. As the Minister of Education is obviously using that ploy, I ask you to draw his attention to Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order I called on the honourable Minister to give his second reading explanation Although I did not hear whatever was said, I immediately called for order. The honourable Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To explain, I said members opposite were abominable "no-men"

Mr Coumbe: Read the explanation.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They do not appear to deny it. This Bill continues the process of converting colleges of advanced education in this State to autonomous, self-governing colleges. This is in pursuance of the State Government's policy and also that of the Australian Government, which will make funds available for colleges that are self-governing. The Bill will convert the Adelaide Kindergarten Teachers College into a college of advanced education under the name of Kingston College of Advanced Education.

It was necessary to change the name of the college, for members will recall that the former Teachers College is now renamed the Adelaide College of Advanced Education It was also desirable to drop the word "Kindergarten" from the title, as the general policy for all colleges of advanced education is that they shall gradually become multi-purpose institutions. This may be difficult to achieve on the present site at North Adelaide in the case of Kingston College, but provision must be made for this eventuality.

In selecting the name Kingston, the Government is not only honouring a great South Australian but is also continuing a trend in nomenclature which has been adopted in the case of Murray Park, Sturt, and Torrens Colleges of Advanced Education. Members will recognize that this Bill largely follows the pattern of the Bills introduced in 1972 in converting the former teachers colleges to colleges of advanced education.

Under clause 4, the college is established as a body corporate and given the usual authorities of a body corporate. Clause 5 places emphasis on the functions of the college in providing advanced education and training for those who seek to practise the profession of teaching in pre-school education. This, of course, has been the strength of the Kindergarten Teachers College for many decades. It is proposed to add to the college and strengthen its enrolments in an endeavour to supply more teachers so that a greater proportion of pre-school children may benefit from a year of pre-school education in established kindergartens.

Under clause 6 the college is granted the same kind of powers to award degrees, diplomas and other awards recognized and approved by the Board of Advanced Education. In this provision, and in others, the college is given the same standing with regard to the Board of Advanced Education as are all other colleges of advanced education in South Australia. Clause 7 removes any possibility of discrimination on racial, religious or political grounds and also on the grounds of sex. Members will note that is makes provision for the college to make special provision for students overcoming some cultural or educational disadvantages.

Clause 8 provides for the management of the college by a council of the normal pattern which provides for participation of stall and students, together with other people experienced in education and some persons from the general community. This last provision is vitally important to any college that must exist within the community that it serves. Clauses 9, 10 and 11 are largely the usual machinery clauses covering the operations of the council.

Clause 13 sets out the authorities of the council and appoints it as the governing authority of the college. The college is required, under clause 14 to co-operate with other bodies which are active in the tertiary area of education, whilst clause 15 makes provision for the council to determine the internal organization of the college.

Clause 16 makes provision for the council to appoint a Director and determine his duties. The Director will, of course, be a member of the council *ex officio.* The college is urged to promote the development of an active corporate life by clause 17.

Clause 18 provides for the college to hold its own lands, including such Crown lands as may be vested in the college by the Crown. Provision is also made to transfer the present properties occupied by the college from the ownership of the Kindergarten Union of South Australia Incorporated to the college. This provision is in pursuance of an agreement entered into with the Kindergarten Union for the independence of the college. I may say in passing that the Government has in mind a Bill to constitute the Kindergarten Union of South Australia Incorporated under Statute. That will be introduced next session. A small mortgage on one of the properties will also be transferred from the union to the college.

Clause 19 is an important clause that guarantees continuity of employment to college staff who were, of course, originally appointed and are employed by the union. Protection is given by the clause, which provides that the status and salary of each staff member shall not be reduced on transfer to college employment. Members will note also that existing and accruing rights with regard to various kinds of leave are also guaranteed As the Kindergarten Union has operated a superannuation fund for its own employees, members of the college staff will have the right to elect to remain as contributors to that fund or become members of the Superannuation Fund of South Australia. The college will be required to meet

the employer responsibility with respect to superannuation but the staff member will decide the fund to which he will contribute.

Clause 20 gives the college the power to make statutes covering the normal operations of the college, and clause 21 enables the college to make by-laws for the protection of college property and the movement of people and vehicles therein. These provisions are normal and follow the general powers given in this respect to all other colleges. They incorporate the usual safeguards in that the statutes and by-laws must be placed before Parliament within a stated time. Clause 23 requires the council of the college to prepare an annual report on the operations of the college for presentation to the Governor and to Parliament Clause 24 makes provision for the audit of the accounts, and clause 25 makes provision for the finances of the college subject to the recommendations of the Board of Advanced Education in exactly the same way as applies to other colleges of advanced education. Clause 26 grants a borrowing power that is subject to the approval of the Treasurer. Clause 27 places the college in the same position as other colleges of advanced education in granting an exemption from certain taxation. I should pay a tribute to the work of Mr. Braddock and the Board of Advanced Education in the preparation of this legislation and also in the co-operation that has been given by the people currently associated with the Kindergarten Teachers College and those associated with the Kindergarten Union. It would not have been possible for us to advance this far without their co-operation.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): In opening the debate on this Bill, I want to say a few things.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel will have to seek leave to suspend Standing Orders if he wants to proceed with the Bill at this stage. I point out that only a Minister can move a contingent notice of motion to allow debate on a Bill to proceed immediately after the second reading explanation has been given.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a disgraceful state of affairs—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows what the Standing Orders provide, without questioning the authority of the Chair.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Do I understand that you, Mr. Speaker, are ruling that I cannot move for the suspension of Standing Orders!

The SPEAKER: This is a Government Bill. The honourable member has the right to move "That this debate be now adjourned", but only the Minister has the right to move another motion. The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY moved:

That this debate be adjourned until Tuesday, April 2.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Kavel has moved "That this debate be now adjourned". I point out to honourable members that this is a Government Bill. The question is ''That this debate be now adjourned." Is the motion seconded?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr. Speaker, are you giving a ruling on my motion to adjourn the debate until next Tuesday and on whether I am competent to move that motion? I seek your ruling, Sir. whether it is competent for me, as the member moving for the adjournment of the debate, also to move for the debate to be adjourned until next Tuesday?

The SPEAKER: Under Standing Orders an honourable member may move "That this debate be now adjourned." The continuation of a debate is left in the hands of the mover of the second reading motion. The honourable member has the right under Standing Orders to move "That this debate be now adjourned."

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Then I move the only thing that I can move:

That this debate be now adjourned.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: That this debate be made an Order of the Day for—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On motion.

Motion carried; debate adjourned.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon G T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1972 Read a first time.

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: I move.

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second leading explanation incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Dr. Eastick: No!

The SPEAKER: Leave is refused. The honourable Minister of Local Government.

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: I thank the Opposition, and stale that the Bill makes miscellaneous amendments to the Local Government Act, and it can be best explained by reference to its various clauses Clauses 1 and 2 are formal Clause 3 amends the definition of "ratable property" in the principal Act The only amendment of substance is that land held by the Crown under a lease will become ratable property under the new provision. At present, land held by the Crown under lease ceases to be ratable property for the purposes of the Local Government Act Clauses 4 and 5 provide for the appointment of a deputy mayor who is empowered to exercise the powers of the mayor in his absence. Clause 6 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 7 makes an important amendment to the principal Act in regard to the time at which ordinary meetings of the council are to commence. The amendment provides that such meetings must always commence in the evening unless the council by unanimous resolution resolves that they should commence at some earlier time in the day Clause 8—

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Minister is deliberately not reading parts of his second leading explanation. He has jumped half way through his explanation of Clause 7 to his explanation of Clause 8 as it appears in the second reading explanation circulated to me, an Opposition member who has to debate the Bill. As I wish to follow the Minister as he goes through his explanation of the Bill, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to request the Minister to read his second reading explanation as circulated to members.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member for Glenelg that I cannot uphold his point of order, as any statement that is made in this House is the responsibility of the person making it. I have no control over the circulation of certain documents and, provided that any honourable member speaks to the subject matter then before the House, I cannot uphold any point of order that is raised. That matter is in the hands of the honourable member who is speaking.

Dr EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker Only about 30 seconds ago the Minister sought leave to have this document incorporated in *Hansard* without his reading it. Would you, Sir, not agree that the Minister is now seeking to make an explanation to this House that is not in accordance with that which he sought to have included in *Hansard?*

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable Minister sought leave to have a certain matter inserted in *Hansard* without his reading it, and leave was refused. It is therefore for the Minister to decide what he shall say in relation to the second reading explanation, provided that he conforms to Standing Orders.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I seek clarification of this point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That the record in *Hansard* will show what the Minister said and not what is typed on his copy of the second reading explanation.

The SPEAKER: Order! The official record of this Parliament is the document which is signed by the Speaker: the Votes and Proceedings of this House.

Mr. MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I ask for your direction. The Minister has supplied me with a copy of what he has to say this afternoon, and he is not proceeding on the lines of the copy that he has supplied to me. I ask that, if the Minister is not going to speak to the document of which he has given me a copy, he provide me with a copy of what he intends to say

The SPEAKER: I have no jurisdiction over what any honourable member says in this House, except as to how it conforms to Standing Orders. All I suggest to the honourable member is that, if he wants to know what is in the second reading explanation, he listen to it, because any honourable member may speak and deliver his own subject matter.

Mr. Goldsworthy: *Hansard* will be a bit thin.

Mr. Coumbe: Start again.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Bill, which amends the Local Government Act, contains miscellaneous amendments. Therefore, it can be explained by reference to the various clauses. Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the definition of "ratable properly" in the principal Act. The only amendment of substance is that land held by the Crown under a lease will become ratable property under the new provision. At present land held by the Crown under lease ceases to be ratable property for the purposes of the Local Government Act.

Clauses 4 and 5 provide for the appointment of a deputy mayor, who is empowered to exercise the powers of the mayor in his absence. Clause 6 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 7 makes an important amendment to the principal Act in regard to the time at which ordinary meetings of the council are to commence. The amendment provides that such meetings must always commence in the evening unless the council by unanimous resolution resolves that they should commence at some earlier time in the day. This amendment is of considerable significance, because it will enable ordinary working men and women and men and women involved in carrying on small businesses to serve as members of the council. Many are now excluded because the times at which the council meet are incompatible with their employment or their business commitments.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're the only one who doesn't sound like an exhausted peacock!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no provision in this Bill about peacocks, but there is provision for the workers to be able to stand for councils and attend council meetings! Secondly, this amendment will enable more ratepayers to attend meetings of councils so that more people may become involved in civic affairs and, I may say, see what goes on in some of these council meetings.

Clause 8 amends section 157 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is to ensure that an employee of a council who serves continuously under a series of councils will be regarded as having been in continuous employment for the purpose of computing long service leave. At present his service is only deemed to be continuous with one earlier period of service in the employment of another council. The amendments also provide that the new provisions relating to superannuation and long service leave will apply to controlling authorities constituted under Part XIX of the principal Act. A machinery amendment is inserted to enable the council to obtain details of the previous employment of any of its employees in the service of other councils so far as that is necessary to compute rights of superannuation and long service leave.

Clauses 9, 10 and 11 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clauses 12 and 13 provide that a council may insure the spouses of any member or officer of the council while acting in the course of official functions. Clause 14 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 15 provides that a council may, with the consent of the Minister, grant a licence for installing pumps or equipment on or near a public street or road for the purpose of conveying water. Clause 16 enables a council to grant licences for roadside restaurants and cafes. Clauses 17 and 18 make drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 19 empowers a council to borrow money for the purpose of enabling it to provide long service leave and superannuation to its employees. Clause 20 provides that a council shall not convert park lands that have been dedicated as such under the Crown Lands Act into a caravan park unless the Minister of Lands has consented to that conversion.

I now seek leave to have the remaining part of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF REMAINING CLAUSES

Clause 21 provides that a council may lease park lands of up to 6 hectares in area and, with the consent of the Minister, may lease a larger area. Clauses 22 and 23 deal with the supply of gas by a council. The present provisions under which the council must itself own the gas works are eliminated. The Peterborough council, for example, supplies natural gas reticulated from the pipeline operated by the pipelines authority. Clause 24 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 25 provides that a hide and skin market, or saleyard, must be licensed if established within a district council district. At present a licence is only required if it is established within a township within the district.

Clause 26 enables a council to maintain and conduct a market and saleyard. Clauses 27 and 28 make consequential amendments to the principal Act. Clause 29 provides that, where a council takes action to remove unsightly objects, it may recover the cost of its action from the owner or occupier of the land. Clause 30 makes consequential amendments to the principal Act Clause 31 makes drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 32 provides, that a copy of the valuation roll prepared under the Valuation of Land Act will be evidence of the Government assessment. Clause 33 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act.

Clause 34 provides that a council may keep its records on microfilm, and the production of the microfilm record will be sufficient compliance with any requirement to produce the record in legal proceedings. Clause 35 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. Clause 36 increases from 10c to $2 the fee that a council may charge for supplying details of unpaid rates and imposts upon

properly within its area. Clause 37 makes drafting amendments to the principal Act. Clause 38 and the schedule convert references to measurements into metric terms.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): Generally, I support the Bill. However, it would be entirely remiss of me not to point out that the Bill was introduced only today, so that I have had little opportunity to study it in depth. Given the little time at my disposal, I shall point out some deficiencies that I think the Government should examine. Clause 3 refers to Crown land under lease which, under this provision, becomes ratable property. Although I welcome this measure as a step in the right direction, as a person who has had over 14 years experience in local government, I should have liked to see all Government property eligible for rating by local government. Many properties could return substantial finance to local government, which needs much more money to carry out its duties over a wide field. I support clause 3, although I am sorry that it does not cover all Government properties. New section 49a provides:

(I) A municipal council may at any meeting choose one of the members of the council to be deputy mayor.

(2) The deputy mayor shall hold office for such term and on such conditions as may be determined by resolution of the council.

Clause 5 repeals section 70 of the Act and inserts the following new section in its place:

(1) If the mayor or chairman of the council is for any reason unable to perform the duties of his office on any occasion or during any period, the deputy mayor or deputy chairman may exercise the powers and perform the duties of the mayor or the chairman of the council in his place.

(2) Where there is no deputy mayor or deputy chairman, the members of the council may elect one of their number to be acting mayor or acting chairman of the council, and he may exercise the powers and perform the duties of the mayor or chairman on any occasion, or during any period, for which the mayor or chairman is unable to perform the duties of his office.

I wonder why existing section 70 has been repealed, as this procedure has been followed many times. Indeed, the Mayor of Mitcham died recently and an acting Mayor had to be appointed. Also, when the Mayor of Brighton passed away last year, a deputy had to be appointed immediately. I cannot understand, therefore, why the Government has seen fit to amend this provision, especially when the procedure outlined in the new section has already been adopted.

The Minister has said in his second reading explanation that clause 6 makes a drafting amendment to the principal Act. It amends section 83 of the Act by striking out "and local government" from subsection (1) When one looks at section 83, one wonders also why this provision has been included in the Bill. As the Minister has obviously had more time than I have had to consider the Bill, will he say why that provision has been included. Clause 7 relates to the meeting times of councils. Councils normally decide when their ordinary meetings are to be held. Indeed, some even stipulate a certain finishing time. I cannot understand why this provision has been included, because in his second reading explanation the Minister said:

The amendment provides that such meetings must always commence in the evening unless the council by unanimous resolution resolves that they should commence at some earlier time in the day.

It is often difficult for some people who work during the day to attend day-time meetings. I cannot understand, therefore, why this provision has been included, although I do not oppose it. The reference to a unanimous resolution means not that the majority of council must vote but that there must be a unanimous vote of council. There should be flexibility in relation to the country. However, I will leave that aspect to my country colleagues.

Most council committees in the metropolitan area meet in the evenings. It has been suggested that meetings should be held alternatively, that is, one in the afternoon and the next in the evening, and so on. Perhaps this could be a compromise. Indeed, if the Minister was in a compromising mood, he could consider this aspect for my colleagues, who will experience difficulty attending country council meetings. Of course, this could suit certain people who could attend meetings either in the afternoon or in the evening and try to rule the roost by holding out for their desired ends.

Clause 8, which amends section 157 of the Act, ensures that a council employee who serves continuously under a series of councils during the period of his working life will be regarded as having been in continuous employment for the purpose of long service leave and superannuation benefits. The Bill has many good points, and this is one of them. I therefore support this provision entirely.

Clauses 12 and 13 provide that a council may insure the spouses of any member or officer of the council while acting in the course of official duties. However, most councils already do this, anyway. I should be surprised if any metropolitan councils are not insuring the spouses of their members or officers against injury while attending official functions. Clause 16 repeals section 370 of the Act and inserts new section 370a in its place, as follows:

(1) The council may grant a licence permitting any person to use (subject however to any other relevant Act or law) any portion of a public road or street as a place for the supply and consumption of food and drink.

(2) A licence under this section may be subject to such conditions as the council thinks fit and includes in the licence.

(3) A fee fixed by resolution of the council shall be payable for a licence under this section.

All members realize that the Adelaide City Council does exactly that. Indeed, the Premier in his many talks on this matter has emphasized the great Mediterranean climate that South Australia enjoys and said how we should take full advantage of it by allowing cafes and restaurants to open in this way. If the Minister and his Premier allow Jetty Road, Glenelg, to become a mall, we in Glenelg, the premier seaside resort of Australia and the birthplace of South Australia, will be able to provide the Government and overseas tourists with a full benefit of the provision. Even a member of this House recently pronounced the word "maul" but all who spoke about the recent accident in London pronounced it "mal", so at least that settled one argument we have had here: a "maul" is something that happens when a person is not looking. However, I support the clause dealing with malls and I am pleased that the Government has allowed councils to fix a fee in this matter.

Clause 19 empowers a council to borrow money for the purpose of enabling it to provide long service leave and superannuation for its employees. Most councils, if not all, have a fund for this purpose and any council that must borrow money to pay for these items is in a bad way. If a council must borrow money for this purpose, there will be a time lag and the employees concerned will have to wait. There is no need for this clause.

Clause 21 provides that a council may lease park lands up to 6 ha in area and, with the consent of the Minister, may lease a larger area. Here we have the Minister getting into the act. We have gone through five pages without that but now the Minister is in it right up to his neck! No-one can do anything about this and the Minister must consent before an area larger than 6 ha is leased. The relevant

section of the principal Act is section 457, and that does not refer to the Minister.

The Act has worked well since it was introduced in 1934 (indeed, the volume that I have commences in 1837) without the Minister's having to give his consent, yet merely because we have changed the reference to area from acres to hectares and gone metric the Minister has decided that he must come in and that councils must obtain his consent in this matter. I object to that provision, and I do not understand why the Minister wants it. I should like to know whether he has any relevant cases on hand and why he wishes to get into the act now.

Clause 24 seems to be all right. I have no gripe with that. It merely strikes out the reference to the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, 1925, and inserts the term "by the Land and Valuation Court". That brings the provision up to date, and I have no quarrel with that. Clause 27 deals with the power to license bazaars. It strikes out of the principal Act the term "the municipality or any township within the district" and inserts "its area". I should like to have a definition of "bazaar". When I was in Turkey recently, I saw a bazaar that had 1 400 shops in it. Did the Minister have that in mind? How many bazaars are there in South Australia? I have not seen one for a long time. I have not had time to look at the dictionary definition of the word, as I received the Bill only a few minutes ago. Clause 29 provides that, where a council takes action to remove unsightly objects, it may recover the cost of its action from the owner or occupier of the land. This is an important provision, and I support the Minister in introducing it. In the metropolitan area, particularly in North Adelaide, people have dumped cars on car parks or on property belonging to other people. Wrecked cars have been dumped all over the place, and the council has not been able to do much about it. People dump cars on a road; no-one knows who owns them; and the cars are left there for a long time. Until now, the council has had the problem of finding out who is the owner and it has then had to take the owner to court. If the council has won the case, it has been able to get some money from the owner, but very little. This amendment allows councils to recover the cost of their action from the owner or occupier of the land. It may be unfortunate for someone who owns land on which a car is dumped, but probably some provisions may prevent this owner from being responsible for someone else's properly on his land. Councils will be assisted by this part of the legislation.

Clause 34 provides that a council may keep its records on microfilm, and the production of the microfilm record will be sufficient compliance with any requirement to produce the record in legal proceedings. I agree with the Minister's action in this regard. Other matters to which I should like to refer concern councils in country areas, but I hope the Minister has taken some notice of my remarks The long schedule alters imperial to metric measurements. I have not checked these measurements, because the second reading explanation was given to me at about 4 p.m., and. with the help of the Minister, I received the Bill immediately before the dinner adjournment. Il was still wet when I received it

I apologize to the Minister for not perusing the schedule to ascertain whether it is correct. I hope the Minister will reply to some of my questions and, if I have missed any, perhaps he will point them out to me. The late presentation of this legislation has made it difficult for the Opposition, as the Bill is expected to be passed soon so that it may go to the Upper House this evening for perusal and debate. I hope some of my colleagues will have the chance to refer to aspects of the Bill in relation to country areas, especially district councils. They may be able to put forward a point of view to the Minister in the hope that he may be flexible in his thoughts and open to suggestions from Opposition members, and that he will accept some of the amendments that may be submitted. I support the Bill generally

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I am amazed that the Minister of Local Government has been able to prepare about 35 clauses of amendments to the Local Government Act of which at least six are desirable. Some amendments are in the interests of councils in particular and the community in general. I have been able to peruse this Bill for a short time only, but from that brief perusal I know that some amendments are undesirable and not in the best interests of the community or councils. Generally, this Bill is another document that demonstrates the Government's intention: that is, to destroy the real effectiveness of councils throughout this State. I will cite the areas in which the Minister intends to take away the rights of responsible people who have been looking after their communities.

At first sight clause 3 has a desirable intent, because it seems to be providing the chance for councils to collect, for the first time, ratable income from land held by the Crown. Without considering the sinister side, one cannot help but wonder why such a carrot is being dangled before the nose of local government. What is the real implication of this clause? What are the long-term effects of accepting this sort of gift from one hand, when so often we have received such gifts but have had them taken away by another hand? I cannot understand what the Government intends with this provision, but when Crown lands become ratable and an unimproved value is placed on the land, who will act for the Crown to object or accept the assessed value of the lands which, under this clause, will be subject to rates? I hope the Minister will reply to that interesting question. I do not object to clauses 4 and 5, which provide for the appointment of a deputy mayor for a corporation or council, as it is desirable to have a deputy to act for such senior officers. I do not understand the meaning of clause 6, because I have not bad the chance to research this item.

Having read clause 7 carefully, I cannot understand why the Minister chooses to interfere with the workings of councils to the extent intended by this clause. Councils have functioned satisfactorily and to the benefit of this Parliament, the community generally, and their respective communities for many years, but continual interference of this nature in the mechanics of the councils must have an undesirable effect. By this clause the Minister intends to force councils to meet during certain hours of the day. I know that the matter has been raised by the member for Glenelg This provision may be acceptable with regard to city councils. However, country councils mainly meet during daylight hours, because they have found this to be the best time to meet Having made this decision in their own right, they should not be interfered with by the Minister and his department.

The Hon G. T Virgo: We aren't interfering.

Mr CHAPMAN: The Minister is grossly interfering with the rights of councils to use the democratic majority system of decision. Although district councils may not endure for much longer, in the meantime it is only fan that they be able to make their own operational decisions under a majority system, a system which the Minister often states should exist in other areas. By the majority system, councils should decide whether they meet in the afternoon, the morning, or at any other time. Under clause 7, the Minister proposes to take away this ordinary operational right of councils, forcing them to meet in the

evening The only way a council can choose not to meet in the evening is, when all members are present, to have a unanimous vote that the meeting be held before 6 p.m

It is unreasonable for the Minister to try to force this sort of thing on councils. To illustrate my point, I give the example of council areas in which councillors must travel long distances. It is convenient for such country councillors to meet during the day. Let us consider the situation where most members of a country council live away from the central township and where the township ward has multiple representation. Under this provision, it needs only one member from the township to object to a day-time meeting and the other members will be involved in the unnecessary expense and inconvenience of attending an evening meeting.

Mr. Duncan: How would it cause them expense?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Perhaps the honourable member has not travelled to council areas outside Elizabeth; he certainly does not understand the expense involved in this work.

Mr. Gunn: Has he been a councillor?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not know whether he has been a councillor; judging from some of his interjections, I should say he has only recently left school. In some cases, country councillors travel long distances to attend council meetings and to deal with community affairs It is inconvenient for them to attend meetings in the evening.

Mr. Duncan: Does it cost more during the day than it costs at night?

Mr. CHAPMAN: In some cases, a council would meet during the day but, under this system, because of one dissenting voice, it would have to meet in the evening, with councillors living far away being required to attend at that time. If a meeting started at 6 p.m., it would follow in some cases that the meeting would still be taking place in the early hours of the morning.

Mr. Keneally: What section of the community would be most disadvantaged by having council meetings in the afternoon?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am saying that most country councillors would be affected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. CHAPMAN: You're telling me!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to ignore interjections.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Not only extra expense but also extreme inconvenience will be caused to these councillors because of the dictates of a bureaucratic central group.

Mr. Max Brown: How is it expensive?

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is expensive all right. Councillors make a substantial contribution to the community by performing their duties.

Mr. Wright: Why is it more expensive?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Obviously few members opposite have had experience in this field. If they had had experience, they would want to retain the right for councils to meet in accordance with a majority decision. In Committee, I will move amendments to give back to councils the right of decision that they deserve. Another provision in the Bill deals with the continuous employment of an employee by a council. In most respects, this provision is reasonable. It is only just that all employees (apart from the Town Clerk, who is currently provided for) should enjoy the right of having their long service leave and superannuation benefits accrue. However, I refer to the case of a council employee who has worked for five councils. When he takes employment with the sixth council, his long service leave and superannuation benefits would have accrued during his term of employment with the other councils. Therefore, it seems reasonable that each of the councils for which he has worked should cover their part of his long service leave and superannuation payments. Unless this aspect is covered, a council may refuse to take on an employee because of the expense involved in his accrued long service leave and superannuation entitlements. I do not believe that any employee should face possible refusal of employment because of provisions in this Bill. I hope the Minister will clarify this matter when he replies to the debate.

Clause 20 refers to the transfer of land, providing that a council shall not convert park lands that have been dedicated as such under the Crown Lands Act into a caravan park, unless the Minister of Lands has consented to that conversion. This provision demonstrates once again how the Minister is usurping the few powers local government now enjoys and handing them back to the central authority, whether it be within his own department or within other sections of the central machinery.

Clause 25 provides that a hide and skin market, or saleyard, must be licensed if established within a district council district I do not object to licensing such places, but I believe again that the council concerned ought to be given discretionary power and that provision should be made for it if it so wishes, but it should not be dictated to in this matter. There may be instances (and again I refer to country areas) where a council wishes to license and control such places more closely, but surely, with the assistance of the Central Board of Health and their own skilled staff, they have proved beyond doubt over a long time that they are capable of running their own affairs in this regard. Again I believe that councils are being dictated to by the central controlling authority and that this is another slur on the integrity of local government generally.

Clause 36, which increases the fee a council may charge for supplying details of unpaid rates and imposts upon property within its area, is a valid and reasonable provision. However, again I say that instead of it being a dictation it ought to be a provision that councils may charge up to $2, not a direction that $2 be the fee. This is another clear example of the type of dictation councils are receiving from the central body and another case whereby the Minister is demonstrating his disregard for responsible parties that make a valuable contribution to the community. One of these days I hope that the Minister and his colleagues will appreciate the value of local government and its application to outer area affairs and that that appreciation be shown and acted on before the local government groups to which I have referred are destroyed altogether.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): I strongly support the Bill. I did not initially intend to speak in this debate but, after hearing the contribution of the member for Alexandra, it was imperative that I speak in the interests of my constituents. The contribution from the member for Alexandra clearly indicates his thundering opposition to the working people of this State. Members are not unused to that kind of contribution from him, and we have seen another example of it this evening.

I particularly want to direct my remarks to clause 7, believing that the amendment provided by clause 7, which is a most important one in the interests of the ordinary working people of this State, will lead to a far greater cross-section of the community participating in local government. It is well known in the community that councils in the past have effectively used the provision that permits them to hold their meetings at any time of day to prohibit working people from taking part in local government.

Mr. Coumbe. What do you mean by "working people"?

Mr. DUNCAN: People who work for their living from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., the normal working hours in the community.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you suggesting that we're not working people?

Mr. DUNCAN: It is well known in the community that many district councils have used this provision to try to keep working people off councils. Later, I will refer to specific examples that will throw right back on the Opposition the sort of arguments it has been putting up. The member for Alexandra referred to this as being outside the interests of the community and of local government. However, if ever legislation provided for the interests of the community and, in my view, the interests of local government, it is clause 7, which provides that meetings of local government shall commence after 6 p.m. The reason is clear: to ensure that all people in the community who work from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. (that is, the great majority of the people) can attend local government meetings and so contribute in the same manner as anyone else in the community to local government in their area. It is this kind of thing that the Opposition sees as a threat, and it is the contribution of working people that the member for Alexandra sees as a threat to the narrow sectional interests he represents in this Parliament. I refer now to specific examples to illustrate how working people are absolutely prohibited from taking part in local government, because of the financial loss they would suffer if they took part in present circumstances. Far from preventing councils from meeting during the day, clause 7 does no such thing: it provides that, if all members of the council can attend meetings during the day, such meetings may be held during the day. However, if any member cannot attend meetings during the day, he should have the right to attend evening meetings. Why should that not be?

Mr. Chapman: Let him take a day off the same as everyone else.

Mr. DUNCAN: It is easy for the member for Alexandra to suggest that. He is a rich man and speaks for the wealthy in this Chamber.

Mr. Coumbe: When does the Elizabeth council meet?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DUNCAN: The member for Alexandra is certainly much wealthier than the average person who works for wages.

Mr. Coumbe: You can have my overdraft if you like.

Mr. DUNCAN: I was not referring to the member for Torrens. The member for Alexandra said that this was dictatorship by the Government. It is no such thing: it is protection of the interests of the people of this State, and the member for Alexandra knows that well.

Mr. Chapman: You're starting to guess again.

Mr. DUNCAN: No, I am not. What the member for Alexandra said is that the interests of the majority of the people of the State are not the interests of the people he represents. Therefore, he is opposed to the provision. That is the only reason why he is opposed to it. In reply to the member for Torrens, who asked what time of the day the Elizabeth council meets, I am pleased to say that it meets in the evening. However, for the elucidation of the honourable member, I point out that my district covers not only the area of that council but also a large part of the area of the Munno Para council, and that council does not hold its meetings in the evenings Indeed, some of its councillors, when this matter was discussed, stated openly and unashamedly that they did not want meetings to be held at night because they did not want the riff-raff from Elizabeth on the council. I will not stand for that, and I do not think this Parliament should, either. I am especially interested in the Munno Para council, and that is why I have referred to this provision.

Dr. Eastick: What about other councils that—

Mr. DUNCAN: The Leader of the Opposition is starting to interject He may be afraid that I will mention some of his friends on the Munno Para council. I refer now to the cost that some people must bear through attending day-time meetings held by the Munno Para council. One council member, who is only a wage earner, sacrifices $28 a day for each meeting he is required to attend. As he must attend one council meeting and one committee meeting each month, he suffers an income loss of $56 a month or about $670 a year, which is a lot of money to a working man. Indeed, it is far more than he or most working people can afford. This person is therefore making a great sacrifice for the people of Elizabeth and surrounding districts. This sort of income loss should not be suffered by those who give their time to serve on councils. This is, therefore, a worthwhile provision.

Dr. Eastick: At what time of the day are the Munno Para committee meetings held?

Mr. DUNCAN: Some, although not all, are held during the day. Others go on at night, and so do the council meetings.

Dr. Eastick: Some commence at night, too.

Mr. DUNCAN: The council on which the person to whom I have referred serves does not. I am not surprised to see the member for Alexandra sulking and slinking out of the Chamber, because it is well known that he represents some of the most reactionary views in this Chamber. His contribution tonight was basically responsible for my entering the debate, because it illustrated that members opposite still support the sort of gerrymandered electoral process they supported for many years while on the Government benches. Although this Government has achieved immeasurable electoral reform in the State, the Opposition is still trying, by opposing this Bill, to enforce a gerrymandered electoral system on the people of South Australia. This is not good enough for the working people of South Australia, who continue to suffer because of this type of action. The member for Alexandra has, by his attitude tonight, exposed many of his colleagues. Those Liberal members who support the right of people to be represented on councils regardless of their income base and who support the rights of people, regardless of their class or creed, should support clause 7 and vote for the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (15)—Messrs. Allen. Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Gunn (teller), Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold and Goldsworthy.
Noes—Messrs. Langley and Wells.

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

Mr. GUNN: (Eyre): At the outset, I lodge a strong protest with the Minister for his bulldozing tactics in trying this evening to force through a Bill that was introduced at about 4 o'clock this afternoon. It is a disgrace

to the Parliamentary system that this arrogant Government had little or no work to do at the beginning of the session and yet this afternoon has introduced Bills, some without notice, and has tried to force them through.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are debating a specific Bill.

Mr. GUNN: Quite, and it was introduced at about 4 o'clock this afternoon. What opportunity have members on this side or other members representing country areas had to consult their councils?

Mr. Keneally: You could—

Mr. GUNN: It is all right for the member for Stuart to go on as be always does. He cannot get away from the fact that this Bill is being forced through to deny members the opportunity to consult their electors and councils. It is nothing short of the rape of the democratic system. The Premier may laugh, but it is a fact.

Mr. Keneally: I had representatives of our council in to see me at dinner this evening, and you could have done the same thing.

Mr. GUNN: Does the honourable member not realize how big my district is? Some councils are nearly 500 miles (804 km) away. Does he think that their representatives can come to Adelaide at the drop of a hat? How-silly can the honourable member get! Those comments are an insult to the House. When we are dealing with legislation as important as this, members should have the opportunity to consult the people who will be affected.

I support several provisions in the Bill, but I should like to discuss others with my councils, and clause 7 is on the top of the list in that regard I want to know the attitude of councils to that provision, because I, like the member for Alexandra, know many councillors who live 40 or 50 miles (64 or 80 km) from the council office. Sometimes these councils sit from 10 am until 11 p.m. By this measure, if a council area includes large towns, it needs only one councillor to object to a matter and the councillors will have to stay overnight. Who will pay for the accommodation?

Mr. Keneally: Who pays the man who gives up his afternoon at work? You're not concerned about him.

Mr. GUNN: I am concerned about him. Everyone on a council makes a sacrifice.

Mr. Keneally: We're talking about people who earn $80 or $90 a week.

Mr. GUNN: I appreciate the point that the honourable member has made. The Chairman of one of my councils is employed by a garage and that garage proprietor grants him time off. There arc two sides to this argument.

The Hon. D. H McKee: You're a wooden-headed pooh-bah.

Mr. GUNN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry to withdraw the remark he made about me.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the remark. What was the remark to which the honourable member objects?

Mr. GUNN: The Minister of Labour and Industry called me a woolly-headed poodle, and I ask for an unqualified withdrawal, as it is a reflection.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre objects to a certain remark made by the honourable Minister, and I ask the honourable Minister whether he will withdraw the remark

The Hon. D H. McKEE: I certainly will, because it is a reflection on the poodle. I did not call him a woolly-headed poodle: I called him a wooden-headed pooh-bah, and I know that the pooh-bah, if such a thing existed, would take exception, so I withdraw.

Mr. GUNN: I do not accept that. The Minister did not withdraw the remark completely. He repeated it, and I ask for an unqualified withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Eyre has asked for the withdrawal of the remark, so I ask the honourable Minister whether he will withdraw it.

The Hon. D H. McKEE: I really feel reluctant to do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! Docs the honourable Minister withdraw the remark?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes, I would rather listen to the remarks of the honourable member than stop him from speaking.

Mr. GUNN: I hope I can continue after that slight delay in the proceedings. Clause 7 will have wide-ranging ramifications for many councils, and the Minister, if he was a reasonable man (and it would be the first time that he was ever reasonable), would be willing to reconsider this clause. It seems particularly unfair that one person could deny the will of six or seven other persons. Surely some balance should be struck. Councils could alternate meetings by holding one in the day-time and one in the evening.

The Hon G. T. Virgo: That's a reasonable step!

Mr. GUNN: Members on this side are completely reasonable, and they are not Conservatives. We always consider things in a realistic way, so I hope the Minister will consider my suggestion. Clause 20 deals with leasing by councils of part of their park land. If the representatives in an area did not know the feelings of their constituents, who else would? Certainly, the Minister would not, and it is not necessary for him to interfere. If a council wants to lease land for a caravan park, it should not have to approach the Minister. It is wrong, and it is another attempt by the Minister to take over completely powers now exercised by councils. Obviously, the member for Elizabeth has a chip on his shoulder.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member is definitely trying to provoke the member for Elizabeth, who is not referred to in the Bill. The honourable member should not breach Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order, but the honourable member for Eyre must refer to the contents of the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Elizabeth does not debate a matter but engages in a personal attack on Opposition members.

Mr. Duncan: Rubbish!

Mr. GUNN: The member for Elizabeth personally attacked Opposition members and district councils without producing proper evidence. He made several accusalions but did not substantiate them. The honourable member should have his facts correct before speaking in a debate, but he has cast aspersions on all district councils in South Australia.

Mr. DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member has completely misrepresented what I said earlier this evening. He has made allegations that I did not produce evidence to substantiate my remarks. I totally reject that allegation. I gave accurate figures of the income of a person.

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable member is making a personal explanation, and I cannot vouch for what he has said. The honourable member for Eyre must confine his remarks to the matters contained in the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I hope that the Minister will not push this measure through the House this evening, but will allow members more time to consider its contents and be able to

communicate with councils tomorrow to obtain their opinions on these matters Apparently, Government members have no regard for the opinions of councils, as only a few Government members have been present in the House during the debate on this matter.

Mr. Duncan: The Liberal and Country League is completely impotent without instructions from outside.

Mr. GUNN: That is a foolish interjection, because we are representative of the people and not of the Trades and Labor Council We do not stand over people, but speak on their behalf.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not have to be repeatedly told that his remarks must be in accordance with the contents of the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I was comparing the manner in which Opposition members ascertained what people thought of legislation.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: You are talking to yourself!

Mr. GUNN: I do not wish to make comments about the Minister, but, if he continues in this vein, he will take what is coming to him. I hope the Minister responsible will not force this legislation through this evening.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support most aspects of this Bill, but not all of it. I deprecate the fact that this type of legislation has been introduced on the first day of the last week of this session, and as late as 4 p.m

Mr. Payne: That applies to any Bill.

Mr EVANS: This is not a simple Bill, and it has many amendments to the principal Act. Local government is an important facet of State administration. Councils have responsibilities, and many members of councils would like to know more about the contents of this Bill. Government members would receive information from Cabinet that this Bill was to be introduced, and at least all Cabinet members would have knowledge of it On some minor Bills I would not object to such a late introduction, but this is a major measure, and some amendments are significant in the whole operation of councils. Normally, I would not complain about the late introduction of minor Bills because I know that, while we arc waiting on decisions from another place, these Bills can be introduced. However, this situation is different

It is not possible to obtain the information one may wish about this legislation, and members should be given the chance to research it, although Cabinet may consider that the Bill is sound, presents no problems, and will be accepted by the Opposition. It is important that the opportunity be given to Opposition members to obtain this information. The system in this Parliament is now such that the time for questioning Ministers has been reduced, and Opposition members do not have the press staff and facilities available to the Government. It is important for us to have time in which we can consider major Bills such as this. Under clause 3, certain land owned by the Crown will become ratable. This provision should be made wider The member for Kavel is not in the Chamber this evening.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where is he?

Mr. EVANS: He may be at the same place as some Government members but I will not say where that is. In his district, in the area of the Gumeracha council 33 per cent of the land is owned by the State Government, which pays no rates on that land. Members on this side have not had time to examine the Bill thoroughly or to consider amendments to it We will have to make representations to members of another place to see whether they will move amendments to provide that, where Government land is used for commercial purposes, it should be made ratable. In this connection. I refer particularly to land used by the Woods and Forests Department, as that land is used for commercial purposes, with the department competing with private enterprise. Yet no tax is paid on that land, nor is sales lax or income tax paid, and no rates whatever are paid to local government.

In addition, in the Hills area there are large sections of recreation parks, wild life reserves, and Engineering and Water Supply Department reserves that are now used for commercial enterprises. The Engineering and Water Supply Department sells to the community water that it obtains for nothing, yet it pays no rates to the council that looks after the area, preserving the quality of the water. The Government should consider paying some rales or making a grant in this case, because the council supplies emergency fire-fighting services, roads, and so on. Moreover, we all know how much the present Government has reduced road grants, so councils are losing both ways. This matter concerns the Opposition. However, if the Bill is rushed through this evening, we will not have time to discuss possible amendments with the Parliamentary Counsel or to do necessary research on ways of amending the Bill satisfactorily Government back-bench members, too, do not have an opportunity to consider the Bill.

Perhaps some Government members have discussed matters in the Bill with the Minister or with Cabinet members. They may have talked about it while the Bill was being prepared Opposition members and the public generally do not know whether that is the case. Local Government is having increasing burdens placed on it with increased workmen's compensation payments, wage increases, demands for more services, and so on. People are now not satisfied with one garbage pick-up a week but want two pick-ups; it will not be long before they want three.

The SPEAKER. Order!

Mr. EVANS: I am referring to clause 3, which deals with non-ratable land. A Government member wondered earlier what was the second clause to which I would refer and, as he suggested, it is clause 7. I want the member for Elizabeth, who has referred to this matter, to consider what I have to say. The honourable member said that a certain class of persons is disadvantaged if council meetings are held during the day. Before the 1972 council elections, a person in my area who does not support me politically said to me, "Stan, will you sign my nomination papers as I am thinking of going into the council?" I said that I would, but I asked him how, as a shift worker, he would get over the problem of attending meetings. He could see the problem. Finally, his wife convinced him not to go on with his plans. Under this provision, only one council member need dissent. On the Stirling council, if seven members wanted to meet in the evening and one member dissented (and the seven could be shift workers)—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What happens then?

Mr. EVANS: If one person objects, they cannot meet in the evening.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't be stupid! Read the Bill

Mr EVANS: Clause 7 provides:

(3) Ordinary meetings of a council may commence before the hour of 6 p.m. on the days on which they are appointed to be held if the council resolves at a meeting at which all members are present that the meetings should so commence, and no member of the council objects thereto.

The Hon G. T. Virgo: They must meet at night unless there is unanimous agreement to meet at other times. You haven't read the Bill.

Mr. EVANS: I will go over it again. The point I am making is that two wage earners may be involved, one of whom objects to the council meeting in the evening, the other objecting to a meeting in the day. The man who objects to a day meeting has a greater say than the man who objects to a meeting in the evening. I believe that both cases cannot be covered by the Bill. In the Stirling area, some farmers could be called peasant farmers, as they would not earn the average wage paid to an adult male. In the past, they have made the sacrifice to attend council meetings when the council has met during the day. Now, because of the urban spread affecting Stirling, the council has by a majority, decided to meet during the evening. Councils should abide by the majority decision.

If a council has eight members, five of whom wish to meet in the evening, the meeting should take place in the evening, and the reverse situation should apply. I point out that 6 p.m. is too late to start a meeting. Most council meetings are held within a township, and most wage earners can be at the council chambers before 6 p.m. I believe that most business men would grant a council member in their employ one hour off to enable him to get to a council meeting at 5 p.m. as business men will accept that, if a person is willing to make a voluntary contribution to community affairs, he should be given such a concession. However, it is wrong to write into legislation that one can dictate to seven or more persons (I believe the smallest council comprises eight members). I do not accept that the member for Elizabeth is worrying about workers. In future, many more women will enter local government, which is good. Many young women, such as nurses, work night shift, and there is no reason why they should be disadvantaged compared to anyone else. However, this clause discriminates against them. It is difficult for a wage earner to make a contribution to local government. Although I do not believe that councillors should be paid, there may be merit in paying them, say, travelling expenses from the rates that are received; and I say that as a person whose family has made a considerable contribution to local government.

I am disappointed that this Bill has had to be pushed through this evening. Although I accept the theory that members can make representations to those in another place if they have a sufficiently strong argument, it would have been better for the members of this, the popular House, to be able to return to their constituents and ascertain their thoughts on the Bill before having to speak to and vote on it. No Opposition member can honestly say that he has had the necessary opportunity or facilities to enable him to carry out a comprehensive survey on the Bill before debating it or voting on it. Regardless of what may have happened in the past, the Government's advantages in this regard far outweigh those of the Opposition. Members represent people, just as local government does, and the people in the community are our responsibility. As much as we may be sure of our attitude this evening, many people outside may disagree with all of us, given the opportunity to see what has been said and what is contained in the Bill. I reluctantly support the second reading.

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): It would be remiss of me if I did not voice my protest about two matters regarding this Bill, the first of which is the speed with which it is being rushed through this House. I represent a district that comprises 11 councils and corporations, and it is impossible for me to gauge the opinion of all concerned in the short time available. As their representative, I believe these people should have an opportunity to tell me what they think about the Bill Under clause 7, it is optional for councils to decide when they will meet, provided there is a unanimous resolution in this respect. This will undoubtedly make it difficult for councils in outer areas.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why?

Mr. ALLEN: I will refer to that aspect later. The member for Alexandra referred to the costs involved in holding council meetings in the evenings He was asked by way of interjection to prove why such meetings should cost more than those held in the day-time. I know that many councils in outer areas meet from 10 a.m. until 6 p.m. or, indeed, into the night, with the idea of avoiding extra travelling, some councillors having to travel as much as 50 miles (80 km) to attend council meetings. The councils concerned can manage only one meeting a month but, if only one member required an evening meeting to be held, they would be forced to have two meetings a month. The Minister can shake his head but, if a council meeting can start at 6 p.m and last for, say, nine hours until 3 a.m., it would be worse than what happens in this House, and that is really saying something!

The Hon. G T Virgo: Do you want me to answer you?

Mr ALLEN: Yes, I should be pleased if the Minister would do so. The member for Elizabeth said that if council meetings are held in the day-time the working man is excluded. Although this may apply in the built-up areas, it does not apply in the outer areas, where it is often difficult to get sufficient men to fill the available positions. I cannot see how this will make any difference whatsoever. The councils in my district would indeed be cross with me if I did not oppose clause 7. Some councils want their health and building inspectors or highway engineers to attend the meetings, and in outer areas it could necessitate those persons having to travel as much as 90 miles (about 145 km) to attend meetings which would impose an additional burden on them. Clause 3 relates to the rating of Crown property, including dwellings. This provision has been requested by local government for some time. Many years ago, when I was connected with a council, it was difficult for the district clerk annually to ascertain, when assessments and rate notices were sent out, whether certain Government residences were occupied. Although a dwelling could be unoccupied when the rate notices were issued, it could become occupied a fortnight later. This causes district clerks much work, and clause 3 will clear up this anomaly.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I want to make several points regarding the Bill, the first of which is that I deplore not having had sufficient time to go through its provisions and to examine some of the local government regulations and by-laws. I have an Act that is well worn and indexed. However, not realizing that this Bill was being introduced today, I did not bring it with me.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I gave you notice on Thursday.

Mr. WARDLE: But did members know what was contained in the Bill?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Would you need to? You could have brought your Act.

Mr. WARDLE: It is all very well for the Minister to try to put me off. The Bill may have comprised only two clauses, as many Bills have done recently. Last Thursday he did not say anything about the Bill comprising 38 clauses, nor did he say he would introduce it at about 4 o'clock this afternoon. In fact, I think we received a copy of the Bill at about 8 o'clock this evening. I did not have a copy before the dinner adjournment.

Mr Coumbe: That's correct

Mr. WARDLE: The Minister cannot say that he supplied every member with a copy this afternoon.

The Hon G. T. Virgo: If you want to criticize your colleagues, go ahead.

Mr. WARDLE: The clerks in council administration (about 137 people) should be able to read in *Hansard* that we had such little time to read the Bill, let alone to contact our district clerks and town clerks to find out what they thought about it. That is the first thing I want to put on record for the clerks to read. My second point is that I consider many provisions of the Bill to be good. I do not know whether I have the distinction of being the first former council officer to occupy a seat in this House, but I do understand the administrative effect of many of these provisions, and much of the legislation is good. I will go so far as to commend it the Minister.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't overdo it

Mr. WARDLE: I am not overdoing it, but I commend the Minister (probably, the department specifically) for introducing legislation covering many things that councils have been doing for a long time, as the member for Glenelg has said earlier. I place specific emphasis on insuring the spouse of the mayor and the many other people who work for a council to make its functions a success. Those people work extremely hard.

I think that my interpretation of clause 7 is similar to that of other members: if, when a council is deciding at the beginning of the year what days and at what time it will have its meetings and only one member of the council objects, say, to a day-time meeting commencing at 10 o'clock, meetings will not be held during the day-time. The member for Elizabeth has given us ample evidence that he thinks in terms of people living in stratas, shall I say, or he sectionalizes people as to who works and who does not work. That is a sign of complete immaturity, because everyone in the community works, and those who work hardest, carry the biggest load, and perhaps earn the largest amount, are not to be looked on as being people who are not so important as those who earn a smaller weekly wage.

It is incredible that anyone should think that a dairyman, for instance, who must pay someone to do his milking so that he can go to a council meeting should be regarded as not suffering from his connection with local government. How different is that circumstance from that of a man who must forgo wages for a day? I am sure that the member for Elizabeth has not many facts about how many people in council forgo wages for a day. He certainly has not been able to give those figures. He knows that most industries pay any council member who is a member of that organization.

I have in my district a manufacturing industry that allows the council representative from the town ward to attend council meetings at the company's expense. That has been going on for many years, and the member for Elizabeth has not been able to produce statistics to show how many people are doing this. Obviously, most people who are working and who are members of councils are being allowed by firms to attend. Most people arc responsible enough to know that that man is playing his part in the community and that he accepts his responsibility.

I consider that few councillors lose pay for a day because of their connection with a council I should appreciate a Government member's telling us whether more than 30 or 40 of the 3 300 councillors throughout the State are deprived in this way. I doubt that that number would be deprived, so the Government's action in taking democracy out of council discussions about the time of meetings is a grim one. If 10 councillors want to meet in the evening and only one does not, the one who does not will call the tune and dictate the policy. A council may have 10 councillors in favour of day-time meetings and only one councillor in favour of evening meetings and that council may toss to decide when the final meeting will be held. I think it would be fairer if the council divided its meetings up. It seems queer and upside down to suggest that we are fulfilling the basic sentiments of democracy when we allow one councillor who wants to meet in the evening to overrule 11 other councillors who want to meet in the day.

I agree entirely with clause 8, which deals with the accumulation of service with various councils for the purposes of superannuation and long service leave. I was one council officer who lost years of service with a council by not being able to have it accrue with my service with other councils, so I agree that it is only reasonable that the years of service in various councils should accrue and that the whole of a council officer's service should form his entitlement to long service leave.

I agree with many other aspects of the Bill that have been mentioned, realizing that there is a large amount of administrative legislation in this Bill that I consider will benefit councils as a whole. However, I disagree violently with clause 7 as it stands Otherwise I am pleased to support the Bill.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): Strangely, local government is one of the few things that I have had little to do with, but I know something about it notwithstanding that. I can see the picture from without and I have a few thoughts on the matter. First, I join with my colleagues in commenting on the rapidity with which the Bill has been introduced and debated. It is wrong that legislation such as this should be introduced at such short notice. I believe that all legislation coming before Parliament should be given ample time to be considered. I am amazed at the contents of clause 7. I recall that, in my council area in days gone by, meetings had to be held during the day because the clerk said that people were paid to work in the day and not at night. As a result, meetings were held during the day.

However, the Government now introduces legislation to make it compulsory to change the situation. We know the Government's attitude to this type of thing: it stands out a mile. In my council area three members represented the town ward and three the outside ward. Because some elements wanted an extra councillor in the town ward, a petition was prepared and signatures obtained. People told me they were concerned about the situation, and I said that all that could be done was to prepare a counter petition. It was prepared, and I believe there were more signatures on it than there were on the original petition, but, despite that, the Minister granted an extra councillor to the town ward, so that Crystal Brook has four members for the town ward and three members representing the outside ward. Some people who signed the first petition also signed the counter petition, but placed a footnote on it stating that they had been hoodwinked into signing the original petition.

This situation indicates to me and to other Opposition members the Government's attitude and what it wants done. The member for Murray outlined clearly the situation, having had experience in council work. What he said is true: if a councillor employed by the Government attends a meeting during the day his wages are not deducted because he attended the meeting. I do not know of any firm that would deduct wages because a person attended a council meeting. I believe that there are differences between councils in the metropolitan area and those in country areas and, as the member for Frome said, country councils have problems regarding this legislation. Whilst supporting the Bill reluctantly, I hope that something can be done about clause 7.

The Hon. G T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) : I am sorry that the member for Fisher is not here, because a statement he made (if I understood it correctly) should be withdrawn. However, I will deal with complaints that there has been insufficient time to consider this legislation

Mr. Venning. We like plenty of time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I appreciate that, and so does everyone else. If the member for Glenelg were present he would agree with me that I bent over backwards this afternoon to provide him with as much information on this Bill as was humanly possible. It is not becoming for his colleagues to make the criticisms that they have in regard to this aspect. The whole of this debate will hinge on one, clause that is, the clause that will provide the chance for all people who wish to nominate for, or to attend meetings of, councils.

Mr. Venning: Are you thinking about the general public?

The Hon G. T VIRGO: At present thousands of people cannot attend a council meeting. For instance, if any residents of the city of Adelaide want to know what is going on at the council meeting, how do they get there? Do they take a day off from work? Is that what Opposition members are advocating? It is not what the Government advocates, because we consider it is the right of ratepayers to know what is happening in council affairs.

Dr. Eastick: Are they denied that right at present?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If Opposition members support my amendment, they will be supporting the right of the people to attend these meetings. If they oppose it, they will be parties to denying the ordinary people the chance to attend a meeting of the Adelaide City Council.

Dr. Eastick: That's not right and you know it.

Mr. Coumbe. And the Minister knows that many ratepayers of the city of Adelaide are there in the day-time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am speaking of ratepayers who live in the area of the city of Adelaide.

Mr. Chapman: Why don't you introduce an amendment to cover that specific point?

The Hon G T. VIRGO: I know many instances in which people have refrained from taking an interest in councils—

Mr. Venning. This is another of your prefabricated stories, but keep going.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —or nominating for councils, because they know that the council meets during the day. They work for a living, and, with a family to support cannot afford to take the time off.

Mr. Chapman: Have you thought about the wife going to the council meeting during the day?

The Hon. G T. VIRGO: That would he almost the most stupid thing I have heard this evening, because if the wife did that who would look after the kids?

Mr Chapman: They would be at school.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member is advocating that the kids be left home to fend for themselves during the day. That is how ridiculous the honourable member is. The member for Frome is the only one who made a comment that is worth a sensible reply.

Dr. Eastick: You said "worth a sensible reply'. Do you mean that all the other questions were without sense?

The Hon G. T. VIRGO. No, but the honourable Leader loves to chip in on matters with which he has nothing to do. The member for Frome suggested that, if a council that now meets monthly at 10 a.m. and continues to 6 pm was forced to hold a night meeting, it would probably have to meet twice a month. Two aspects are involved. First, if all members of the council agree that a meeting once a month from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m is most suitable, such a meeting will continue, the provision in the Bill having no effect. However, if one council member is inconvenienced by that arrangement and desires another time for the meeting, his circumstances should be considered.

Mr. Venning: Majority to rule.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will deal with that in a moment. With regard to the point of the member for Frome, meetings could be held twice a month. The honourable member suggests that this would increase the cost of council members, as they would have twice the travelling expense. If the honourable member reads the Bill carefully, he will see that this provision relates to ordinary meetings of the council, and not to committee meetings. Most councils operate on a committee basis. Under these conditions, this provision will not impose hardship.

The member for Rocky River has referred to majority rule, or the democratic right of the people. If I were a member of the Liberal and Country League (and God forbid that I should be), I would hang my head in shame if I ever allowed the word "democracy" to pass my lips because, in years gone by, the L.C.L. occupied the Treasury benches in this place for so long against the democratic wishes of the people. Let us not lose sight of the fact that at present the representatives of local government, on whose behalf the member for Rocky River and other members are so vocal, represent only a minority of the people. The member for Rocky River and some of his colleagues only a short time ago in this place attempted to deny the people of the State the right to vote at local government elections.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. CHAPMAN: What is meant by the reference to lands held by the Crown under lease?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): This clause is principally involved with the situation created by the benevolence of the Government in providing members with district offices. The Public Buildings Department currently leases the offices from private investors. Strictly, we are not presently liable to pay rates and taxes to the council. However, the Government desires to pay these sums. As the non-payment of rates and taxes would benefit only the landlord, we could see no benefit in that, as we would rather benefit local government

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will Crown lands leased by, say, the Agriculture Department in country areas be included in this category, or is the provision specifically for the purpose of catering for the premises to which the Minister has referred? I take the Minister's nod to be an answer to my question. Why are these offices not referred to specifically?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I only promote the legislation: I rely on the ability of Parliamentary Counsel to do the necessary drafting.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will all land occupied by the Government soon come within the category of land leased by the Government?

Clause passed.

Clause *4*—"Deputy mayor."

Mr. CHAPMAN: I take it that clauses 4 and 5 refer to the appointment of a deputy mayor. Will this appointment now be made by council members? If that is the case, does the Minister realize this will destroy the concept of mayoralty amongst district councils, where mayors are normally elected by the people in a way separate from that in which council representatives are elected?

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: New section 49a (1) simply refers to the ability of a municipal council, at any meeting, to choose one of its members. Obviously, this procedure

will take place at a meeting of the council. The honourable member talks about destroying this concept of—

Mi. Chapman: An independent chairman.

The Hon. G. T VIRGO: Most municipalities have aldermen who are elected over the whole area anyway.

Mr. MATHWIN: Why have these provisions been included in the Bill? This practice has taken place for many years. If councils need a deputy mayor, they adopt processes of appointing one. So, the position is that according to the Act they can do it if they wish, but why has the Minister included this provision? If the Minister knows the answer, will he reply to me?

The Hon. G. T VIRGO: If the honourable member for Glenelg, who has also been a member of the Brighton council, has been a party to electing a deputy mayor, he has done it illegally. Once the Bill is passed, we hope that his action in doing so will be legal.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Local government auditors' certificates."

Mr. MATHWIN: Section 83 of the Local Government Act provides:

(1) The Auditor General, an officer of the Highways and Local Government Department appointed by the Minister for the purpose, and another person appointed by the Minister for the purpose, shall inquire into the qualifications of such persons as apply to them for certificates under this section and may, subject to this Act and the regulations, issue to any person whom they deem qualified, a certificate to be known as a "Local Government Auditor's Certificate".

Can the Minister say why he has struck out "and Local Government" from subsection (1)?

The Hon G. T. VIRGO: No such department as the Highways and Local Government Department exists today. The local government part of the title was removed some years ago. The Highways Department is referred to in order to clarify the position.

Mr. MATHWIN: I notice that the current *Hansard* refers to the Minister as the Minister of Transport and Minster of Local Government. Therefore, it is obvious that the local government part of the Minister's department should remain.

Clause passed

Clause 7—'Ordinary meetings."

Mr. CHAPMAN: This clause has occupied much of the debate and. apart from being an intrusion into the rights of local government, it raises several questions. Can the Minister say what prompted him to introduce such a provision into the schedule of amendments when, in fact, the Local Government Act Revision Committee chose not to refer to it in its report, which it prepared after many months of investigation into the improvement of local government functions generally? Nowhere does the committee's report refer to the time at which councils shall meet Why has the Minister chosen to inflict on councils this direction and take away from them the right to decide how and when they should meet?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: When I closed the second reading debate I thought I gave all the explanations required, and I answered the question the honourable member has raised. Many representations have been made to me by people who desired to participate in and nominate for local government but who were prevented from doing so because the local government body in which they were interested met during the day. They could not, because of their own personal reasons (usually economic), nominate for council. The existing provisions prevent people from offering themselves for local government. As the member for Elizabeth said this evening, a council has prevented the will of the people being given effect to by denying a member the opportunity of attending council meetings as a result of a majority decision, even though he was elected, unless he was willing to lose wages for attending.

Dr Eastick: He knew that when he nominated.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is the point. That is why so many people today are not nominating and why we are not getting the best people in council for the very reason the Leader has given by interjection. I do not believe that any impediment should be placed in the path of a person who wishes to nominate. The decision should be in the hands of the people who have the votes, and there are too few of those today anyhow. At least let us ensure that those people who wish to take an interest in local government are not prevented from doing so by people who have ulterior motives in mind. That is why this provision has been introduced to ensure that a council shall meet at a time when it is possible for people either to nominate or attend without losing wages. Surely people have a right to know what is said at council meetings and to hear how members of council react to resolutions.

Dr. Eastick: They are not denied that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: They are not denied it if the person involved has the finance behind him and can afford to lose wages when attending council meetings. However, I doubt whether many men who have a wife and family to support would be willing to sacrifice a day's pay to go and listen to a local council meeting.

Mr Chapman: They aren't very interested then.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Alexandra is saying that one only shows interest through one's pocket, and that is the very thing we want to get away from. For too long local government and the Legislative Council have been the preserve of the wealthy. It seems that a person is measured by what he owns and not by what he is The Government is trying to get away from that concept, and this provision is a step in that direction

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): We have just heard, in that outburst from the Minister of Local Government—

Mr Harrison: True facts.

Dr. EASTICK: No, only part of the facts The Minister would have us believe that people are denied the chance of involvement in local government unless they happen to be wealthy. Many council members would take the Minister up on that point. Whether councils sit during the day or in the evening, many council members attend meetings at their expense and that of their families. Many such men elect to enter local government realizing that they will have to undertake many activities connected therewith al the expense of their employment and financially. However, what the Minister failed to tell us, and what the member for Elizabeth started, to tell us, is that in. the eyes of Government members the only people capable of entering local government are those who are willing to submit to caucus scrutiny and who will go to their local member for instruction.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Try being a Leader instead of a child, for a change

Dr. EASTICK: The truth hurts.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know that it's a lot of tripe.

Dr. EASTICK: I know that it is correct, as do many other members. The Minister would also realize that the persons who have been subjected to caucusing and who have taken instructions between adjournments in some council meetings—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Which ones, for instance?

Dr. EASTICK: The member for Elizabeth would know of the situation that has applied at Munno Para, and he and the member for Playford would know of the situation that has obtained at Elizabeth regaiding the taking of instructions

The Hon G. T. Virgo: From whom?

Dr. EASTICK: From the local member of Parliament.

Mr. McRAE. I should like to make a personal explanation. I want specifically and deliberately to state—

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Acting Chairman.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Climes). Order! There is no point of order. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Dr. EASTICK: The Minister is trying to suggest that there is only one—

Mr. Payne: You've dropped it now, haven't you.

Dr. EASTICK: No, I have not. Would the honourable member like me to continue? The member for Elizabeth would know full well the situation that applies in relation to some of his colleagues who get up at council meetings and quote from the Australian Labor Party instruction book

Mr. Payne: That applies to the member for Eyre, who quotes it every day in this House.

Dr. EASTICK: But in an entirely different context.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable Leader of the Opposition to speak to the clause.

Dr. EASTICK: I am referring to the qualities that make a successful councillor. Such a person needs to be willing to forget his political ties and to be interested in the community.

The Hon. G T. Virgo: The man who has the money to take the day off.

Dr EASTICK: Money has nothing to do with it. Having worked in Local government with many workers. I have enjoyed their company and common sense. That is more than I can say for the Minister, who has been making such inane interjections. It should not be necessary for one to be a member of a political Party in order to enter local government, but that is what the Minister is saying.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't be ridiculous. Speak to the Bill and don't write things into it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN. Order!

Dr. EASTICK: The present provision allows persons to honour their obligations to local government.

Mr. Payne: They can go in the day-time.

Dr. EASTICK: The council of which I was a member never sat in the day-time, except for a committee.

Mr. Payne: I have no quarrels with the councils in my district: they sit at night.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: Those who wish to involve themselves in council affairs should be able to do so. A person who must go without pay to attend council meetings is in no different a position from that of a person in any other type of employment who must absent himself from work for the same purpose. If people were genuinely interested in what was happening in local government, they could take one or both of two simple courses of action.

Mr. Payne: They could let their wife and kids go without.

Dr. EASTICK: I did not refer to wives and children. Such persons could seek to read council minutes or question their councillor as to a debate that had occurred, or they could attend council meetings and listen.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How?

Dr. EASTICK: During the course of the council meeting.

The Hon. G T. Virgo: When it meets during the day?

Dr EASTICK: If they so desired, after work or when the council was meeting at night. Will the Minister say how many people listen to council debates?

Mr. Payne: You ought to drop down to Marion sometimes. You'd get a surprise.

Dr. EASTICK: Very few people take the opportunity to attend council meetings, although the opportunity is there if they wish to take it. By making certain statements the Minister has tried to draw a red herring across the trail. I do not consider that there is any need for change.

Mr. McRAE: The Leader has referred to activities in which I may have been involved. My district includes the three councils of Munno Para, Salisbury, and Elizabeth, and members of both my sub-branches are also members of those councils, but I specifically deny that I have ever caucused them, or helped have them endorsed or elected. If they come to me for assistance, I am pleased to give what assistance I can.

I will tell the Leader of one thing that was brought to my attention in the presence of the member for Salisbury. This matter concerned a councillor at Salisbury. The Leader has specifically identified me and the member for Elizabeth as being allegedly involved in caucusing. One of my sub-branch members had the unfortunate quality of being a member of the Australian Labor Party, and he became a member of Salisbury council. His employer told him that, if he did not withdraw a motion that he had before the council, he would be sacked That man told that to me and the member for Salisbury, each in the hearing of the other.

I asked whether I could take action immediately on his behalf and he said that he did not want me to do so. However, if the Leader wants to start digging into the affairs of local government, particularly in Salisbury, in relation to politics, he will find a sordid situation that involves not caucusing by the A.L.P. but, on the contrary, an extremely strong steamroller job by the conservatives of the Liberal and Country League. I have yet to know a more conservative council.

Mr. MATHWIN: Obviously, the cases regarding the country and the city are completely different. All city councils meet in the evening.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: No, three do not.

Mr. MATHWIN: What three?

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood Meadows, Noarlunga, and Munno Para.

Mr. MATHWIN: Meadows council is not a city council.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Yes it is.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have been connected with local government for more than 15 years and I know that most councils meet in the evening. An evening meeting that commences at 7 45 p m. or 8 p.m. may continue until 2 a.m.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Only because you talk too much.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, it is because the other members cannot agree with what I say. The position is different as between country councils and city councils. In the country many councillors would have to drive about 50 miles (80 km) home after a meeting and if a working man had to drive that distance at 2 a m. we would be doing him a far greater disservice by forcing him to attend an evening meeting.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's his decision.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister is honest and sincere, as I think he is, he will consider the different circumstances in the two cases. I agree entirely that evening meetings would be far better for city councils, but I disagree regarding country councils.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It has been said that people are denied an opportunity to be involved in councils because the councils meet in the day-time. I think that, when the Minister was speaking about that matter, it was the member for Elizabeth who interjected. He has been notorious for making ill-founded statements and rude interjections during the debate. It was stated then that the workers who work from 9a.m. until 5 p.m. could not afford to sacrifice wages to become involved in local government.

During the first four years of my term of eight years in local government. I was a shearer, and that was my principal income. If one can do it, another can do it. If a man is keen, he will sacrifice wages for a day. I know many councillors who depend on their wage income but they know this before they choose to serve on a council, and they sacrifice their time during the day to serve. If the Minister was genuine about this matter, he would deal with it on the basis that has been suggested to him. I thank the Committee for the opportunity to speak about those who sacrifice their time and wages. I move:

In new subsection (3) to strike out "at a meeting at which all members are present" and "and no member of? the council objects thereto".

My amendment will leave the power of determining the commencement time of meetings in the hands of the council. Clause 7 will destroy all decisions of councils but the Minister admitted that, with the co-operation and assistance of the member for Elizabeth, information was obtained leading to the inclusion of this clause The honourable member has been a member of Parliament for about a year and has never served on a council and the Minister served as a member of a metropolitan council for a short time. I understand that the requests for evening meetings have come from a limited part of the metropolitan area in which most meetings are already held in the evening. The Local Government Act Revision Committee made recommendations, some of which have been accepted and some opposed by the Minister, but this committee did not refer to any provision similar to clause 7.

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the amendment, because the autonomy of councils has been slowly eroded for many years. We are to have the situation where one person can control the position, but that is not usually acceptable to the Government. The principal Act suggests that councils have the right to appoint the time, place, and date of a meeting, but this amendment is not democratic. Everyone should have the right to nominate as a member of a council but, whatever the time of the meeting prescribed, someone would be disadvantaged.

Mr. COUMBE: I do not oppose a provision determining whether a council shall meet at a certain time, but I object to the form of this clause and the way it will operate. As many people as possible should be able to be members of a council or attend council meetings. This clause has been introduced by a Party that believes in a majority rule, but it provides that every member of the council has to be present and has to agree, irrespective of any circumstances, such as sickness or any other reason for being absent. Looking al this provision, one concludes that the Minister does not believe that councils are capable of coming to a majority decision. Yet the Local Government Act sets out various matters, some of which involve considerable sums of money (the current minutes of the Adelaide City Council meetings refer to one project involving $1 000 000), that are decided by a simple majority vote. I am sure that the Minister belongs to many organizations that abide by majority decisions. In this Parliament, decisions are made on a majority basis. Yet in this case the Minister wants councils to decide unanimously. This could lead to an awkward situation, if a council wanted to change its meetings from the day to the evening and a member of the council was on leave or ill.

Mr Keneally: What if it was in the interests of a council to meet during the day because a member might lose his seat if the meeting was held in the evening?

Mr. COUMBE. If a councillor were absent, even if a council that had previously met during the day wanted to meet during the evening, it could not do that. This provision refers to meetings at which all members are present and at which no member objects.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo. Read the rest!

Mr. COUMBE: I have read it over and over again.

The Hon. G T. Virgo: Then you haven't understood it.

Mr. COUMBE: Once again, this is an example of the Minister's obsession about compulsion. I have no objection to a council's voting on its time of meeting. However, as the wording of the provision is anathema to me, I support the amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I have never in my time in Parliament heard such a load of deceitful rubbish from the front bench.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I don't think you should be so rude to the member for Torrens.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I meant the Government front bench. We have often heard the rantings of the Premier about one vote one value. Yet the Minister is providing that one member at a council meeting shall dictate the time of future council meetings, irrespective of inconvenience caused to other people. A valid case has been put forward that in country areas it is inconvenient to hold council meetings during the evening. However, the Minister is willing to dictate to councils throughout the State when they shall hold their meetings This is another nail in the coffin of democracy at the Government and local government level. As originally drafted, this provision will go down in history as the "Virgo veto". I fully support the amendment, which introduces democracy and common sense into the provision. Any person who has the arrogance to believe that he can dictate to councils (as the Minister believes at present) deserves to be replaced as Minister.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment. The Minister should have accepted my suggestion to be flexible. I pointed out that the circumstances applying in the country were different from those applying in the city. However, because of the Minister's inflexible attitude, I must support the amendment. As my colleagues have said, the time of the meeting of a council will depend on the vote of one member. If a person is absent from council meetings as a result of illness, it will be impossible for the wishes of council to be carried out. The whole scheme will therefore be a complete failure.

Mr. EVANS: I support the amendment. I believe the tide has swung in the metropolitan area, as most councils now meet at night. Some council members work for salaries or wages, and I do not mind this practice being encouraged. However, the Bill will have an, adverse effect

on some areas, as each council represents a different section of society. I refer, for instance, to the Stirling council, which formerly met in the afternoon but which now meets at night The Minister of Development and Mines referred to the Meadows council. Although I agree that it can in some respects be considered to be within the metropolitan area, because of the way in which its wards are drawn up and because of other factors, it is a country council to a degree. The change is occurring even at Meadows, and in a few years I believe that council will be meeting at night. Indeed, the Minister would no doubt agree that already it occasionally meets at night, when its meetings can last until as late as 1 a m. or 2 a.m.

If the amendment is accepted, the *status quo* will be maintained; that will be the fairest solution. However, if the amendment is rejected, a large section of the community will be adversely affected. About 750 000 persons over the age of 18 years are living in the metropolitan area, no more than 500 of whom would attend council meetings. I say that not to denigrate people but to show that they are not really interested. The Stirling council would have more people attend its meetings than would any other metropolitan council, and it is to the credit of those who attend its meetings that they are so interested. I do not know how we can give shift workers the opportunity to attend council meetings. The incidence of shift work is increasing and, if we really want to solve this problem, I suggest that town clerks and council officers be paid extra money so that councils might meet on Saturday afternoons or on Sundays, when most people would be able to attend meetings.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, McKee. McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo (teller), and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Arnold and Goldsworthy.
Noes—Messrs. Langley and Wells.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 8—"Appointment, removal and salaries of officers."

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

In new subsection (9), after "account", to insert "—(a)"; to insert the following new paragraph:
"and
(b) in determining any other rights in relation to employment that may be dependent upon length of service"; and in new subsection (13) to strike out all words after "necessary" and insert "for the purposes of this section".

These amendments will enable the period of service to be used for all purposes, not for long service leave purposes only.

Amendments carried.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Long service leave and superannuation pay made when an employee ceases employment ought to be shared by the councils that have employed him throughout his period of employment.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Provision is already there.

Mr. CHAPMAN: It is not in the principal Act, and I ask how the final employing council is protected.

Mr. HALL: I also would like the information that the member for Alexandra has requested.

The Hon. G T. VIRGO: The information for the member for Goyder is the same as I have given to the member for Alexandra, namely, that provision is already there.

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister point out the relevant provision? This matter was discussed at a local government meeting that I attended last Friday. Do I understand from the Minister that each council will share the long service leave payments according to the period of service with the council?

The Hon. G T Virgo. The council is entitled to claim on the previous council for the period of employment, and the honourable member will find provision for councils to make such inquiries as are necessary to determine the matter.

Mr. Chapman: What about the sharing of the financial burden?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Goyder has the call. If the Minister is going to reply to the honourable member for Goyder, I will give him the call.

Mr. HALL: I understand that the Minister is saying that there is no legal difficulty for a council when a clerk it has employed for, say, a year terminates his service and has had, say, 17 years service with other councils Can the last council employing that man claim from other councils?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 18 passed.

Clause 19—"Non-application of this Part to certain borrowings."

Mr. MATHWIN: It is a poor state of affairs if a council has to borrow money to provide funds so that employees can be paid their entitlements. Has the Minister examples of councils that have not provided such a fund?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Not many councils make provision for the payment of long service leave, and I know of one council in which the clerk has had 30 years service and is due to retire this year, but no provision has been made for payment of long service leave to him If the honourable member can suggest any way that that officer can be paid other than by authorizing the council to raise a loan, I should be interested to hear it.

Clause passed.

Clause 20—"Power of council to improve park lands and reserves "

Mr CHAPMAN: This is another indication of how the Minister is draining the few powers that councils have left Councils have been able to diversify the use of park lands under their control, plant areas of trees, and create recreational areas. This is a normal function of councils, but a control is to be inflicted on them requiring them to seek consent before they take these actions

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Why not ask the Minister of Lands about it?

Clause passed.

Clause 21—"Powers to let ground vested in the council."

Mr. MATHWIN: Why has the Minister included himself in this part of the Bill? Does he know of instances in which a council would need the protection of the Minister?

The Hon. G T. VIRGO: A theme runs through the Local Government Act concerning many functions for which the authority of the Minister is required. This provision is consistent with similar activities within the Act. For instance, if a council wishes to dispose of land it can do so only with the consent of the Minister, such consent being given only in cases where the council undertakes to devote the proceeds to similar undertakings. A brake is placed on this type of operation, and it is acceptable to councils. I have no doubt that this provision is

simply to cater for an area previously not catered for. Had this matter been dealt with before, some of the problems that have arisen would not have arisen.

Clause passed.

Clauses 22 to 24 passed

Clause *25*—"Power to license hide and skin markets."

Mr. CHAPMAN: This is another classic example of where an instruction is to be given to a council. Surely the Minister realizes that councils are made up of members who are elected by ratepayers Therefore, councillors should be left some right to make their own decisions Councils should have the power to license these premises if they desire to do so. We appreciate that for many years these premises have been licensed in township areas. Nevertheless, it should be left to the discretion of the council whether or not such markets ate licensed

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This provision simply gives to local government a power for which it has asked.

Clause passed.

Clause 26 passed.

Clause 27—"Power to license bazaars."

Mr. MATHWIN: What is the definition of "bazaar"?

The Hon G T. VIRGO: The plain, English meaning of the word. The member for Frome has offered the honourable member a dictionary, and there are other dictionaries in the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Oxford dictionary defines "bazaar" as an oriental market. Is that the meaning that will be given to the word in this legislation?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I think you should go to the library, as I suggested.

Clause passed.

Clause 28 passed.

Clause 29—"Unsightly condition of land."

Mr MATHWIN: Section 666b (5) (a) provides:

... may be applied towards defraying the expenses incurred in defraying the expenses incurred by the council in taking action under subsection (4) of this section:

Paragraph *(a)* of this clause provides:

by striking out from paragraph (a) of subsection (5) the passage "in defraying the expenses incurred",

To which "in defraying the expenses incurred" in section 666b (5) (a) does this paragraph apply?

[Midnight]

Clause passed.

Clauses 30 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—"Particulars of charges upon property."

Mr. CHAPMAN: Section 875 refers to inquiries by ratepayers about rales and other moneys due. This provision increases the fee for this service from 10c to $2. As the charge was originally fixed in 1934, the increase at first seems reasonable. However, the provision relates to any person who inquires about these unpaid rates, and "any person" includes ratepayers within the area. Therefore, if a ratepayer chooses to inquire of his own council about unpaid rates on any property in his area, he will be required to pay $2. This is another example of unreasonable domination of local government bodies by the Minister. If he wishes to protect local government and bring the principal Act into line with today's inflationary trends, surely it is reasonable to stipulate that a maximum of $2 be paid.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member has read section 875 of the principal Act he will realize that, as it stands, the council of which he was a member, which is paying its staff a considerable salary, recoups 10c for handling an inquiry which involves an authenticated return stating what rates and other moneys are due and payable to the council in respect of a property at the date of giving the certificate; when they became due and payable; which, if any, of the rates and other moneys are a charge upon the said property; or stating that no rates or other moneys are payable This information must be sent in writing and, if necessary, in registered form. All this for 10c?

Mr. Chapman: No-one is suggesting that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is what the Act provides We are ensuring that councils do not operate at a loss, giving them a reasonable return and a fair go, something the honourable member knows little about.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (37 and 38), schedule and title passed.

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

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to register my objection to the method by which the Bill was introduced and to the condition in which it has come out of Committee. It was introduced originally at a late hour, giving members no time—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can speak only to the Bill as it came out of Committee. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: This Bill deals with a principal Act of 908 sections, plus a schedule of 19 pages. It has been virtually impossible for members to do their homework thoroughly and to do their job as they are obliged to do as representatives in this Parliament. That is my main object in speaking to the third reading.

I was laughed at by Government members when I spoke in Committee on clause 29, which amends section 666b (5) *(a)* of the principal Act. In my opinion, the section as amended by clause 29 is in the same condition as it was before the Bill was considered. The reference to the words "in defraying the expenses incurred" appeared twice. The Minister would not explain the position when I asked in all seriousness; therefore, I register my objection.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill

The Hon J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

The urgent need for this short Bill has been demonstrated by the parlous state of the Cattle Compensation Fund, established under the principal Act, the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1972. In fact, this fund, in the financial year, 1972-73, required a Treasury subvention of $110 000 to meet its obligations during the current financial year. Clearly, two actions are immediately necessary. First, it is necessary to relieve the fund of its obligations to make contributions towards the national brucellosis/tuberculosis campaign. At present these contributions are running at the maximum permitted by the principal Act; that is,

$25 000 per annum. I hasten to point out that relieving the fund of its obligations will in no way prejudice the eradication campaign, since appropriate funds will be found from other sources both Stale and Commonwealth.

The second action, which has been agreed to by the industry, is to increase from July 1 next the levy under the principal Act. At the moment this levy stands at 5c for cattle or carcasses having a sale price of up to $70 and 10c for cattle or carcasses selling at more than that figure. At current market prices this has been an effective levy of 10c a head.

It is now proposed to increase this levy to 5c for each $20 or part thereof of market value up to a maximum of 50c. This will result in a beast or carcass having a market value of $200 or more attracting the maximum levy, and this accords with the maximum market value of $200 on which compensation is payable Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 brings the measure into operation on July 1, 1974. Clause 3 relieves the fund of the obligation referred to above Clause 4 increases the levy payable under the Act.

Mr. ALLEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): This is a short Bill brought about by the Cattle Compensation Fund having become short of money. Indeed, in his explanation, the Minister said that the urgent need for this Bill was brought about by the parlous state of the fund. In this House on September 19, 1972, I issued a warning that this could happen. Speaking in the debate on the Appropriation Bill I said:

I also issue a note of warning about the Cattle Compensation Fund. The Auditor-General's Report sets out the present position of the fund, and I think that gives cause for concern by those interested in the industry. The balance in the fund at June 30, 1971, was $277 394. Receipts in 1971-72 were $67 971. I may add that this was a result of record slaughterings of cattle in South Australia during that year. This amount would have been much higher had not many cattle been transported from this State to the Eastern States for slaughter. Payments in 1972 amounted to $198 731, which was about three times the sum received. The balance at June 30, 1972, was $146 634 and, if the current year's receipts were added, it would be about $200 000. However, if as many claims are made this year as were made last year, the fund will be practically exhausted at the end of the financial year.

I referred, of course, to the financial year 1972-73. At the end of June, 1973, the Treasury had to supplement the fund by $110 000. At the commencement of the current financial year the fund stood at $81 643, and if payments are the same this year as last (and most indications are that they will be) the Government will have to supplement the fund again al the end of this year with a further $100 000. This state of affairs cannot be allowed to continue, and it is one of the reasons for the introduction of the Bill.

It is intended that stamp duty, which at present is about 10c a head of cattle, will be altered; stamp duty in future will be at the rate of 5c in every $20 up to a maximum of $200 total price, for the animal, bringing in 50c a head in stamp duty. From prices ruling at the abattoirs at present, I imagine that the sale of an animal at an average of $140 would bring in about 35c a head in stamp duty and this should keep the fund financial for some time. One reason for the large payments of compensation in the 1972-73 financial year was the stepping up of the programme of eradicating brucellosis and tuberculosis. In the Far North of this State we have a serious problem. The smaller cattle stations in the North appear to be able to have quite a good muster, and the incidence of disease on those stations is down to about 1 per cent. On the large cattle stations, however, it is difficult to get a good muster, with the result that some cattle that miss the muster could be carriers of these diseases, spreading them through the whole of the herd.

Conditions in the North of the State are good, and so many water holes are spread over the stations that cattle move off in groups of 15 or 20 and it is difficult to get a good muster. This problem is accentuated because fences have been washed away by recent rains. Many cattle have become mixed with others, and much of the eradication work done in the past will be nullified The work may be set back to some extent as a result of the floods. The increased stamp duty will be hard on owners of cattle in the inner areas. Primary producers who run cattle in smaller paddocks are able to watch diseases closely, and only a few cases are reported. Unless the diseases are brought under control, we stand every chance of losing some of our valuable overseas markets. It behoves all, everyone, whether in the inner country or in the outer areas, to continue to concentrate and try to rid the State of the diseases. I feel sure that cattle owners in the inner country will not object to the increased stamp duty in order to supplement the sum in the Cattle Compensation Fund. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Establishment of Cattle Compensation Fund."

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I point out that there is a variation and that we are amending section 11 of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (b) of subsection (3), not subsection (2) as stated earlier. Indeed, the Minister's second reading explanation refers to the substance of subclause (3), and it is only by striking out paragraph (b) of that subsection that we can hope to achieve what is intended by the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The Leader drew my attention to this matter, which has been corrected.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS AMENDMENT BILL

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable him to introduce a Bill forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion for suspension. Is the motion seconded?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Yes.

The SPEAKER: For the question say "Aye". Against say "No". There being a dissentient voice, it is necessary to ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—Messrs Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs Byrne, Messrs Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

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

Pair—Aye—Mr. Langley. No—Mr Arnold.

Majority of 6 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: As it is carried with an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House, the motion for suspension is agreed to.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon L. J. KING obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1972. Read a first time

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Local and District Criminal Courts Act in two respects. First, amendments are made to the provisions providing for the award of interest in judgments from a date before the date of judgment. These amendments are entirely parallel to the amendments proposed to the corresponding provision in the Supreme Court Act. The second set of amendments relates to the enforcement of orders for costs. It has happened occasionally in the past that a successful plaintiff has proceeded immediately to take enforcement proceedings in relation to an order for costs before the defendant has had the opportunity to ascertain what is the amount of the taxed costs for which he is liable The amendments are therefore designed to ensure that the judgment debtor receives notice of the amount of the taxed costs before the judgment creditor proceeds to enforce the order.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 35g of the principal Act which deals with the award of interest in judgments. The amendments are, as I have said, exactly parallel to those recently proposed to the Supreme Court Act. Clause 4 requires a judgment creditor to inform a judgment debtor of the amount of the taxed costs before he takes enforcement proceedings in relation to an order for costs.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

Later:

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): This is an administrative Bill, which contains a provision similar to one proposed to the Supreme Court Act relating to judgments awarding interest. I support the Bill.

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

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment

STATE TRANSPORT AUTHORITY BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 3 insert "and".

No. 2. Page 2, lines 6 to 9 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 3. Page 2 (clause 4)—Before line 10 insert new definition as follows:

> "public transport" includes railway transport but does not include any other transport primarily or predominantly encompassing the carriage of freight or stock.

No. 4. Page 3, line 1 (clause 7)—After "office" insert "not exceeding seven years".

No. 5. Page 3, line 2 (clause 7)—After "Governor" insert "and, upon the expiration of his term of office, shall be eligible for re-appointment".

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos. 1 *and* 2:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 and 2 be agreed to.

These amendments delete paragraph (d) of the definition of "prescribed body" Members will recall that, in addition to the Municipal Tramways Trust, the South Australian Railways, and the Transport Control Board, this provision included "any other person or body whether corporate or unincorporate". These amendments probably weaken the legislation and will make the task of the authority more unwieldy. However, we have adequate time to introduce further appropriate legislation if necessary and, accordingly, I accept these amendments.

Mr. HALL: The amendments are substantially the same as the amendment moved previously by the member for Flinders. The Minister's attitude to that amendment demonstrates the need for a House of Review in order to make amendments necessitated by his arrogance

Mr. BECKER: I support the amendments and compliment the other House on its work. This means that if any other body is brought within the ambit of the authority it will be done by legislation.

Motion carried.

Amendment No 3:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be amended by striking out "railway transport" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "transport or other activity under the control of the South Australian Railways Commissioner".

The Legislative Council, as did members here, wanted to insert a definition of public transport. This was brought about by a fear held by members of another place, as well as by certain members of this place, that this Bill was designed to control the road freight industry. In an attempt to get an agreement it is necessary to amend the amendment in the way I have indicated so that the road freight transport industry is clearly outside the ambit of this authority, as it always has been. One of the few people who suggested that that industry would come within the ambit of the authority was one Legislative Council member for Southern, who did this for reasons of political expediency. All other people realize that the load freight industry has never been involved in this Bill, because it simply transfers to the authority the powers held by the existing authorities, namely, the Municipal Tramways Trust, the Transport Control Board, and the South Australian Railways Commissioner.

Railway transport can be interpreted in its strictest sense to mean a train and nothing else. However, railway transport includes not only trains but also the delivery waggons, for instance, that take freight to and from the Mile End and Adelaide stations. In Peterborough, a semi-trailer owned and operated by the department picks up and delivers freight to and from the station there. The Railways Commissioner is also involved in running a dining-room, a book stall, a milk bar, and another sort of bar, etc., and we believe that the whole of the railways operation should come within the ambit of the State Transport Authority. I think this amendment, if amended, will satisfy the needs of all concerned and it will certainly not inhibit the operation of the authority

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister assure the Committee that the railways will not enter the road transport field? I believe this possibility has been mentioned in the press.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is in it now.

Mr. BECKER: I thought there had been a statement that the department was going further into it.

The Hon. G. T VIRGO: The South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act gives the Commissioner full authority to enter into all aspects of delivery and he is doing just that. If a person wants to transport freight from, say, West Beach to his sheep station near Peterborough, he can get the Railways Commissioner to arrange to pick it up at West Beach and transport it by road to the railway station, say, at Mile End and thence by rail to Peterborough, where it will be taken by road to the sheep station.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3, as amended, be agreed to.

Mr. BECKER: On the basis of the assurance given by the Minister, we accept the amendment

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 4 *and* 5:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 4 and 5 be agreed to.

These simple amendments provide that the term of office of the Chairman shall be no more than seven years and that he shall be eligible for reappointment There is nothing in the amendments to which we object.

Mr BECKER: We support the amendments and see no objection to them, either.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 was adopted:

Because the amendment adversely affects the main principles of the Bill.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendment to its amendment No. 3 without amendment.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

GAS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 21. Page 2660.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition) In supporting the Bill, I will point out to the responsible Minister, if he comes into the House, that certain questions should be answered and assurances given in connection with this matter. The principle behind the Bill is not in dispute. We can see a distinct advantage for industry in South Australia by allowing assistance of this type to be given. However, as financial aid is to be granted to overseas industries, an assurance will have to be given that there will be no difficulty for this Government in controlling or recovering funds so expended. As overseas countries will be involved, the jurisdiction involved will be different from that involved when assistance is provided to an industry located in South Australia.

Under the Bill, applications for assistance will be investigated by the Parliamentary Industries Development Committee, in the same way as the applications of local industries are investigated. I am told that assistance will be granted only when a South Australian industry forms an integral part of the total involvement. I should like an assurance from the Treasurer that the fact that the Industries Development Committee will be unable to see the industry concerned will not reduce the detail it will receive or cloud its ability to assure the Government that the end result will be successful. Moreover, I hope that members of this committee will not use these investigations as an excuse for overseas tours to inspect industries established overseas. The Treasurer has nodded his head, indicating that this will not happen, but I should like an assurance from him on that matter.

I accept that, under this proposal, the public purse will be involved in arrangements concerning a far wider range of organizations than has applied previously. Bearing in mind the type and depth of inquiry we have come to expect from the Industries Development Committee, I believe that such an inquiry will be sufficient to safeguard the South Australian public purse. True, on earlier occasions, through no fault of the members of the committee at the time, difficulties have arisen resulting in a loss to the State. I forecast that, whether an overseas industry or a local industry is involved, events will occur in future that will result in expense for the South Australian community. Therefore, I am sure that, having regard to the past experiences of this committee, future members will be constantly aware of danger signs and difficulties that may arise. Treasury officials, who also have a part to play in these investigations, will be able to give warnings at the correct stage.

Under the Bill, assistance will be granted to prescribed countries. From announcements made last week during the official visit of the Chief Minister of Penang, one could see a distinct possibility of Penang's being one of the first prescribed countries. Indeed, some announcements made at official and public gatherings indicated that there was already knowledge of an area in which mutual benefits could accrue from these activities. Although I accept that no positive announcement can be made about this, I should like the Treasurer to say what percentage of the total sum available for industrial development will be made available for overseas development. I know that this proposal is supported by several industry leaders in South Australia.

Although I do not suggest that $1 000 000 is a very meaningful sum with regard to overall industrial development, using that sum as a base figure, is it intended that 75 per cent shall be used in South Australia and 25 per cent overseas? Will the circumstances of the inquiry involved before the Industries Development Committee determine what proportion of the total sum shall go overseas and what proportion shall remain here? The Treasurer should inform the House on these matters when he winds up the debate. If South Australia is to take the opportunity of extending some of its industries into an under-developed country, thereby enabling that country to become more developed, is it intended that the State shall make an *ex gratia* payment to that country, or give it some benefit which will be repayable or on which interest will have to be paid?

Also, has the Treasurer had discussions with the Commonwealth Government regarding schemes, such as the Colombo Plan or similar plans, whereby the State assists an industry by the means provided in this Bill and provides funds, parallel with funds provided by the Commonwealth Government, for the country concerned for its development? I refer to funds which will be either not repayable or made available on a long-term basis without interest having to be paid. I realize that this takes the matter so much further than the Treasurer's second reading explanation. However. I should like to know before the Bill passes what additional benefits may accrue and whether any discussions have taken place of which members should be made aware. Although certain questions will be asked m Committee, the Treasurer could assist the passage of the Bill by replying to those that I have already asked.

Mr. HALL (Goyder): The Treasurer has given no good reasons why one should support this Bill. He simply read out the details of the Bill but gave no instances of what he intended to do with the powers that he is now asking the Parliament to confer on him; nor has he said what project prompted the introduction of this Bill. He was, however, kind enough to say in his second reading explanation that the appearance of this short Bill belied its significance in relation to the industrial scene in this State. I can at least agree with that, because this Bill makes a substantial amendment to the Act I was surprised to find that the Leader of the Opposition so quickly approved of the Bill, unless he knows more than what the Treasurer has said about it in the House. I therefore question on what basis he supports the Bill.

One can ask some pertinent questions about this matter. It appears that certain funds available to this Government may be provided for overseas countries Who will get the benefit of the employment involved, and who will measure the benefit that local industry will derive from this action? The Treasurer may say in reply that the Parliamentary committee has the task of overseeing this matter However, that committee could comprise mainly members of the Party of which the Treasurer is a member. Unfortunately, I do not know what the committee's representation is at present. If the committee comprises mainly Labor Party members, it will simply mean that Labor Parly policy will approve, or otherwise, the allocation of this money I am about the only member of this House that can be neutral in this debate, as no other member, and certainly not the Treasurer, has said why this State should venture into overseas affairs (affairs that are really not his prerogative as State Treasurer). Why should the Treasurer allocate moneys to interests outside this State's jurisdiction? I do not want to delay the House on this matter, as I do not have any information regarding it. I am speaking only in the hope that the Treasurer will be able to answer my questions. I suppose this State could invest money in an overseas country whose Government could change, and the country involved could have a totalitarian regime, as a result of which South Australia could lose that money. I should like to know what is the situation, as no worthwhile information has been given to the House

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill, and remind members that we are dealing with the Industries Assistance Corporation. Members who have studied the Bill should know the difference between the corporation and the Parliamentary committee. It is important to realize this and, for the information of those members who are unaware of the representation on the Parliamentary committee, I remind them that it consists of four members of Parliament (two from each side of politics), with an independent member representing the Treasury. It is, therefore, an inter-House and inter-Party committee, about which I can speak with first-hand knowledge, having served on it for more than three years.

The Government is breaking new ground in this Bill by intending to make investments in prescribed countries for the benefit of this State Paragraph *(b)* of the definition of "overseas industry" is as follows:

that, in the opinion of the corporation—

not necessarily that of the committee—

is or will be of substantial benefit to an industry carried on wholly or mainly in the State.

I take it that the words "in the State" refer to South Australia. If that was not their meaning, the Opposition's support for the Bill would be withdrawn. However, the Bill has some merit because, indeed, only South Australia can benefit from it. Under the terms of the Industries Development Act, the Government does not advance any money. If the committee makes a certain recommendation, the Treasurer is required to give a guarantee, which he must meet if the venture fails. In this respect, one or two unfortunate instances have occurred in the past. Indeed, I must admit I was a member of the committee when a couple of failures occurred. Before I entered Parliament, I saw the benefits that certain companies derived as a result of recommendations made by this committee. I also recall when the former Liberal Government was in office that I as Minister, along with the then Treasurer (the member for Goyder), used the provisions of this Act to induce industries to come to South Australia.

I should like the Treasurer to explain one interesting matter when he replies. If the committee recommends the guarantee of a loan, the Treasurer stipulates that the interest payable on the loan shall not exceed a certain rate. I will not refer publicly to that rate of interest because that is a matter for the committee. However, I should like the Treasurer to say what is likely to be the Treasury's policy in view of the assistance that can now be given to an industry in a prescribed country. Will the interest payable by such an industry be tied in some way to what happens in South Australia or, indeed, in Australia, or will it be tied to, say, the fiscal policy of the Commonwealth Government or to that of the prescribed country? These are important matters that must be considered. If an industry is to be set up in South Australia with this sort of assistance, the Treasury recommends an upper limit on the rate that should be made available by the lending authority.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I support the Bill. The second reading explanation is clear to me, and I think my interpretation of the Bill is correct. I understand that, if a local industry wishes to expand overseas or if it is necessary for a local industry to have part of its product manufactured overseas for use here as a component, the committee will be able to assist. If a manufacturer of, say, what is now a wholly Australian refrigerator will be able to have some parts made in Malaysia, there will be a chance for the Government to protect industry by allowing it to establish in that country, and the parts will come back here.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The parts don't come back here: they go there.

Mr BECKER: The whole thing ties up with the manufacturing programme of the industry. This new provision will be welcomed by industry, and South Australian manufacturers are fortunate that the Government is willing

to enter this field. Some risk is involved because of the financial arrangements regarding some of these overseas countries, and this will have to be worked out in close conjunction with the Commonwealth Government regarding policy. However, I do not see any big problem there.

The corporation will have as an additional member a person with expertise in this field. Being a former banker, I would suggest that a banker be appointed, but doubtless, many persons in industry would be of immense value to the corporation. This value is well known to present members of the Industries Development Committee, and the House has little to fear from the attitude that we have been taking recently in considering applications to the committee.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): During the last week there has been a visit to South Australia by the Chief Minister of Penang, who is also a prominent politician in Malaysia on whom the Prime Minister of Malaysia and his Government place much reliance. He has been outstanding in the industrial development activities of that country. Malaysia is an aiea where the gross national product per capita is increasing by about 20 per cent per annum, which is an extremely high rate, and it has a market of about 13 000 000 people; that market will quickly become available to the nearest industrial country (Australia), given certain conditions The conditions arc those that every developing country in the region imposes these days. They do not merely become supermarket No. 1 for Australian industry, we will not merely provide to them industrial products that they will then buy from us in large numbers.

They want part of the benefits of industrial development, and there is every reason why they should demand participation. Many provisions have been made for the involvement of Government corporations in Malaysia in joint venturing developments. Specific benefits have also been made available and, particularly in Penang, a free trade zone area is available, which means not only that manufactures could be carried on there for the local market but also that this is an area where there is virtually no taxation on the imported materials and on the manufacture of goods. Consequently, there can be a big distribution centre available to us.

Members know that Australia now faces exactly the situation that Europe faced a few years ago: it is less and less possible for us. in the expansion or diversification of our industry, to import process workers. Europe tried to solve this problem. Germany, Scandinavia and France did it by importing guest workers. That was a system of second-class citizens, or helots, and that produced serious problems for those countries. Australia always has set its face against doing anything of that kind, and I do not believe for a moment that we should do it.

If that is the situation we face, South Australia needs to diversify and strengthen its markets to cope with the situation that has constantly faced us of a fluctuating domestic market for consumer durables, which has been a major problem in securing South Australia's industrial employment. If we are to diversify, one way to do it is to get an additional market where additional process workers are available to us. We can do that with the support of the Governments concerned and of the Commonwealth Government. A move of this kind has been discussed fully with the Commonwealth Minister for Overseas Trade, and it has his full support and concurrence. The Chief Minister of Penang has told me that it has the full support and concurrence not only of his Government but also of the Prime Minister of Malaysia, and it can be expected that in that region a similar situation will arise in due course. This can be of great benefit to South Australian industry.

We have provided the necessary safeguards in the legislation to ensure that there is no misuse of public money and that there is proper scrutiny to see that the money we use in this area is for the benefit of strengthening the security of employment in this State. That is the basic object of the exercise.

The Leader has asked whether any specific proportion of the money provided to the Industries Assistance Corporation will be allotted specifically for an overseas grant or investment of this kind. No specific figure has been laid down, because we consider that all applications should be examined overall in a completely pragmatic way by the corporation and we consider it undesirable to put a limit on a specific investment. I think the corporation must look at the applications that come before it and allot its priorities for the benefit of the State.

Mr. Coumbe: They also are repayable funds of the State and the Commonwealth.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, in some cases that can apply. I may point out that our interest rate is one of the highest at present. It is very much higher than the interest rates now payable on loans in many developing countries. It is much higher, too, than the late in New Zealand. Certainly we would not contemplate the provision of money at a higher rate than has been allowed here previously. Obviously, we cannot provide Government funds or allow the guarantee of funds at a rale that would then interfere with our normal public borrowing programme. That will always be the case.

The fact that our interest rate is so high in relation to an enterprise that will, doubtless in the developing country, have some infusion of Government funds, may be a slight problem to us in the immediate future. However, I consider that this can be sorted out and that considerable benefit can flow to local organizations through the special taxation concessions that accrue from the kind of joint venturing arrangement in the countries with which we are concerned. The Government will consult with the Commonwealth Government about the need to obtain agreement to end any possibility of double taxation. Once that ends, real benefits from taxation concessions can flow in the developing countries concerned. The member for Hanson has referred to the way in which parts will flow. In South Australia we do not intend that investment will be made in a way that will provide componentry in the developing country for the South Australian market. We do not intend that investment from here should be supported by the Government, with a developing componentry in a low-wage market for importing to South Australia. We intend that investment be concentrated in an area in which we are providing componentry from here for a finishing or assembling process in the developing country, or the supply of a raw material or a processed material from here. As a result of the visit of Dr Lim last week, some specific proposals have been suggested, and arrangements have been made for several industrial leaders of significance in this State soon to visit Penang to discuss propositions that will be of benefit to their industries and to employment in South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. HALL: What does the Treasurer contemplate in relation to ownership of overseas industries? The Treasurer has been involved in the Redcliffs project and has been subjected to Commonwealth Government discipline about it. What will the link be between South Australia and overseas industries?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): The honourable member is wrong: I have not been subjected to any discipline by anyone in relation to the proportion of ownership in the Red Cliff Point project at any stage of the development of that project. I requested from the Commonwealth Government an indication of what it considered to be the required proportions of investment: I finally received that indication, and I agree with it. There has never been any question of discipline. In relation to overseas development, the countries concerned all require a 51 per cent local involvement in the development of any industry, and that is a perfectly proper request. That would mean that South Australian industry, in supposing any joint venture, would have a minority holding, but it accepts that situation. It would provide the technology resulting in real benefits, while local investment by private investors or Government corporations would be involved in the developing countries This situation has been accepted by those industries in South Australia with which I have discussed the matter.

Mr COUMBE: The Treasurer has said that he is willing to make his guarantee available on a percentage of local equity that is less than 50 per cent. Therefore, the Government is taking the risk (if one is involved) that, if the industry fails, taxpayers will pay the bill. I understood the Treasurer to say that there may be some problems regarding interest, and I remind him. of who was responsible for forcing up the interest rates in this country.

Mr. HALL: We are now learning that the taxpayer or elector is to be asked to back companies that have a major foreign ownership in any country in the world, it could be in the Middle East for all we know. We should be suspicious of the Treasurer's information if we have learned from past experience, but we are being asked to approve of South Australian citizens backing the Treasurer's ventures. There must be some limit to what the guarantee can be, but if the Treasurer obtains this power he may use it at the direction of his Party. The Australian Government, not the South Australian Treasurer, should handle all important overseas contacts on behalf of the Australian people. It seems that we may be asking South Australians to guarantee overseas millionaires. If it happens to be an industry from Singapore with a 51 per cent Singapore ownership, does the Treasurer say that it will be a small investor in Singapore who invests in the industry? It will be the millionaire investor who invests in the industry, and good luck to him. However, why must he be guaranteed by the South Australian taxpayer? If that is all the Treasurer can get from his overseas trip—

The CHAIRMAN: I draw the honourable member's attention to the wording of the clause.

Mr. HALL: I thank you, Mr. Chairman, but I do not know what relevance that statement has. I am concerned about an overseas firm coming in with at least 51 per cent of the capital and being guaranteed by the South Australian taxpayer. Such investors will already be wealthy people and the only excuse advanced by the Treasurer is that we will produce components that may be sold overseas That is a nebulous proposition because of the inflation rate in South Australia. With the scant information given by the Treasurer, I do not think that the South Australian people should guarantee the investment of overseas entrepreneurs in South Australian industry. If the Treasurer had a specific industry in mind that required certain assistance and if he told us the history of the matter, the product concerned, and who wanted the guarantee, we would have more information, but I will not follow him in this adventure, nor I do not expect the South Australian public to follow him

Members of the public expect the Treasurer to administer this matter in the interests of South Australian taxpayers and not in the interests of some overseas investors. If the Treasurer wishes to support the overseas aid programme, such a matter should be handled by his Commonwealth colleagues, not by him. The Opposition is being led by the nose in its earlier approval of the Treasurer's proposition.

Mr. COUMBE: We are dealing with "proclaimed countries" and this will mean that from time to time if a project must be referred to the committee it must be proclaimed. Unfortunately, in world politics and industry we have seen several takeovers in recent years under the guise of nationalism. This clause enables a guarantee to be given to a South Australian corporation that has a business in a proclaimed country. I could recount numerous cases where large industries have been set up to the benefit not only of the parent company but also of the country where the development is taking place, but because of a change of Government a takeover has unfortunately occurred and equity in the company has been lost. Could the Treasurer comment on this vital aspect?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It will be necessary before any payment of funds is made for satisfactory evidence of the stability of the investment to be given to the Government, to the Commonwealth Government, and to the corporation. No proclamation of a country will be made lightly. In consequence, the Government is well aware of the matters to which the Deputy Leader has adverted. We have not been precipitate in relation to Malaysia: we examined the situation in some depth before we took this step. The first country to be proclaimed will be Malaysia. If the Deputy Leader looks at the reports of Australian diplomats in Malaysia and the situation in Penang, he will see that the degree of stability achieved there is remarkable, and I think there is little likelihood of the kind of difficulty to which the Deputy Leader adverts. Quite clearly, before any other country is proclaimed the greatest care will have to be taken on the very basis the Deputy Leader has mentioned.

Mr. BECKER: I take it that the State Industries Assistance Corporation will finance the Australian percentage of the industry overseas and I therefore assume that the remarks of the member for Goyder are complete nonsense.

Mr. HALL: I cannot hear the member for Hanson: because he does not speak up I could not hear his criticism of me. I should like to know what he said, because I believe this provision is important.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Goyder should not make accusations against the honourable member for Hanson.

Mr. HALL: Next time the member for Hanson speaks I should like to hear him. It is obvious from the Treasurer's remarks that there is little safeguard for South Australians if we commit them in this way. I draw the attention of the Treasurer to the great shifts in the economic strength of the world in recent years because of the fuel crisis Japan, which was supposed to have—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the clause under discussion.

Mr. HALL: I am discussing the clause and I am discussing some economic ramifications of clause 3, which defines "overseas industry". There has been much debate about the implications of a guarantee that South Australians may be involved in as regards overseas industry. I was saying that there have been great shifts in economic strength overseas and Japan is one instance That country is neither included in nor excluded from this provision. Japan, which was supposed to have overwhelming reserves, has been found in the fuel crisis not to have those reserves In looking to Malaysia, the Treasurer is extending boundaries widely to an area that is not predictable, as recent evidence shows. What the Treasurer has said about this matter is wrong.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

FIRE BRIGADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (CONTRIBUTIONS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 20. Page 2595)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): Although this appears to be a small Bill, its ramifications are wide indeed. It seeks to vary the present contributions paid by metropolitan councils to the Fire Brigades Board. This matter has a long history. I recall taking to the Chief Secretary several deputations, including one when I was accompanied by the member for Ross Smith, both of us representing councils in our respective districts. The original legislation badly needs rewriting. Over the years, the position has changed, especially with regard to metropolitan councils.

Although I agree with the provisions of the Bill, I should like them to have gone further, and I will deal with that aspect later. The original legislation provided for local government contributions of two-ninths or 22.2 per cent, Government contributions of two-ninths or 22.2 per cent, and contributions by the fire insurance companies of five-ninths or 55 5 per cent That situation applied for several years, with an upper limit of $20 000 for the Government's contribution.

That was all very well in the days when money values were more constant than they are now. In recent years, the proportion has changed tremendously. At present, the contribution rate of the Government is 16 per cent; of local government, 23 per cent; and of insurance companies, 61 per cent Whereas under the old legislation, if it had not been for the artificial upper limit, the Government would have had to pay 22.2 per cent of the total maintenance of the Fire Brigades Board, at present it pays only about 16 per cent. To assist councils, the Government helped out in the case of some superannuation payments that had to be made to employees of the Fire Brigades Board. In addition, it made *ex gratia* payments to several councils. Therefore, an unsatisfactory arrangement was reached that was *ad hoc* to say the least; something had to be done The original Government contribution of 22 per cent was down to 16 per cent. As a result of this short-fall, local government was paying two-sevenths of the total, instead of two-ninths, and the insurance companies were paying five-sevenths, instead of five-ninths.

That is a considerable difference, when it is worked out in dollars and cents. The Bill sets out a new ratio, whereby the Government and local government will each pay one-eighth, with insurance companies paying three-quarters. In other words, the Government and local government will pay 12½ per cent, with the insurance companies paying 75 per cent. Without having regard to escalation in cost, we can see at once that the Government will pay less, local government will probably pay less, and insurance companies will face a fairly solid increase of from 55 per cent to about 75 per cent. An analysis of the figures is rather interesting. Under the present distribution, this year the South Australian Government paid about $650 000. councils paid $976 000, and insurance companies paid $2 440 000. Under the Bill, the Government's contribution will drop to $508 000, the council's contribution will drop to $508 000, and the contribution of insurance companies will increase to $3 050 000. That will be the effect of the Bill.

I have given figures for the current year, whereas next year the sums will be considerably higher. These new percentages will operate to the great benefit of local government. I support this change, because I have proposed by way of deputation and in the House that this legislation should be reviewed so that some relief can be given local government. This contribution and the compulsory contribution to the upkeep of hospitals are the two biggest contributions made by any council. The contribution under this legislation is a millstone around their neck from which they are seeking relief. There is a great disparity between the sums that metropolitan councils pay. Members may be surprised to know that there are nine fire districts, and this is an anachronism that should be corrected: we should have only one fire district.

When one sees the charges that are levied by councils, one is staggered. I refer, for instance, to the highest on the list, Mudla Wirra, 17.2 per cent of whose rates are involved in this respect. I also refer to the Adelaide City Council and the Port Adelaide council with 10.2 per cent and 10.95 per cent respectively of their rates being paid out in this way. This means that about one-tenth of the rate income of these councils goes directly in Fire Brigade contributions. At the other end of the scale, the Glenelg council pays a modest 2.37 per cent of its rates, the payments by other councils ranging up to about 3.8 per cent. This shows that a disparity exists in the contributions being made by various councils. This scale should be evened out because, after all, we all live in a fire district, irrespective of the area in which we live. One must remember too, of course, that fires do not take into account council boundaries. One can now get the stupid position in which, say, the Attorney-General may be living on one side of a street and the member for Ross Smith on the other side of that street, each paying a different percentage contribution.

One must remember the peculiar positions of the Adelaide City Council and the Port Adelaide council. Adelaide has a big concentration of large buildings, some of which are owned by the Commonwealth and State Governments. Port Adelaide has a large concentration of wharves that arc under the control of the Marine and Harbors Department and some Commonwealth Government departments. The situation of these councils needs to be considered carefully. I would, however, be opposed to having the sums that are paid by these councils lumped in with those paid by other metropolitan councils, as that would be unfair. Some scheme should be worked out in which special consideration is given to these two councils.

Another aspect that needs to be considered (and this is pertinent to the Bill because it involves contributions that are made by councils) is that there is a growing number of non-ratable properties in certain metropolitan districts. Councils receive no help in this respect from the Commonwealth Government, and such properties

produce no revenue for Fire Brigade contributions Some State Government departments, however, pay water rates by means of an *ex gratia* payment. Because the number of non-ratable properties is increasing, councils are on the one hand denied rate income while, on the other hand, the values of the properties that are subject to fire risk are increasing enormously.

I have the privilege to represent a district that comprises parts of four councils. In the Prospect council district, for instance, is the new Australian Broadcasting Commission building, which is to be opened officially next Friday and which is a monster of a building. .Members can imagine the problems involved in fighting a major fire in that building, even though it has the latest fire prevention equipment. I refer also to the archives building in the Prospect council district, and to the large Highways Department building at Walkerville These are not small buildings, and they must be protected from fire. There are also hospital buildings at Enfield, as well as Agriculture Department buildings and the buildings of several other departments. In Adelaide there is a host of both Commonwealth and Stale Government buildings. I am referring to at least $50 000 000 worth of Commonwealth Government buildings on which that Government pays no rates but which it expects to be protected from fires This raises the whole problem of Government contributions. I remind members that the State Government levies a pay-roll tax on the Fire Brigades Board, and councils must pay a tax on that tax. That is how silly it gets! I should have thought that the State Government could give relief in this respect.

It is not necessary to amend the Act to provide for only one fire district, because it could be done by proclamation, if one worked on the value of a council's rale income. Be that as it may, I do not consider that that is the best way to tackle the matter. I believe (and I am sure the Minister would agree with me) that by far the best and fairest method would be to adopt the assessed annual value system, as used by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. We could have one fire district in the metropolitan area instead of nine as at present, provided that the Government could relieve the Adelaide City Council and the Port Adelaide council of some of the extraordinary contributions they must make because of the concentration of Government buildings in their districts. By using the assessed annual value system, we would get over the problem of the distorted sums that must be paid by various councils. I therefore recommend that next session the Government introduce an amendment to the Act to provide for an assessed annual value system. It would be cumbersome for an Opposition member to introduce such an amending Bill because of the points I have made regarding the Port Adelaide and Adelaide councils requiring special consideration. As we are considering Fire Brigade contributions, we must also think of the poor householder. You, Mr. Speaker, have several delightful houses in a salubrious district.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: He owns several houses?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. If you were not in your elevated position, Mr. Speaker, I would call you a capitalist because you owned them. What is the position of the householder regarding fire protection? He pays his premium to the insurance company and a percentage of his council rate is used for Fire Brigade contributions. He also pays the South Australian Government for the water that he uses, and he hopes that one day that water will put out any fire that occurs on his property. Part of the payment to the Government is used for the 12½ per cent Government contribution to which I have referred. The suburban householder gets it all ways: he is the guinea pig. I think that the suggested new values (which I am supporting) and the reduction for suburban councils from about 23 per cent to 12½ per cent will be more than made up by what the insurance companies charge, but I hope that will not be the case. However, that is by the way.

One anomaly stands out as a result of a measure that this House passed previously, and I can refer to this matter in passing and still be within Standing Orders, Mr. Speaker. The House will remember that, in the Government's wisdom, it changed the number of members of the Fire Brigades Board from five to seven by adding an employee representative and the Chief Fire Officer. Previously, we had one representative on the board from the metropolitan councils, one from the Adelaide City Council, a Chairman, and two representatives of the Fire and Accident Underwriters Association. The insurance companies had two members on the board of five when those companies were paying about 60 per cent of the total costs. At present, they are being required to contribute about 75 per cent of the total costs of operating the fire services in the metropolitan area and their representation on the board has been reduced to two members on a board of seven. I do not suggest that any of the other members be taken off the board, but I point out that we must face this anomaly.

One problem associated with fire protection is the rapid escalation of costs in this service, and we must face this problem. It is a necessary service that must be provided for the 24 hours of the day and it now must provide for many contingencies for which it did not have to provide earlier. Previously, most fires occurred in places such as public buildings and houses. However, now the service could be required at a fire after a motor car crash or in an oil tanker that catches fire while travelling down a road. A fire may occur in a trailer or something else moving from one place to another.

Therefore, the scope of the fire services is increasing. As the height of our city buildings is increasing, so is the requirement of expertise and equipment for the Fire Brigades Board required to be expanded proportionately. I point out to the Minister that costs are increasing rapidly each year, and I ask the Government to consider two matters next year. Whilst I have indicated my support at this stage and have referred to the fact that other States have a similar arrangement regarding costs, I ask the Government to consider introducing a Bill to provide for one fire district in the metropolitan area, from which certain parts could be excised. I have in mind that part of the Hills area in the Mitcham council area could be excised and dealt with by the Emergency Fire Services, but that would be for the council to decide. The system I have suggested would give a more equitable distribution. Port Pirie may be attracted to this idea, because there is a problem about providing a fire service there.

I ask the Government to take cognizance of the fact that councils, by their contributions, pay a tax on a tax, because part of their contributions are paid on the pay-roll tax that the Government levies, and wages would be a significant part of their total expenditure, apart from capital. On behalf of councils, I welcome the relief being given by the reduced percentage, and they may get some relief this year. I wish to give recognition to the solid work done by voluntary committees that several councils have established, and some of these organizations have contacted me during the last two or three years about this matter. A close examination of this problem has been made, and I am pleased that councils are being given relief in this way.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support basically my colleague's remarks, but I want to amplify what he has said about the percentage that the insurance industry must pay now. It is clear from the second reading explanation that the payment formula being introduced is in use in other States The Minister told us that the matter was to be considered in Victoria, and he may like to know that the system has been operating there since January 1 this year. Therefore, four States have introduced this system.

Mr. Coumbe: We like to keep the Minister up to date.

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, and we like to be informed about what the Minister tells the House. In accepting that the four States to which I have referred are the major States in terms of the volume of industry and insurance, it would be difficult to argue with the arrangement that has been made. However, I know that the Minister has tried to find out what percentage of houses is insured. In other words, he has tried to find out what percentage of the population accepts a responsibility to insure property. The people enjoy the benefits of a Fire Brigade and the facilities it provides and they are, in effect, contributing a small part of the total cost, particularly with the reduction of the Government's contribution to only 12½ per cent. Statistical details need to be made available so that this matter can be considered in true perspective. It seems that there is a distinct responsibility on a Government that accepts that it must provide community services to also accept a fair and just part of the total cost, and not expect those who pay for the insurance risk to meet most of the cost of the facility. We must remember that the Fire Brigade not only fights fires but also provides other services for the community; such as pumping out cellars and subways, and rescuing small children and animals from trees.

If the Government considers the whole matter, it should accept the responsibility of paying more than 12½ per cent of the total cost. The person who insures is being asked to carry the load of those who do not insure, although the person not insured is now required to pay the Fire Brigade if a fire occurs on his property. However, these persons may go through the whole of their house ownership life without paying even a cent directly to the board. My colleague has referred to the unjust action taken earlier by the Government in destroying the relationship that existed between the members of the board representing the insurance industry and other persons. Insurance companies now will have a 75 per cent financial responsibility—

The SPEAKER: Order! I allowed the honourable member for Torrens to introduce this matter because he was the opening speaker, but I cannot allow it to be part of this debate unless it can be linked in some way. The Bill deals with contributions to be paid, not the constitution of the board. The Leader must link his remarks to some direct facet of the Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: There would be no difficulty in that. If we consider the 1973-74 figures as an example, instead of meeting an account of $2 439 909, insurance companies will be asked to pay $3 049 887, and that is a massive increase, bearing in mind that these companies play no part in spending that money. Escalating costs must also be considered, and, on figures available to insurance companies at present, the cost is expected to be more than $5 000 000 in 1974-75. This is money held on trust on behalf of those in the community who accept the responsibility of insurance, but the companies cannot direct how the money is to be spent.

One fears that this could become a precedent: for a long time it has been a feature of insurance business that insurers are required to make part of their funds available to statutory bodies such as the Fire Brigades Board, and under the provisions of the Bush Fires Act for equipment and for contributions to an accident fund for volunteers who are not covered by workmen's compensation. I hope that insurers will not be called on to meet the financial responsibility relating to the Police Force. We may find that the Government will direct that insurance companies be responsible for paying a part of the cost of operating the Police Force for such things as traffic management and police patrols acting as deterrents to burglary of industrial, commercial, or private property.

Mr. Payne: Do insurance companies have differential premiums in these circumstances?

Dr. EASTICK: Yes, they have, but, if the Government considered this move, insurance premiums for burglary, motor vehicles, or any other kind would increase.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not discuss insurance companies' activities: he must confine his remarks to contributions they make to the Fire Brigades Board.

Dr. EASTICK: Members should appreciate the wider ramifications of this matter. We should never assume any issue that is introduced to this House should be discussed in isolation from other issues that can subsequently evolve. We have had two amendments to the Fire Brigades Act during the present session and, by dividing the responsibility in those two amendments (one between board representation and the other concerning financial contributions), the Government has denied a full public scrutiny of the wider ramifications of these two issues. On an earlier occasion, I warned the Government that it must surely be recognized that, as the insurance companies were being asked to provide a greater proportion of this money (75 per cent in this case), they should also have a greater opportunity to influence decisions regarding the expenditure of that money. I do not resile from that statement.

The Government should ascertain how many people in the community insure their property, and how many live on the fruits of the responsibility shown by others and do not insure their property. Those in the latter category should bear a share of the cost. Members opposite are silent on this point, but what I have said parallels distinctly the argument put forward in relation to union membership. If what is said about union membership is correct, the argument that I have put forward with regard to responsibility for these payments is also correct. Although my colleague and I do not intend to move amendments, I hope (although I believe this is rather a forlorn hope) that the Attorney-General will answer some of the questions we have raised when he closes this debate. However, thank goodness there is another opportunity outside this House for the matter to be considered further. I support the Bill.

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

Later:

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 21. Page 2659.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This short Bill contains important provisions affecting public servants. First, it deals with higher duty payments. In the past, there has been some confusion whether certain officers have qualified to receive these payments. The Bill clarifies the position so that, when an officer is on leave and is replaced by

a junior officer, if the junior officer undertakes higher duties he is to receive higher duty pay. Secondly, provision is made in the Bill to enable officers to retire at age 55 if they wish, or to continue until they attain 65 years. This provision brings the Public Service Act into line with the Superannuation Bill, which we passed recently. I support the Bill.

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

Later:

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 20. Page 2594.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This Bill is consequential on the Superannuation Bill. It provides that teachers may retire at the age of 55 years, the only qualification being that they retire at the end of the year in which they turn 55. This provision is designed to prevent the school year being disrupted by their retiring on their actual birthday. I support the Bill.

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

Later:

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

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

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 21. Page 2661.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): As the administration of justice is always an important matter, this is an important Bill. The Bill has two purposes: administratively, it streamlines the procedure for the constitution of jury lists each month; and, in the legal sense, it clarifies the meaning of "remained in deliberation for at least four hours". The Opposition supports the Bill because it believes that, administratively, it is a necessary improvement on the existing situation. With criminal trials increasing at a steady rate, it is not unusual for three judges to be sitting in the criminal jurisdiction of the Supreme Court at the one time. In addition, the Central District Criminal Court could have three judges sitting. Invariably, one jurisdiction could find itself short of jurors, because of the exemptions of jurors and the number of cases being heard, whereas the other jurisdiction could have an excess of jurors.

The logical solution to this problem is a pool of jurors to be used by both courts. At the same time, it is equally logical that the numbers on the jury list be increased. As the Minister pointed out in his second reading explanation, under clause 4 the State will be divided into three jury districts, and under clause 13 the numbers of jurors to be listed will be increased to 3 000 for the Adelaide district and 500 for the country. Clause 25 relates to the computing of time spent by a jury in deliberation and, under new section 59 (3), where there has been a prolonged interruption the presiding judge may decide whether or not such period shall be included in the period of deliberation.

Clause 29 removes the power of the judge to issue precepts whenever jurors are required for any inquest. Section 91 of the principal Act reserves the power of issuing precepts to the judge in certain circumstances. This matter was referred to by the Minister in his second reading explanation, and the Bill relieves a cumbersome procedure in that regard. It may be argued that this provision will make the system simpler to administer. However, once we set a precedent of removing a judge's power, how much further may it go? I will not canvass that matter, however. As the Bill streamlines procedure and will make the workings of the courts more efficient, I support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 17 passed.

Clause 18—"Repeal of Part V of principal Act and enactment of Part in its place.''

Mr. RODDA: I move:

In new section 30 (3) (6) to strike out "post in a pre-paid envelope" and insert "registered mail".

It could be difficult for a pre-paid envelope to reach a juror in some districts, because many country people lock their places up and are lax in getting their mail. As penalties are imposed, a person could find himself in difficulty. Registered mail is a means whereby the Sheriff would be properly notified if someone did not receive a summons.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): As I agree that the amendment is reasonable, I am willing to accept it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (19 to 36) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MISCELLANEOUS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 20. Page 2595.)

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): In the absence and on behalf of the member for Chaffey, I am pleased to speak briefly to the Bill, which I support. Clause 6 enables festivals in future to be properly and fully recognized by the Licensing Court. In future, organizers of festivals of an historical, traditional or cultural significance will be able to apply to the court for a licence to sell liquor. This will enable them to sell liquor during the festival for a maximum period not of three days, as was the case previously, but, with the satisfaction of the court, for a period up to 14 days. This is indeed an important amendment, as many districts have already conducted or intend to conduct festivals lasting for more than the three days for which they could be licensed previously.

The Bill will clearly protect the interests of those connected with the Almond Blossom Festival at Willunga, for instance, which is of so much value to this State. Indeed, the district in which this festival is held has provided a valuable tourist attraction and community programme during its almond blossom period, and this will continue to be a great asset to South Australia. In the past, it has conducted a programme that has lasted for eight days. Much difficulty has been experienced in obtaining a satisfactory licence to sell liquor for the duration of the festival, and in this respect many approaches have been made to the Attorney-General and various other Government departments for recognition of the district's needs. In future, each case can be dealt with individually by the court and does not have to be cited specifically in the Act. As a result of the forward moves by the Attorney-General and his department, such organizations will be able to deal directly with the court in future. I am indeed pleased to be able to support the Bill on behalf of the member for Chaffey, who intended to speak to it. I do so also on behalf

of all districts that will benefit under the Bill, and I am particularly pleased to do so on behalf of the Willunga district, where so much difficulty has been experienced in the past.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I, too, support the Bill Clause 21 repeals section 137 of the Act and replaces it with a new section which provides that it shall be an offence for any person who is on licensed premises to refuse truthfully to state his age when requested to do so by a member of the Police Force, the holder of the licence or permit, his servant or agent, or an inspector. When the Act was amended previously, the Liberal and Country League made the point that the responsibility in this regard should not fall on the publican or his servant. The responsibility at present lies on the person selling the liquor, and any person can walk into a hotel and claim to be over 18 years of age. If it is found that such a person is below that age, the licensee or his servant can be prosecuted. I support the provision that puts the onus on the individual. He knows when he enters the hotel that he is under age and the law is displayed on all premises so that those who are under age can read it. These people know that they commit an offence by consuming an alcoholic beverage if they are under the age of 18 years

I should like the legislation to cover the auctioning of wine but I have not had time to consider an amendment and I will try to make representations to members of another place. A type of licence could be available to persons who wish to sell old-vintage wines in limited quantities. I do not say that a person should be able to store many thousands of gallons of wine for 10 years or 20 years and then pass that off in a business operation. However, many people would like to sell wine by auction, and there is difficulty about doing that now unless it is sold in licensed premises or a permit is obtained from the court to conduct the sale

In the main, I support the Bill and the comments that have been made by the member for Alexandra, but I do not understand why only one or two festivals should be mentioned. Recently we amended the Act to benefit one group. I do not understand why some should receive a licence automatically, whilst others have been denied one, and I am pleased that the court will be able to give organizers of historical or other functions the opportunity to sell liquor on their gala days. I particularly support the provision that puts the onus on the consumer as much as on the licensee.

The Hon. L. J KING (Attorney-General): Regarding the matter of wine auctions that the member for Fisher has raised, I am considering this whole matter and it is not an easy topic to deal with, for reasons that would be apparent to most members who have had experience of licensing problems. Apart from working out the principles on which such an amendment to the law could be made, it is necessary to consult the interests that would be affected by a change in the law relating to wine auctions.

I cannot insert in this Bill any new provisions regarding that matter. It needs careful consideration, but decisions will be made before the next session of Parliament, and action will be taken then if a satisfactory solution of the problem can be worked out. I have had representations from various people and interests concerned and I intend to consult the various interests in the next two or three months I hope to be able to introduce an amendment next session.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Special licences for festivals."

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

In paragraph (a) to strike out "and (2e)" and insert ", (2e) and (2f)".

This is purely a drafting amendment The Bill as it stands does not repeal subsection (2f).

Mr. MATHWIN: I ask the Attorney whether this clause covers surf lifesaving carnivals, particularly those held on what we would term bank holiday weekends. The Australian surf championships will be conducted here during the Easter weekend, and clubs are concerned about Good Friday. I ask the Attorney whether a special licence would be available to the clubs for the Easter weekend.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I take it that the club to which the honourable member refers is a licensed club, but this amendment is not designed to extend the hours of licensed clubs. It enables the court to confer authority on a governing body of a festival or a body conducting a festival to sell liquor in terms of the permit during the festival. I do not think it would apply to the situation contemplated by the honourable member. The policy of the Act, as can be seen from several provisions, is clearly against trading on Good Friday and, therefore, it would not be open to the club to which he refers to trade on that day

Amendment carried, clause as amended passed

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Conditions of application where no licence of the class sought has previously been granted in relation to the premises."

Mr. MATHWIN: I ask the Attorney whether this clause covers the surf lifesaving world series carnival. People will be eating at the carnival, including on Good Friday and, as a bar is available, could liquor be sold at that bar?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, because this association is a licensed club and can only serve liquor to members or to visitors who have been introduced and vouched for by members. No public trading facilities are available at such a club. There may be provision for the admission of honorary members, but the association will have to consult its solicitor or the court regarding this matter. The policy of the Licensing Court is not to grant liquor facilities on Good Friday, because many people in the community consider that this is a day on which the Christian attitude should be respected, even by those who may not share these beliefs.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 to 23) and title passed

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL (AMENDMENTS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 21 Page 2662.)

Mr RUSSACK (Gouger). This Bill constitutes another step forward in the implementation of the Acts of South Australia under the Acts Republication Act, 1967-1972. If passed, the Bill will greatly assist easy reference to Acts and details in the Statutes of this State. The objects of the Bill are to make certain consequential and minor amendments to, and to correct certain errors and remove certain anomalies in, the Statute law, and to repeal obsolete enactments. The first of the two schedules refers to the repeal of four Acts, which are now obsolete, and their repeal would not prejudice any person. The second schedule refers to 28 Acts as listed. In his second reading explanation the Minister stated:

Every precaution has been taken to ensure that no amendment to any Act changes any policy or principle that has already been established by Parliament

Even though the Minister made that statement. I now more fully appreciate the benefits of this Bill after researching each item in the second schedule. I am convinced that, with one exception, everything is satisfactory The exception is the Bills of Sale Act, 1886-1972, section 11 of which is amended by striking out "bringing in" in paragraph (6) and inserting "buying in". In my research I found that this amendment was introduced in 1940. I accept that clause 3 (2) of the Bill would solve this problem, because it provides:

. . . all references in the second schedule that are ancillary to or consequential upon the enactment by this Act which purports to make that amendment shall be struck out and this Act shall have effect as if those references and that amendment had never been included in this Act.

Despite that provision, I suggest that it might be wise in Committee to amend the second schedule as I have suggested. As this Bill will facilitate the reprinting of Acts in the Acts Republication Act and make references to Statutes easier to undertake, I support the second reading.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I, too, support the second reading. It is a pleasure to be considering a Bill that has been on the Notice Paper since last week, as later this evening we will have to consider Bills introduced today. I hope that, in closing this debate, the Attorney-General will indicate when the consolidation of Statutes will be complete. I understand that the Statutes were last consolidated in 1937. Their consolidation again would be of benefit to all those who use them, especially members of this House.

The Hon L. J. KING (Attorney-General): The work on consolidating the Statutes is going forward. Of course, it is limited by the availability of skilled personnel able to do this exacting and highly skilled work. Mr. Ludovici is devoting his time to it with what assistance can be provided to him, and he is making satisfactory progress. The difficulty is to fix a cut-off date for incorporating the amendments in the Statutes to be consolidated and published in the consolidated volumes. It is hoped that we can have a cut-off date at about the end of this year. The work will proceed from there, with volumes starting to appear about a year after that. As this job is long and painstaking, it will be some time before a complete set of consolidated Statutes is available.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 and first schedule passed.

Second schedule.

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

In the first column to strike out "Bills of Sale Act, 1886-1972"; in the second column to strike out "Section 11 — Strike out 'bringing in;' from paragraph (6) and insert 'buying in,' in lieu thereof;", and in the third column to strike out "Bills of Sale Act, 1886-1974".

This is a formal amendment. A further examination of the Bills of Sale Act discloses that the amendment provided in the second schedule of this Bill has in fact already been made to that Act. I am obliged to the members for Gouger and Mallee, who brought this matter to the attention of the Parliamentary Counsel.

Amendments carried; second schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICES BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) ACT, 1968, REPEAL BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER BILL

In accordance with Joint Standing Order 1, the Legislative Council requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly in the appointment of a Joint Select Committee on the Bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MEAT CORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LAND SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 1.16 am the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 27, at 2 p.m.