HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, August 27, 1974

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

BUILDERS LICENSING 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.

PETITIONS: SODOMY

Mr. BOUNDY presented a petition signed by 52 persons objecting to the introduction of legislation to legalize sodomy between consenting adults until such time as Parliament had a clear mandate from the people by way of a referendum (to be held at the next periodic South Australian election) to pass such legislation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a similar petition signed by 297 persons.

Mr. GROTH presented a similar petition signed by 125 persons.

Mr. COUMBE presented a similar petition signed by 69 persons.

Mr. McANANEY presented a similar petition signed by 106 persons.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 463 persons.

Mr. RODDA presented a similar petition signed by 238 persons.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY presented a similar petition signed by 40 persons.

Dr. TONKIN presented a similar petition signed by 290 persons.

Mr. ARNOLD presented a similar petition signed by 147 persons.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD presented a similar petition signed by 121 persons.

Mr. MATHWIN presented a similar petition signed by 262 persons.

Mr. KENEALLY presented a similar petition signed by 28 persons.

Mr. GUNN presented a similar petition signed by 15 persons.

Mrs. BYRNE presented a similar petition signed by 18 persons.

Mr. PAYNE presented a similar petition signed by 313 persons.

The Hon. L. J. KING presented a similar petition signed by 182 persons.

Mr. MILLHOUSE presented a similar petition signed by 440 persons.

Mr. BLACKER presented a similar petition signed by 30 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: SPEED LIMIT

Mr. WELLS presented a petition signed by 37 residents of South Australia, stating that because of conversion to metrics the speed limit of 30 kilometres an hour past school omnibuses and schools was too high and presented an increased threat to the safety of schoolchildren, and praying that the House of Assembly would support legislation to amend the Road Traffic Act to reduce the speed limit to 25 km/h.

Mrs. BYRNE presented a similar petition signed by 60 persons.

Mr. ALLEN presented a similar petition signed by 65 persons.

Petitions received.

PETITION: NATIONAL ROUTE 64

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition signed by 239 electors of the District of Frome, stating that parts of National Route 64, between Spalding and Burra, and the highway between Clare and Burra, were still unsealed, and praying that the House of Assembly would investigate the apparent drop in priority for these works and endeavour to provide sufficient Government grants funds to maintain district council staffing at its present level, and to allow full use of the plant that could carry on with economical road construction on both projects immediately.

Petition received and read.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Croydon Park Technical College—Extensions to School of Automotive Engineering;

Salisbury Major Trunk Sewers.

Ordered that reports be printed.

HILTON PROPERTY

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Ombudsman on the acquisition by the Highways Department of property at Hilton.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As soon as the Industries Assistance Commission report on the passenger motor vehicle industry was released, the South Australian Government established a committee headed by the Director of the Premier's Department to examine the report, advise on its implications for Australia and South Australia, particularly in terms of employment and regional development, and to consider alternative means of achieving the Australian Government's objectives, as stated in its reference to the I.A.C. This committee has held discussions and exchanged information with the manufacturers in South Australia, General Motors-Holden's and Chrysler, with representatives of the parts manufacturers and with the other manufacturers whose purchases affect South Australian suppliers, Ford and Leyland. The committee and I have also discussed the report and its implications with the groups of representatives from the Prime Minister's Department and the Department of Manufacturing Industry, which is considering the report and will advise the Australian Government on its implementation. Although the process of analysis and discussion is not yet complete, it is possible to make a number of comments at this stage on the report and its implications. The first thing to stress is that in general the I.A.C. report is a competent document which highlights the unfortunate

results of past Australian Government efforts to achieve a high local-content Australian motor industry. However, we disagree with the I.A.C. in the following ways:

(*a*) Demand estimates: The I.A.C. estimates the demand for passenger motor vehicles at 612 000 to 642 000 in 1980 with medium cars representing 44 per cent of that total. These estimates appear to be based on optimistic projections of important variables, for example, gross national product, population, rate of interest, operating costs (price of petrol, etc.), price of new vehicles in relation to other goods, etc. Our estimates suggest a total market of about 540 000 by 1980, of which medium cars would represent 35-40 per cent; that is, my advisers estimate the market available to present local manufacturers will decline in absolute terms to about 210 000 whereas the I.A.C. expects growth in this market to 286 000.

(*b*) Rationalization; The I.A.C. assumes that the removal of vehicle plans and the reduced duties will induce amalgamation of component manufacturers with consequent improvements in efficiency in resource use. Discussions with manufacturers have made it clear that the implementation of these measures would lead rather to increased sourcing of components overseas. (The motor vehicle manufacturers, of course, make decisions as to sourcing.)

(*c*) Local content: The I.A.C. concludes that its proposals would sustain manufacture of vehicles with 85-90 per cent local content. If the recommendations were implemented, the local content of medium size vehicles would probably be reduced to between 60 and 70 per cent. Lighter vehicles presently assembled in Australia would be imported as built-up vehicles (i.e., local content in these areas would be reduced substantially). The I.A.C.'s conclusion seems to be based on: a lack of understanding of the practical problems of industry reorganization and, hence, of the process of adjustment following changes in assistance to industry; and an underestimation of the protective effect of the motor vehicle plans which have made it necessary that manufacturers source locally rather than with "low cost" affiliated companies overseas.

(*d*) Employment sustained by vehicle manufacture: There is reason to believe that the I.A.C. has underestimated the employment sustained by motor vehicle manufacture: it has ignored employment by materials suppliers, and the number engaged in specialist component manufacture seems to be underestimated. The report also does not recognize the possibility that the loss of automotive business by some firms could destroy their overall viability with consequent secondary effects on employment. If we take a major component out of a component line then we destroy the viability of a total business in many cases.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why don't they do their homework?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are trying to get them to do so.

(*e*) Effects on employment if recommendations implemented: In general terms, the I.A.C. estimated that 15 000 jobs would become redundant in the industry and 13 000 new jobs would be created (that is, a net loss of jobs of 2 000 over the next decade). In view of the foregoing doubts about assumptions underlying this estimate, there are strong grounds for believing that the I.A.C. has substantially understated the extent of the job opportunities that would be lost. The I.A.C. report also implicity assumes that disruption would be minimized because the creation of new jobs would offset the lost job opportunities, and because present labour conditions would facilitate the adjustment. Comments from the industry, however, suggest that the acceptance of the commission's recommendations would bring a severe initial impact on employment especially in skilled areas such as design toolmaking, etc., and the overall reduction would occur within two or three years. There is no reason to believe that a smooth adjustment would occur.

Regarding South Australia, the commission, in its report, expects no significant employment problem for the Adelaide region as a result of its recommendations. Adelaide, however, is heavily involved in component manufacture (including the manufacture of panels, engines, and transmissions, which are considered high-cost areas by I.A.C. and consequently would be among those considered first for resourcing). At this stage it appears that the implementation of I.A.C. recommendations could lead to the elimination of a considerable number of jobs sustained by motor vehicle manufacture. The committee investigating the report visited Melbourne yesterday to see the Ford Corporation and officials of General Motors-Holden's.

The committee visited the Leyland company, and recently held discussions with it. This committee has said that, if the scheme as recommended to the Commonwealth Government by I.A.C. is adopted, employment in South Australia within the motor vehicle industry and its suppliers could be reduced to 8 000 from the present level of 23 000 by the year 1980. This is a disastrous situation for the motor vehicle industry. If the commission's recommendations are adopted, it spells doom to the major area of employment in South Australia. In considering the disruption to the South Australian economy, the loss of jobs in the motor vehicle industry would need to be considered, in conjunction with expected falls in employment in the electronics and domestic appliance industries, and this is already occurring through the activities of the Commonwealth Government in reducing tariffs affecting these industries, particularly in South Australia.

Our preliminary view is that the recommendations, if implemented, would not maintain a viable industry which achieves highest efficiency with high Australian content, product rationalization, etc., and which is well located for social, employment, and environmental purposes, and those were the terms of reference specified to I.A.C. by the Commonwealth Government. In view of all these considerations, we believe the fundamental question whether Australia wants a motor vehicle manufacturing industry at all, rather than a small assembly operation, needs to be answered. If the answer is "Yes" (and for South Australia it must be "Yes"), the implementation of I.A.C.'s recommendations cannot be countenanced. I believe that not only this Parliament but all the people of South Australia must make clear that they will not accept any action of the Commonwealth Government to implement the recommendations of I.A.C. For the information of members, the committee examining the I.A.C. report will be making a firm proposal of a scheme to enable the Commonwealth Government's broad objectives to be accomplished without any severe loss of employment, and without any of the dire consequences that I have forecast would occur if, in fact, I.A.C.'s recommendations were accepted.

Mr. Evans: In other words, we all have to work harder.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member works with the State Government in this matter, he and other members can accomplish much for South Australia.

QUESTIONS

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

STATE'S FINANCES

In reply to Mr. McANANEY (August 20).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In reply to the honourable member's question, 1 supply the following tabulated information:

	Salaries and wages $'000	Pay-roll tax $'000	Materials, services etc. $'000	Total $'000
July 1973	1 115	—	882	1 997
July 1974	2 025	91	1 261	3 377
Increase	910	91	379	1 380

Salaries and wages: the increase of $910 000 was caused by three Public Service pays being brought to debit in July 1974, compared to two such pays in July 1973. This accounts for $675 000, and the remaining $235 000 reflects, in the main, the increased cost this July compared to the most recent increased salary and wage rates which came into effect after July 1973, but which are included in July 1974 costs.

Pay-roll tax: departments are now required to recover to revenue the current rates of pay-roll tax as enacted.

Materials, services, etc. $379 000: this increased cost reflects the general cost of inflation for goods, rentals, and services, the effects of increased charges in last year's Commonwealth Budget, for example, postages and telephones, and a minor expansion in the administration of Government policies.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

In reply to Mr. RODDA (August 21).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No proposal exists to phase out correspondence courses in public health, meat inspection, etc., which are at present conducted by the Further Education Department.

TEXTBOOK

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (August 21).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The book to which the honourable member referred in this question was placed on the optional wider reading list for Matriculation students in previous years, but was removed in the list published in the Public Examinations Board Manual for 1974. No doubt schools will have retained copies in their block book stock. Certain poems in the anthology contain the frank use of vocabulary, which has gained currency in recent literature on sex topics. Such topics and vocabulary are not sought out by teachers, but when they arise in the pursuit of English courses, especially at this senior level, they are best dealt with in the way the Senior Master at Kingscote Area School did in the case that has been brought to the honourable member's notice: naturally, in a normal, unsensational, and low-key fashion.

Kingscote Area School has two copies of *Children of Albion—Poetry of the "Underground" in Britain,* which have been available amongst a range of anthologies for use in the pursuit of particular interests in English by individual students at Matriculation level. There is no insistence by the school (nor was there by the Public Examinations Board) on the use of the book. In a broad range of assignments, one girl in the Matriculation class chose to use this book to prepare a tutorial on poems dealing with the three themes of drugs, war, and sex. In the course of her tutorial, which was prepared under the guidance of the Senior Master who is of fine repute, well respected in and beyond the school and a former member of the Secondary English Curriculum Committee, she duplicated a number of poems that were handed out to members of the class who read and discussed them.

A particular poem to which I understand one girl and her parents objected was dealt with in the broader context and dispensed with in a few minutes in the normal controlled classroom environment under the senior's direction. Despite his advice not to disseminate the duplicated sheets amongst younger students, copies did become available beyond the senior class group, with the result that much comment occurred. I am confident in the ability of the school to ensure that this will not recur.

SOMERTON HOME

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (August 7).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The following information is in addition to that contained in a letter from the Minister of Health on December 13, 1973, in reply to the question asked on November 28, 1973. The present situation with regard to the Somerton Crippled Children's Association property is that an approach was made by the Hospitals Department to the National Hospitals and Health Services Commission in March seeking approval for funds to purchase the property, but this request has not been approved of at this stage. However, the Hospitals Department would still be very interested in acquiring the property for use possibly as a rehabilitation hostel, if the Australian Government will provide funds for its purchase, and a further approach will be made to the National Hospitals and Health Services Commission closer to the time when the Crippled Children's Association will be vacating the premises towards the end of 1975.

LICENSING ACT

In reply to Mr. ARNOLD (July 25).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member had asked that the Government amend the Licensing Act to enable the Licensing Court, at hearings for removals of retail storekeeper licences, to consider the needs of the people in the area for which the licence was originally granted. It is true that there is a need for a change in the law, for it has recently become a practice for investors to purchase a retail storekeeper's licence, having a small turnover in a country town, with the intention of removing it to a more profitable site in the metropolitan area. By using the removal procedure, the applicant avoids the onus placed on him by section 22 (2) of the Licensing Act, which requires the court, when considering a new application, to be "satisfied that the public demand for liquor cannot be met by other existing facilities for the supply of liquor in the locality in which the applicant proposes to carry on business in pursuance of the licence". Consideration is being given to amending the Licensing Act to provide that the requirements of section 22 (2) shall also apply to applications for removal of retail storekeeper licences. Such an amendment will remove the present anomaly.

SMOKING

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (August 6).

The Hon. L. J. KING: Smoking by any person while engaged in preparing and supplying food for sale is already prohibited by regulation under the Food and Drugs Act. Suppliers also have an obligation to protect food, premises, and equipment from contamination. The Government is not considering legislation that would prohibit smoking by customers in restaurants or other areas in which food is sold.

MODBURY COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRE

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (August 20).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Government is negotiating for the acquisition of a suitable site in the Tea Tree Gully shopping centre for the building of a community welfare centre. Subject to satisfactory completion of these negotiations, design work for the centre will be put in hand. In the meantime efforts are being made to acquire a larger house in the area that can be used to accommodate the department's district office until the new community welfare centre is available. Subsequently, the house would be used as a residential facility for children.

RUBBISH CONTAINERS

Tn reply to Mr. RODDA (August 8).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Litter from roadside litter bins is collected regularly by departmental maintenance personnel for disposal at approved council dumps. The department has found this arrangement satisfactory to date, and has no plans for alternative procedures.

LEIGH CREEK ROAD

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (August 7).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I refer to the question asked by the honourable member during the Address in Reply debate regarding the upgrading of the road from Hawker to Leigh Creek. Subject to the availability of funds from the Australian Government, it is planned to commence construction and sealing of the Hawker to Leigh Creek road at Hawker in mid-1975 on completion of the Hawker to Wilpena Road, and to continue towards Leigh Creek. A completion date cannot be predicted at this time. Upgrading of the existing road will continue at the known trouble spots such as Commodore Swamp, Beltana Creek, Puttapa Creek, and the two miles of clay road near Wilpena. Generally, this road is now in reasonable condition.

MITCHAM HILLS TRANSPORT

In reply to Mr. EVANS (August 7).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I refer to the question asked by the honourable member during the Address in Reply debate with regard to the public transport system in the Mitcham Hills area. The question of the future of bus services in the Mitcham Hills area is one that is now being examined by the bus service planning group set up by the Director-General of Transport. Since the resumption of most metropolitan private bus services, most bus services in the Mitcham Hills area are operated by the Municipal Tramways Trust, using former private buses. As more buses become available, the bus service planning group intends that some improvements will be made to the bus route network, while at the same time service frequencies will be improved. One service, serving part of the Coromandel Valley area, is still owned and operated by a private company and that company is licensed by the Transport Control Board and not by the Municipal Tramways Trust. The future of that service is beyond the terms of reference of the bus service planning group. However, I will ask the Director-General of Transport to examine the future of these services jointly with the State Transport Authority.

CHURCHILL ROAD CROSSING

In reply to Mr. JENNINGS (July 30).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not intended to proceed with the arrangement for police control of the crossing on Churchill Road at the Islington railway workshop. Instead the Commissioner of Highways will proceed to design a pedestrian actuated signal crossing.

GRAIN TRUCKS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many hopper-bottom grain trucks are now used by the South Australian Railways?
2. What is the cost of each truck?
3. What contribution is made by growers to the cost of each truck?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

I. Narrow-gauge waggons, 68; broad-gauge waggons, 28; and standard-gauge waggons, 52, a total of 148.

2. Narrow gauge, average cost $17 335; broad gauge, average cost $9 322; and standard gauge, average cost $10 945.

3. A surcharge of 1c a tonne is levied on all wheat and barley hauled in these hopper waggons, and as at June 30, 1974, the total contribution from this surcharge was $48 532 or an average of $328 a waggon.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What number of sites in South Australia were considered for the establishment of a petro-chemical complex, and where were they?
2. Who suggested each of the sites?
3. What criteria was used to eliminate each of the sites other than Redcliff, and who made the decisions on each site?
4. What attempt was made to involve possible consortium members in the selection of a site?
5. Have any members of the present consortium or members of a former possible consortium reported adversely on the selected site, and what site or sites have any of these organizations suggested as an alternative site to Redcliff and for what reasons?
6. Has any potential consortium member withdrawn because of the site selected?

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

1. Four geographic areas were seriously considered for the location of the petro-chemical complex. Within these four areas several sites were examined. The areas were Port Stanvac, Port Paterson/Red Cliff Point/Port Pirie, Osborne/Torrens Island/Dry Creek, and Ardrossan.

2. The sites were selected on the basis of consultation by State Government departments with companies interested in the development of the Cooper Basin, and the marketing and use of its products. Industrial consultants were also used in identifying the necessary parameters.

3. The only site other than Red Cliff Point that sustained serious consideration was LeFevre Peninsula, and it received very active investigation when the size of the intended industry was about one-quarter of the size of the industry now proposed. The Government had some reservations about this site, because it would have occupied the greater proportion of land on the peninsula and inhibited other development. Because there were two proposals before the Government at the time, the proponents of the smaller scheme were told that the Government considered that the Red Cliff Point site should be given priority, and that the LeFevre Peninsula site should be considered as unavailable. This decision was made by me following advice from the Marine and Harbors Department and my own department.

4. Consortium members were involved in the selection of the sites actively under investigation, and check lists were supplied by them to the Government so that full cognisance could be taken of factors affecting location.

5. There has been no adverse criticism of the site by the present consortium or any other proponent of the complex. Statements have been made by the present consortium of the additional cost of the Red Cliff Point location as against a metropolitan area location. This is not a criticism, however, but an appraisal of establishment cost. The present consortium would not be willing to consider a change of site at this stage.

6. No potential consortium member has withdrawn because of the choice of the Red Cliff Point site.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Was any regional or site study carried out before the decision to site the petro-chemical project at Redcliff and, if so, by whom?

2.If studies were made, when were they made and what was the result?

3. If no such study was carried out, why not?

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

1. Four geographic areas were seriously considered for the location of the petro-chemical complex. Within these four areas, a number of sites were examined. The areas were Port Stanvac, Port Paterson/Red Cliff Point/Port Pirie, Osborne/Torrens Island/Dry Creek, and Ardrossan. The Red Cliff Point site was selected on the basis of consultation by State Government departments with companies interested in the development of the Cooper Basin, and the marketing and use of its products. Consortium members were also involved in the selection of sites actively under investigation, and check lists were supplied by them to the Government so that full cognizance could be taken of factors affecting the location. A considerable amount of information on the environmental profile of the area was available at the time when the site was selected.

2. and 3. This information is documented in Appendix 4 of the plan for environmental study, which was published by the South Australian Environment and Conservation Department in May this year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Was a request made, in October, 1973, or at some other time and, if so, what other time, to the Department of Geography, University of Adelaide, to assist in preparing an environmental impact statement concerning the terrestrial landscape of the area at Redcliff being considered as the site for the petro-chemical complex?

2. If this request was made—

(*a*) to whom was it made and by whom; and

(*b*) what reply, if any, was received and when?

3. Has any comprehensive impact study concerning the petro-chemical project at Redcliff yet been carried cut?

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

1. My department has made no such request.

2. See 1.

3. Impact studies consist of many components as was explained in reply to a question in *Hansard* on Tuesday, August 13, 1974. From that comprehensive list, several studies have been started or have been underway for some period of time, whilst a firm commitment to many of the others has now been reached with the petro-chemical consortium.

COMMONWEALTH GRANTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What amounts were received, respectively, during the 1973-74 financial year from the Australian Government for—

(*a*) National sewerage scheme;

(*b*) Monarto Development Commission;

(*c*) Home care grants;

(*d*) Youth, sport and recreation; and

(*e*) National estate?

2. On what date was each individual payment received?

3. What amounts were outstanding at June 30, 1974, in respect of Australian Government promises for each of the above headings?

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

1.(*a*) $1 598 234.

(*b*) $4 413 000.

(*c*) $81 143.

(*d*) (i) Recreation and sport $75 000.

(ii) Community centres and recreation facilities $105 000.

(iii) National Fitness Council $106 990.

(*e*) $45 000.

2. (*a*) $1 598 234, June 27, 1974.

(*b*) $2 749 000, June 14, 1974; $1 664 000, June 27, 1974.

(*c*) $46 268, October 22, 1973; $10 809, February 25, 1974; $24 066, June 28, 1974.

(*d*) (i) $75 000, June 4, 1974.

(ii) $20 000, February 19, 1974; $85 000, March 8, 1974.

(iii) $31 497, July 31, 1973; $39 686, February 6, 1974; $15 807, May 27, 1974; $20 000, June 7, 1974.

(*e*) $45 000, June 3, 1974.

3. At June 30, 1974, a claim of $5 066 in respect of the National Fitness Council was outstanding. In addition, the State had incurred costs of a type approved for reimbursement under Monarto arrangements to the extent of $1 078 000 at that date, but had not submitted a claim.

VAUGHAN HOUSE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): What proportion of girls admitted to Vaughan House, other than on remand, in each of the years ended June 30, from 1971 to 1974, respectively, would be classed as recidivists?

The Hon. L. J. KING: For purposes of the question, "recidivist" has been taken to mean girls who have been recommitted and placed at Vaughan House for a further period of training.

Year ended	Proportion of girls recidivists
June 30, 1971	35 per cent
June 30, 1972	29 per cent
June 30, 1973	57 per cent
June 30, 1974	35 per cent

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): For each of the years ended June 30, from 1971 to 1974, inclusive, what was the average number of inmates at Vaughan House, in the various categories?

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

Year ended	Average number of residents
Year ended June 30, 1971	26
Year ended June 30, 1972	25
Year ended June 30, 1973	26
Year ended June 30, 1974	45

Before June 30, 1973, almost all the residents were placed at Vaughan House for training. Since July 1, 1973, about 50 per cent of residents have been on remand including remand for assessment.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many complaints have been lodged in the past year by owners and occupiers of property near Vaughan House who have been, or who claim to have been, deprived

of the full enjoyment of their properties by the inmates of that centre?

2. Has each of these complaints been investigated, and with what results?

3. What actions have been taken, or are intended to be taken, to ensure that innocent and peaceful residents in the vicinity of Vaughan House do not suffer as a result of changes at that centre?

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

1. Complaints received: July to December, 1973, 12 complaints; January to June, 1974, three complaints. Some of these complaints have been made to the centre, not about residents of the centre but about youths who have come to the centre from the community.

2. All complaints have been investigated and action taken to curb any residents of the centre acting in an abusive way.

3. (i) New window screens have been ordered that restrict visibility into neighbouring houses.

(ii) All staff are aware that they have a responsibility towards the local community, and take action to ensure no disturbance of the peace.

(iii) A security service has been engaged to keep unwanted visitors/intruders from the property.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What were the number of abscondings from Vaughan House, by category of inmate, for each of the years ended June 30, 1971, 1972 and 1973, and for each of the six-month periods ended December 31, 1973, and June 30. 1974?

2. What actions have been taken since the mass break-out from Vaughan House in November last, and what further actions are planned to increase security at the centre?

3. Have the actions had the full desired effect, and, if not, why not?

4. What are the full details of each absconding from the centre since the November break-out, and following the Minister's assurance to this House that security would be improved?

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

1. The absconding figures include abscondings from leave, work-out, and trips from centre.

Year	Number of Abscondings		
	From centre	From outside employment, leave or trips from centre	Total abscondings
Year ended June 30, 1971	Detail not available	Detail not available	125
Year ended June 30, 1972	Detail not available	Detail not available	82
Year ended June 30, 1973	77	49	126
July 1, 1973, to December 31, 1973	48	23	71
January 1, 1974, to June 30, 1974	5	27	32

2. *(a)* Visit by senior officer from Correctional Services for one month to give advice on security aspects.

(b) Completely re-arranged key system whereby staff only carry keys to internal doors.

(c) Windows now all adequately secured.

(d) Observation windows fitted to all unit access doors.

(e) Roster planning so that one male residential care worker and one female residential care worker are on duty in each unit.

(f) New procedures introduced, including full security check each night, new recording system for all critical problems, and daily security check of dangerous materials and objects.

3. Yes. Only two have absconded from secure areas since February, 1974, when security alterations were completed.

4. December, 1973:

December 8, 1973, absconded from taking keys from staff.
December 8, 1973, absconded from taking keys from staff.
December 8, 1973, absconded from taking keys from staff.
December 24, 1973, failed to return from Christmas leave.
December 25, 1973, failed to return from Christmas leave.
December 26, 1973, failed to return from Christmas leave.

January, 1974:

January 1, 1974, failed to return from work.
January 4, 1974, failed to return from work.
January 6, 1974, failed to return from leave.
January 19, 1974, failed to return from leave.
January 23, 1974, failed to return from leave.

February, 1974:

February 5, 1974, broke out of building through front window.
February 5, 1974, broke out of building through front window.
February 5, 1974, broke out of building through front window.

March, 1974:

March 2, 1974, did not return from sponsored outing.
March 3, 1974, failed to return from leave.
March 3, 1974, failed to return from leave.
March 25, 1974, climbed over fence.
March 25, 1974, climbed over fence.
March 27, 1974, failed to return from work-out.

April, 1974:

April 1, 1974, failed to return from work.
April 30, 1974, failed to return from seeking work.

May, 1974:

May 4, 1974, failed to return from outing.
May 4, 1974, failed to return from outing.
May 4, 1974, failed to return from outing.
May 4, 1974, failed to return from outing.
May 4, 1974, failed to return from outing.
May 18, 1974, failed to return from medical clinic.
May 27, 1974, failed to return from employment interview.

June, 1974:

June 5, 1974, failed to return from school.
June 5, 1974, failed to return from work.
June 14, 1974, absconded from beach trip.
June 14, 1974, absconded from beach trip.
June 14, 1974, absconded from beach trip.
June 20, 1974, failed to return from work.
June 22, 1974, failed to return from home outing.
June 28, 1974, failed to return from work.
June 29, 1974, failed to return from work.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice): What was the number and average age of both male and female staff supervisors and residential care workers, respectively, at Vaughan House at June 30 in each of the years from 1971 to 1974, inclusive?

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

	30/6/71			30/6/72			30/6/73			30/6/74		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Number of residential care workers . .	0	13	13	2	12	14	3	13	16	11	25	36
Number of supervisors	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	5	5	5	2	7
Average age of residential care workers	0	43	43	31	44	43	33	40	39	25	36	36
Average age of supervisors.....	0	56	56	0	56	56	0	45	45	34	61	37

Dr. EASTICK (on notice) :

I. What are the minimum qualifications for a residential care worker at Vaughan House?

2. How may these qualifications be obtained?

3. Of the residential care workers now at Vaughan House, what number have—

(*a*) the minimum qualifications; and

(*b*) qualifications above the minimum required?

4. Are unqualified persons employed at Vaughan House on work usually done, or which it would be desirable to have done, by qualified residential care workers?

5. What is the average length of experience of this kind of work for both male and female residential care workers presently at Vaughan House, and how do these figures compare to similar figures at June 30 in each of the years from 1971 to 1973 inclusive?

6. How does the present number of residential care workers at Vaughan House compare to the authorized staff establishment at that centre and with the desirable number of such workers at a centre of the kind and size of Vaughan House?

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

1. Minimum qualifications:

(*a*) Passing of a selective personal test.

(*b*) Experience with youth in groups.

(*c*) Subject to (*a*) and (*b*) above, preference is given to people with the Child Care Certificate, Group Work Certificate, or Residential Care Certificate.

2. Child Care Certificate is awarded on satisfactory completion of the Child Care and Development Course arranged by the South Australian Council of Social Service. Residential Care Certificate and Group Work Certificate are awarded by the South Australian Institute of Technology. In-service training courses are conducted by the Community Welfare Department.

3. Eleven hold or are completing the Child Care Certificate Course. Fourteen have completed the first year of the in-service training course. Nine have no formal qualifications, but all of these have had related experience in child care, and are now undertaking an in-service training course.

4. Yes, but all start now are undertaking in-service training.

5. Figures and records to make an accurate answer to this question are not available.

6. (*a*) The present establishment for base grade residential care workers at Vaughan House is 38. There is one vacancy which is in the process of being filled.

(*b*) The present establishment is the desirable establishment for Vaughan House.

COMMUNITY WELFARE OFFICERS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many officers of the Community Welfare Department were injured in the course of their duties at Vaughan House, McNally Training Centre and Windana, respectively, in the year ended June 30, 1974, with location and severity of the injuries classified as in the reply to the question from the honourable member for Bragg on November 27, 1973?

2. Did the majority of injuries sustained by officers at Vaughan House in this period again consist of lacerations, bruises and "the shock of having their heads hit against the wall or floor"?

3. Are the two officers from Vaughan House mentioned in the reply to part 3 of the question on November 27, 1973, still being paid accident compensation?

4. What other officers are now being paid accident compensation, and in each case at which centre was the officer injured and what was the nature of the injuries?

5. What actions have been taken to ensure that the incidence of attacks on officers and the number and severity of injuries at the hands of boys and girls at these centres are reduced?

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

1. Injuries sustained through physical contact with inmates 1973-74.

Vaughan House	M.T.C.	Windana	Location of Injuries	Severity—Days off Duty: Minor (in restraining inmates)	Minor (unprovoked assaults)	Major
	1		Forehead and left thigh		0	
1			Shin	0		
1			Face		0	
1			Left hip, left arm	0		
1			Head		0	
1			Head			17
		1	Left arm and back	0		
1			Head and back		0	
1			Head and right knee	0		
		1	Left arm and left thumb	0		
1			Right eye, face, shock			4
		1	Right leg	2		
	1		Left knee	2		
1			Left eye			14
		1	Left eye, neck and concussion			92
	1		Face		1	
1			Chest and shock		0	
1			Hip and arms	0		
11	3	4	Head 10 Body 3 Limbs 5			

2. Majority of injuries at Vaughan House—Bruising 7, Laceration 3, Strain 1. (No case of head banging.)

3. One officer has been retired on the grounds of invalidity and workmen's compensation settled by a lump-sum payment.

The other officer is still being paid workmen's compensation. but the Crown Solicitor is negotiating a lump-sum payment with this officer at present.

4. None being paid workmen's compensation at present, other than the officer mentioned in 3.

5. (1) Officers now carry only keys to internal doors, and this lessens the risk of injury to obtain keys.

(2) There are a minimum of two residential care workers (one male and one female) a shift a unit.

(3) Strict security is observed in relation to implements such as cutlery which may be used in assaults.

(4) Training in methods of restraint is being given to staff.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is the Community Welfare Department having any difficulty recruiting adequate numbers of sufficiently qualified residential care workers to staff its juvenile training centres and, if so, what is the extent of understaffing in the various centres?

2. What are the department's plans and realistic prospects for future recruitment of adequate numbers to work or be trained in residential care duties?

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

1. Yes. People with academic qualifications for residential care are not usually available. In-service staff training programmes are being provided at all departmental training centres for juveniles. There are vacancies for three residential care workers at the various centres at present.

2. The department is able to fill vacancies as they occur from responses received to press advertisements, and to have the persons selected undertake training courses.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the Government yet made any decision as to amendments to long service leave provisions under various Acts and, if so, is it intended to introduce legislation and when?

2. If a decision has not yet been made, when is it expected that it will be made?

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

1. The position is as stated in my letter to the honourable member of June 10, 1974.

2. See 1.

HOSPITALS FUND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): How much has been paid by the Lotteries Commission into the Hospitals Fund, and how has it been spent?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: A total of $13 558 234.64. As payments from the Hospitals Fund are also made from moneys received from Totalizator Agency Board, the on-course totalizator before December 31, 1970, and Motor Vehicles Third Party Insurance Stamp Duty, it is not possible to state the particular use of Lotteries Commission funds. Details of payments from the Hospitals Fund are as under:

	Year	Page
Auditor-General's Report	1966-67	322
Auditor-General's Report	1967-68	302
Auditor-General's Report	1968-69	302
Auditor-General's Report	1969-70	312
Auditor-General's Report	1970-71	304
Auditor-General's Report	1971-72	284
Auditor-General's Report	1972-73	358
Auditor-General's Report	1973-74	Not yet tabled

JAPANESE LANGUAGE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Since August 21, 1974, has the Minister approached, or caused an approach to be made to, the Japanese Government for financial support for the teaching of the Japanese language at tertiary level, and which?

2. If an approach has been made, what is the result, if any, and if no approach has been made, why not?

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

1. The only approach that has been made to the Japanese Government concerns the purchase of certain textbooks for secondary schools. The establishment of Japanese at the tertiary level requires the co-operation of a tertiary institution and a willingness of the Australian Government to provide the necessary finance, as universities and colleges of advanced education are now fully financed by that Government. It is possible that an independent approach has been made to the Japanese Government, even though that is not a pre-condition to the establishment of Japanese at the tertiary level. The South Australian Government has been active in encouraging tertiary institutions to become involved in teaching Japanese, Chinese, and Malay-Indonesian. It is likely that significant developments will take place over the next few years.

2. *Vide* 1.

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): What is the policy of the Government concerning alternative schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Consideration will be given to the establishment of alternative schools where there is a demand. In the establishment of such schools the staffing provision will be normal unless there is a case for the appointment of additional staff because of the socio-economic disadvantages of the area served by the school, or because of the educational difficulties of the children likely to be in attendance at the school. It is considered that a proposal for an alternative school should, wherever possible, make satisfactory provision for children of secondary age. There may well be serious difficulty if children who attend an alternative primary school have no alternative secondary school open to them.

DENTISTS ACT

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to introduce legislation to amend the Dentists Act during this session of Parliament?

2. If legislation is introduced, will it provide for the registration of dental technicians, granting them chair-side status, and for what other purposes will it be introduced?

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

1. No.

2. Not applicable, in view of reply to 1.

STUDENT TEACHERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): Are student teachers covered by workmen's compensation in the event of injury travelling to and from colleges of advanced education and while engaged in practice teaching?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Crown Solicitor's view is that bonded student teachers are not workmen within the meaning of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Nevertheless, the Government is willing to consider *ex gratia* payments to cover medical expenses in relation to any injury sustained by bonded students in the circumstances contemplated by that Act. If *ex gratia* payments

are made, the students concerned would continue to receive allowances, notwithstanding that they may be absent from classes through injury.

FIREWORKS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (on notice): What arrangements will be made so that retailers will be able to dispose of surplus stocks of fireworks on which the Government has placed a ban?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Retailers may make such arrangements as they wish to dispose of stocks, provided these arrangements are within the law. It is expected that there will be applications from several quarters to conduct local displays, and fireworks now held by retailers may be sold to permit holders.

SPENCER GULF POLLUTION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When did the Minister first know of the existence of the recommendations of the Spencer Gulf Water Pollution Co-ordinating Committee referred to in his statement in this House on Wednesday, August 21 ?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: In October, 1973.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say what progress has been made in the reassessment of the Redcliff project ordered by the Prime Minister, reportedly on the advice of the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor), and whether it is still possible for a September deadline to be met for the indenture agreement to be placed before this Parliament? The Premier has already indicated that the moment of crunch for the Redcliff project is fast approaching, and that unless the indenture is signed and ratified as a matter of urgency the project could be lost. Although we have become used to hearing constantly that the project is in jeopardy (it has been repeated every month or so since last October), the situation must surely now be getting desperate, especially as this is the week of crunch.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Leader has commenced with his customary hyperbole in this matter.

Dr. Eastick: Just give us the truth; that's the main thing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I always do that. The assessment of the project by the Commonwealth Ministry is proceeding. This morning, I had a conversation with Mr. Connor about the matter. He has achieved a preliminary figure in relation to the price of the liquid petroleum gas content. He has his officers in Melbourne today making final assessments of the figures with representatives of Imperial Chemical Industries. He expects to communicate with me at the end of the week regarding the price of the l.p.g. content. The Australian Treasury has proceeded with its assessment of the project in relation to Treasury matters; the Prime Minister has had an overall report; and the Department of Urban and Regional Development has also reported on the matter.

In all of these matters, progress has been made with the necessary Commonwealth Ministries to obtain a decision in time for us to meet our schedule of having the indenture legislation before the House next month. The matters between the South Australian Government and the consortium in the indenture have been completed. I appreciate that the Leader constantly wants to make some kind of political capital out of some aspect of this matter, even though his comments from time to time seem to be inconsistent with other bits of political capital he has tried to make. If, however, he is concerned to see that we get on with the project, I assure him that we are making satisfactory progress.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier say what is the most recent estimated cost of the project and at what rate the cost is being inflated by each additional months delay? When this project was first announced (which was during the State election campaign last year), it was costed at about $300 000 000. In a report in the *News* of November 28 last the Deputy Premier was quoted as having said of the project, "This is a $320 000 000 project: we cannot afford any delay." In May this year a spokesman for one of the consortium members stated that cost escalations in the six months since talks had begun had forced estimates up to $420 000 000, an increase of 40 per cent. Incidentally, several months earlier, Mr. Scriven, of the Premier's Department, had been reported as already describing it as a $450 000 000 project. At this rate of cost escalation, $600 000 000, or a 100 per cent increase in 12 months, is already being speculated on and I therefore ask the Premier what is the latest cost estimate in respect of the project.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member a complete figure off the top of my head, but I can give him an outline of the figures. The total cost to the consortium is expected to be over $600 000 000. The total cost to the Commonwealth Government is expected to be about $200 000 000 and, from memory, the cost to the State Government is expected to be about $45 000 000. That is an all-up figure, if we consider the total of the infra-structure. That would be the outline of total costs at present. I point out to the honourable member that those figures do not immediately relate to the figures originally quoted, which were only quotations of what it would actually cost the consortium. As the project is being enlarged somewhat so that it will be a plant of world scale and so that it will achieve the economies of scale sought, the redesign of the project has produced some escalation of cost entirely apart from the effect of inflation, but the total expenditure on the project would be over $800 000 000.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Premier say what is the total estimated cost of the South Australian Government's involvement in the project, including the cost of providing support facilities? The Premier says that the estimated cost of the project has increased from $300 000 000 when first announced to about $600 000 000, and then to $800 000 000 at present, including Commonwealth Government expenditure. Bearing in mind that last February the State Government was reported to be committed to spend about $130 000 000 on support facilities, excluding the cost of about 2 500 rental houses for families, I am interested to know what is the Government's present commitment. If I heard correctly, the Premier said it would be $45 000 000, and there would seem to be a discrepancy between that figure and the $130 000 000 stated last February.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The discrepancy arises from the fact that the State Government has asked for Commonwealth Government assistance in relation to the cost of the power house for the project. There is a significant difference here because the. State Government now intends to provide the water, road surfaces, and port facilities. Additional infra-structure is being sought in various ways through arrangements with the Commonwealth Government and will not immediately be a burden on State Loan funds. However, I will get an accurate report for the honourable member so that he may see the present configurations.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether his department has investigated or obtained information on whether ethylene dichloride, the main product of the Redcliff project, has any connection with cancer? Unfortunately, over the weekend a strong rumour has been rife in Whyalla that this product of the Redcliff project can cause cancer. I point out that I do not believe rumours, but this rumour is so vicious that it should be investigated. In order to dispel the rumour, will the Minister obtain the necessary information for me?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This matter has previously been raised with me by the Port Augusta Sub-Branch of the Australian Labor Party through its most efficient local member, my colleague the member for Stuart, and has been touched on in debate in the House by the member for Flinders a few weeks ago. There is no evidence to suggest that ethylene dichloride is carcinogenic. This issue has arisen because of newspaper reports of evidence overseas that workers involved in the production of vinyl chloride monomer show some incidence of cancer. As I recall, the member for Flinders, in quoting someone in the press, suggested that ethylene dichloride would be manufactured at Red Cliff Point. Although this in itself is not a cancer-producing agent, pressure would be placed on the industry to go a step further and, in addition, produce vinyl chloride monomer.

At this stage there is no intention to produce vinyl chloride monomer at the plant and, in fact, Imperial Chemical Industries has entered into an understanding with B. F. Goodrich that it would produce vinyl chloride monomer at Altona. So, any opportunity that might have existed for the production of vinyl chloride monomer in South Australia has gone. Any future proposal for the enlargement of the Redcliff plant into vinyl chloride monomer production would have to be carefully investigated by the Government before any go-ahead could be given. There is no proposal for that at this stage, nor is there any suggestion from responsible medical authorities that, on its own, ethylene dichloride is carcinogenic.

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Premier say what savings have been offered to the State Government by the Commonwealth Government to reduce this State's commitment to the project from $130 000 000 to the $45 000 000 indicated by him? In the *Advertiser* of February 20 a report stated that the State Government had told the consortium that it would provide a power station estimated to cost $50 000 000; a liquids main from the Cooper Basin and a gas spur line from the Adelaide main at a cost of about $50 000 000; wharf facilities costing about $7 000 000; upgrading the Morgan-Whyalla main at a cost of about $4 500 000; and other services involving 2 833 hectares, but that building of 2 500 houses, all for rent, had not been costed. Today, the Premier said that the State Government's commitment was only $45 000 000, less than the cost of either the power station or the pipelines. It would seem that one of these projects, possibly even both, is to be financed by someone other than the State Government. Can the Premier say what the situation is?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have told the member for Bragg that I will get him the details, but the Commonwealth Government had made an offer to the State Government that the Commonwealth Pipelines Authority would build the pipeline, especially as there would be back-up supplies to the plant eventually from the Commonwealth field at Mereenie and Palm Valley, and that the line would go from Gidgealpa-Moomba to the Mereenie and Palm Valley field. Secondly, as I pointed out to the member for Bragg, the proposition now is that the power station be financed through the Commonwealth Government, and not by the State Government, with a proposal that has been put for financing in conjunction with the consortium, and this would alter markedly the cost of the infra-structure to the State.

HOUSING DEMOLITION

Mr. PAYNE: As Minister in charge of housing, will the Minister of Development and Mines consider introducing legislation to control the demolition of dwelling-houses? The following report appears in the *Sunday Mail* of August 25, under the heading "Waste of materials":

"Demolition of habitable homes is running at the rate of 60 per cent of Housing Trust constructions," the Liberal member for Fisher claimed.

Mr. Evans: That's right.

Mr. PAYNE: The figure of 60 per cent quoted does not seem to me to be related to a definite period. As this report goes on to be somewhat critical of the Housing Trust, I will not quote any more of it, mainly because I disagree with its contents. However, if the figures given by the member for Fisher are correct, the position may well warrant introduction of legislation by the Government.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Government has examined this matter several times, and it is extremely difficult to see how, in fact, flexible legislation could be drafted. Take the situation in which, for example, some demolition must take place for the construction of a factory. There is a problem there involving, on the one hand, the responsibility of providing employment and, on the other hand, that of providing housing. Doubtless, members could think of other sorts of situation in which a certain amount of flexibility would be required in the legislation, and it would be difficult to see how we could have that and still have the Act operate in a way in which the Government would want it to operate. In view of the honourable member's question, I am willing to examine the matter further but I point out that at present this Government, through the operations of the same semi-government instrumentality as the member for Fisher has criticized (namely, the Housing Trust), is involved in this very field by using some Commonwealth-Slate Housing Agreement money to purchase old houses that otherwise might be demolished and to refurbish them so that they can provide housing for low-income earners. This programme is being carried on now and it shows that, if one wants to evaluate the performance of the trust in providing houses for people, particularly low-income earners, one must look beyond the purely construction figures that come from the trust: one must look at the other ways in which the trust is continuing to house about 90 families a week.

I have not had the opportunity to take out a figure, so I cannot comment on the newspaper report of the statement by the member for Fisher that 60 per cent of trust construction is the rate of involvement. As no period of time is mentioned, it is difficult to comment. I wonder where the honourable member got his information, and I should be pleased to obtain his source. I know that he has stated previously in relation to the trust in particular and housing in general that housing costs over a specific period increased by 40 per cent, and I have an itemized list from the trust that shows that for the first half of this year, or one month less than the period to which the honourable member has referred, the cost increased by exactly 25.4 per cent, so there is a considerable discrepancy there and one wonders how

it has arisen. However, I will examine the specific matter the honourable member has raised, because I consider that, if some form of legislation could be introduced, it might be useful to us. In the meantime, I point out that the position is being partly held by the present programme of the trust.

SAVINGS SCHEMES

Mr. DUNCAN: Will the Premier investigate and report to the House on the possibility of one or both of the State Bank or the Savings Bank of South Australia introducing index-linked savings schemes for pensioners and other persons on fixed incomes? As the House will appreciate, in the present inflationary climate many persons with small savings are finding that they are eroded rapidly. If such a system could be introduced, it would guarantee savings against inflation. This would provide protection for the most vulnerable sections of the community, especially the elderly and the pensioners, against the effects of inflation and would be in line with the Government's general policy of looking after the interests of such persons.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN : I will get a report for the honourable member.

TEACHER HOUSING

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education say whether any decision has been made to establish a teacher housing authority and, if not, when does he expect a decision to be made? In asking a similar question on July 30, I indicated that this was a matter of considerable importance to the teaching profession. On that occasion, almost a month ago, the Minister said that the matter was being considered and that he hoped to be able to make a firm announcement in the relatively near future. When will a decision be made?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Very shortly.

COUNCIL ALLOCATIONS

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Minister of Local Government say who determined the Commonwealth Government allocations made recently to local government and what criteria were used to determine those allocations? In addition, was the money distributed on a population basis to ensure equality? A press report published late last week states that the Commonwealth Government has allocated $56 300 000 to the States and that South Australia is to receive $4 700 000. Some councils have been allocated large sums, but others are to receive nothing.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Prior to making allocations, the Grants Commission took evidence from all councils, and I assume the council to which the honourable member has referred made a submission, too. The decision to allocate funds was made by the Australian Government, not by the South Australian Government. If the honourable member cannot obtain that information through the good offices of his one and only colleague in the Commonwealth Parliament, L shall be pleased to write to the Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) and obtain it for him.

HOUSING TRUST HOUSES

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Development and Mines say how many older houses the Housing Trust purchased in the 1973-74 financial year? In replying to an earlier question regarding a press report about older houses being demolished, the Minister said the Housing Trust had been buying older houses to save them from demolition. The figures I have obtained from councils and from the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that the State is losing between 1 200 and 1 300 houses a year because of the demolition of habitable houses, which is a loss of material and labour that we can ill afford. In his reply, the Minister wished to know where I had obtained my figures. I assure him that they are available from most councils. However, some councils in fringe areas do not keep figures, because little demolition is done in those areas. In fact, in the Minister's own area several houses were demolished by the State Planning Authority to allow development in the area. 1 therefore ask how many houses the Housing Trust has purchased, because I believe it is many fewer than were actually demolished.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I try to keep as much information as I can in the House so that I can have it readily available for members. However, in this case I have not got the figures and it will be necessary for me to get a report. At a meeting on July 2 this year, the board of the trust authorized the purchase of 22 houses and cottages, under the Special Rental and Funded Housing Scheme, at Forestville, Glenelg, Mile End, Ottoway, Ovingham, Thebarton, Wayville, and Woodville. That was all done at one board meeting. However, I will get the total picture for the honourable member.

COUNTRY RAIL SERVICES

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Transport say what progress has been made in connection with the Commonwealth Government's taking over country railways in South Australia? On the last occasion the Minister replied to a similar question I understood him to say that Commonwealth and State Transport Departments were investigating the matter. As the Minister has such an intimate, albeit perhaps abusive, relationship with the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, perhaps the Commonwealth Government could take over country rail services, as it has taken over his authority on roads.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: From the outset let me make clear that the relationship between the Australian Minister for Transport and me is on the highest level and will remain that way, and snide comments from the honourable member will do him no credit at all.

Dr. Tonkin: Wouldn't you—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Bragg wishes to drag the level of the debate into the gutter, he can. do so.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg did not ask a question so he will cease interjecting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Negotiations between the Australian Government and the South Australian Government on the subject of transfer are temporarily at a halt because we are awaiting information from the Commonwealth Treasury in answer to questions we posed. Until that information is available it is not possible to conclude the arrangements.

STRUAN

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works investigate the methods of job inspection within his department, particularly at Struan. I refer specifically to a job at Struan House, which is now the regional headquarters of the Agriculture Department. Last Sunday morning, Mr. Donald Haggett, a registered plumber, asked me to visit a job at Struan House. He has permitted me to use his name because he is incensed about this matter. Mr. Haggett was to replace a lead seal on the laboratory roof where the fume flue comes through the roof. The contractor

who carried out the repair work last year had, with a carpenter, imperfectly placed a seal around the flue and had stuck it down with a cement compound in several places. Consequently, it had leaked water all over the flue and into the laboratory; this caused damage to the ceiling and to the installations in the laboratory. Mr. Haggett is replacing the seal and soldering a new one in the approved manner (which should have been done originally). For this work, he is being paid $50. He has also pointed out to me that a 14 metre tank stand has a platform at the apex of the stand that would be about 3 m by 3 m. A 1 m timber overhang protrudes all around the platform, which is used as a catwalk and which has a fence around it. There are no steel supports under the platform, which will ultimately be a danger to anyone who uses it, and men will be standing on it.

According to Mr. Haggett, the specifications provided that steel supports be placed under the platform. He has further pointed out to me that it will be necessary to replace the piping (a 100 mm down-feed water pipe into a 50 mm outlet) installed by the plumbers employed by the original contractor. Will the Minister discuss this matter with his officers because, after about six months, it would be costly to have this work redone in the approved manner?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am concerned to hear these allegations. I will have this matter investigated and bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Does the Minister of Environment and Conservation intend to introduce a Bill to amend the Planning and Development Act to ensure that further development in South Australia is based on sound urban planning instead of on legal technicalities? If he does intend to introduce a Bill, when will he do so? Successful appeals to the Planning Appeal Board appear to be based more on legal technicalities than on sound urban planning, no doubt because of the powers given to the board under the Act. Yesterday, the board released details of its decision to allow Temperance and General Mutual Life Assurance Society Limited to proceed with a subdivision, at Stonyfell, of about 18 hectares into 115 housing allotments. As the Minister knows, the Minister of Development and Mines opposed the subdivision last year and I, too, strongly opposed it: the subdivision will simply produce noise and dust problems, particularly dust problems associated with the strong gully winds that blow the dust from the quarries over the proposed subdivision. The South Australian President of the Royal Australian Planning Institute has described the Act as ambiguous and imprecise, and I believe that it is time the State had a tight Act, with teeth, so that we can have sound urban planning.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Amendments will be introduced this session to amend the Act, but I cannot say exactly when this will be done.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You look forward to the honourable member's support?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes.

FAIRVIEW PARK SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education ascertain what stage has been reached in the planning of a primary school to be built on land facing Hamilton Road, Fairview Park, held by the department? This school does not appear on the Loan Estimates, under the heading of school buildings for which planning and design is proposed during 1974-75. However, it has been suggested to me that the department intends to erect a Demac construction or portable units, on the site next year, thus allowing the school to commence operating, subject to a solid construction building being erected. Erection of this school will relieve the pressure from existing nearby primary schools, such as Banksia Park and, to a lesser degree, Surrey Downs.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inquire for the honourable member and bring down a report as soon as possible.

JAMESTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education try to have the new library at the Jamestown Primary School completed this year in time for the school's centenary? I understand that a new library has been promised to the school, and it is intended that it be of Demac construction. It is now some time since the school was promised a new library. Although the school committee is aware of the problems in respect of construction today, I have been asked to see what can be done to have the library completed this year in time for the school's centenary celebrations.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I point out to the honourable member that the Demac programme, which has just been commenced by the Public Buildings Department (the first units under it have recently been installed in schools), is of fundamental significance in allowing the department to meet its classroom requirements for next year. Inevitably, with changing numbers of enrolments at some schools, it is important that priorities be given in this programme to providing classroom accommodation where it is required. It would not be possible to bring forward a library project if it meant that other classroom accommodation could not be provided at the beginning of next year. Having said that, I will check the matter and let the honourable member know what the situation is.

TEXTBOOK

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Premier lake action to ban from public exhibition *Children of Albion—Poetry of the "Underground" in Britain,* which contains poems of the British underground? A report in the city edition of the *Advertiser* on August 22 confirms that this book, which was on the Matriculation English list last year, has now been dropped by the Public Examinations Board, but investigations have shown that the book is still on display and for sale in the children's schoolbook section of a large retail bookseller in Adelaide. Some poems in the book have caused embarrassment and offence to people on Kangaroo Island, as well as in Adelaide, who have perused the contents since my exposure of its existence. Contents of the book have been described as disgraceful and in no way beneficial to conditioning children for further education, and parents are horrified to learn that such material is still freely available off the shelf to children of any age.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation Act, 1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that during the passage of the Superannuation Act, 1974, the principal Act, it was indicated that any difficulties and anomalies that occurred in that measure would be dealt with as they arose. In the nature of things, certain matters have come to the attention of the Government and this short Bill is intended to deal with them. To consider the Bill in some detail, clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act presaged by this Bill will come into operation on the day that the principal Act came into operation, that is, July 1, 1974.

Clauses 3, 4, 5 and 6 are, as it were, "all of a piece". Although the provisions relating to the election of a contributor and pensioner's representative to the South Australian Superannuation Board have remained substantially unaltered for almost 50 years, a recent examination of the provisions by the Government's legal advisers has suggested that the method of electing this representative that has been applied throughout the period does not strictly accord with the statutory provisions. The sole purpose of these clauses is, then, to ensure that the provisions of the Statute are now in accord with, and authorize, what has been a long-standing practice. Clause 7 amends section 28 of the principal Act by providing machinery for the payment of deputies of members of the South Australian Superannuation Board.

Clause 8 inserts a new section in the principal Act and provides for the appointment of a deputy to act in the place of a trustee of the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust, should the trustee be unable to perform his duties as such. Members will recall that, although two of the trustees are appointed by virtue of other offices they hold, it seems desirable that provision should be made to deal with the question of the temporary absence of one trustee. Clause 9, by amending section 42 of the principal Act, provides for the payment of deputies of trustees, and is consequential on the amendments proposed by clause 17.

Clause 10 amends section 49 of the principal Act and is intended to ensure that in the attribution of contribution months to a contributor there will be some consistency. Members will recall that it was provided in the principal Act for months of service to be attributed to contributors to attract into Government employment certain officers of somewhat advanced years who would otherwise find entry into the scheme of superannuation so expensive as to be economically unattractive. The amendment merely provides that all proposed attributions will be the subject of a report by the board so as to ensure consistency in the application of the policy.

Clause 11 amends section 51 of the principal Act and is merely intended to make the meaning of this section quite clear. In ordinary circumstances an amendment would not be proposed to this section, but a question has arisen in relation to section 69, and the amendment here moved is basically to ensure a consistency of expression. Clause 12 amends section 69 of the principal Act to make clear that, to qualify for a progressive increase in pension, a contributor must have attained the age of retirement and have had 360 contribution months, that is, 30 years service. Tn the section as amended it is now spelt out that, if before attaining the age of retirement the contributor has had 30 years service, the increases will be related to each month of service he works after attaining his age of retirement. If, on the other hand, a contributor attains the age of retirement without completing 30 years service, the increases will occur only when he has completed 30 years service.

Clauses 13, 14, and 15 all deal with the same matter, which is the appearance of the letter "N" in the formulae included in sections 79, 81, and 103. In some circumstances it would be possible for the factor (N-5) to have a negative value, and this would cause a distortion in the application of the formulae. The amendments, which are in common form, prevent the letter "N" having such a negative value. In conclusion, it would be idle to pretend that a continuing review of the operation of the principal Act, which incidentally has been remarkably well received by the Public Service in general, will not throw up further anomalies, and again the undertaking is given that these will be dealt with as and when they arise.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUPERANNUATION (TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Superannuation (Transitional Provisions) Act, 1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As this is a purely formal matter, I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It seeks to remove an anomaly in the formula in section 8 of the principal Act. The amendment proposed by this measure is the same in form as amendments before the House to corresponding formulae in the Superannuation Act, 1974, which relate the interest payable on contributions to the South Australian Superannuation Fund upon withdrawal from the fund to the period over which the contributions were made. The amendment is intended to ensure that the factor (N — 5) in the formula may not have the negative value that it would otherwise have in the case of contributions over a period of less than five years.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the Act presaged by this Bill will come into operation on the day that the principal Act came into operation, that is, April 2, 1974. Clause 3 amends section 8 of the principal Act to provide that "N = five or the number of whole years comprised in the prescribed period, whichever is the greater number".

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Evidence Act, 1929-1972. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. J. KING: 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.

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is designed to introduce new reciprocal procedures under which South Australian courts may co-operate with courts of other States, Territories and countries in the taking of evidence. At present the procedures are rather complicated and lack uniformity. Some time ago recommendations were made to the Standing Committee of Attorney's-General that there should be uniform procedures for the taking of evidence outside the territorial jurisdiction of a court and that these procedures should apply as between the Australian States and Territories and New Zealand and should be capable of extension to other

countries. This proposal was endorsed by the Law Reform Committee in its twenty-first report and has the support of the Law Society. There are, of course, at the present moment various provisions that are to some extent analogous to the present Bill. For example, order 37 of the Supreme Court Rules deals with the subject.

These provisions appear to cover civil and criminal proceedings. In the Local and District Criminal Courts Act provision is made in sections 284 to 292 for the taking of evidence away from the court. These provisions, however, relate only to civil matters and do not extend to district criminal courts. There does not appear to be any general power in the Justices Act for this purpose but certain legislation, for example, the Community Welfare Act, deals with the subject in so far as the proceedings authorized by the legislation are concerned. The amendments contained in this Bill will provide a procedure which it is hoped will become uniform throughout Australia and under which many of the present complexities and inconsistencies will be avoided.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 enacts new Part VIB of the principal Act. Under new section 59d the Attorney-General may, by notice published in the *Gazette,* declare that a South Australian court corresponds to a foreign court for the purposes of the new provision. Section 59d (2) provides that the new Part will extend to both civil and criminal proceedings. Section 59e provides that a South Australian court may request a corresponding court to take evidence of a witness or to order the production of documents. Section 59f is a reciprocal provision to the effect that, where a corresponding court requests a South Australian court to take evidence, the South Australian court is invested with all the necessary powers for that purpose. Section 59g provides for verification of depositions. Section 59h deals with a case where a witness from whom a South Australian court is requested to take evidence is proceeding to some other country or State. In that case a request received from a corresponding court may be transmitted to another court to whose jurisdiction the witness is proceeding. Section 59i provides that the new provisions do not limit the power of a court to require a witness to attend in person. It further provides that the provisions of the new Part are supplementary to, and do not derogate from, the provisions of any other Act or law.

Dr. TONKIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

EGG INDUSTRY STABILIZATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

Members will recall that the principal Act, the Egg Industry Stabilization Act, was passed by this House last year. Pursuant to section 49 of that Act a poll was held, and 65 per cent of those voting expressed themselves as being in favour of the measure. Following this vote the Act was substantially brought into operation. However, when the licensing committee set about its task of determining base quotas for poultry farmers, it formed the opinion that the application of the Act, in its present form, could give rise to some inequities that could be avoided by its amendment. Since these inequities cover somewhat disparate aspects it would seem convenient if they could be dealt with in the consideration of the clauses of the measure. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes an amendment to section 4 of the principal Act, this being the interpretation section and, since this amendment is entirely consequential on the amendment intended by clause 6, it can be better dealt with in the explanation of that clause. Its relationship with that clause is, it is suggested, self-evident.

Clause 3 proposes that the time for making an election under section 13 of the principal Act will be extended until one month after a day that will be fixed by proclamation, if and when this Bill is passed. It seems that the time originally provided in the principal Act for the making of an election by farmers was, in all the circumstances, too short. Clause 4, by an amendment to section 16 of the principal Act, proposes to remedy one apparent inequity. Members who are familiar with the scheme of production control encompassed by the principal Act will be aware that it is based on the number of leviable hens kept by poultry farmers over various periods antecedent to the enactment of that Act. A leviable hen is a hen in respect of which a hen levy is payable under the relevant legislation of the Commonwealth.

However, in any flock comprising leviable hens, the levy is not paid on the first 20 hens. Accordingly, in the calculation of base quotas under the principal Act no regard could be paid to the first 20 hens in any such flock. While in a flock of, say, 2 000 birds this factor would be relatively insignificant, in a flock of, say, 50 to 100 birds this factor would result, in the licensing committee's view, in an unfair reduction of a base quota. Accordingly, by this clause it is intended that every poultry farmer will be entitled to keep, in any licensing season, his hen quota plus 20 birds. This will place each farmer in a marginally better position than he would have been had the 20 birds been included in the figure from which his base quota is derived.

The licensing committee is satisfied that in practical terms this apparent increase of about 34 000 birds that will result from this amendment can be kept in this State within the limits of the State hen quota. Clause 5 proposes, in relation to section 20 of the principal Act, an amendment similar in both form and effect to that proposed by clause 3. Clause 6, on the face of it, by inserting a new section 20a in the principal Act, seems to confer an extraordinarily wide power on the licensing committee. However, it is proposed only after careful consideration by the committee. The committee discovered that the strict application of the Act will bear heavily on eight or nine cases out of a total of 1 678 cases.

While it would be easy to ignore these cases which for one reason or another do not fit exactly the terms of the Act, the committee considers that this would be fundamentally unjust. In ordinary circumstances specific provision would be made to cover them by an amendment to the legislation, but such an amendment was found, in practice, to distort the legislation unduly or to open the door to other applicants who were, in the philosophy of the Act, without merit. Accordingly, after deep consideration it is thought better to invest the licensing committee with this discretion in the confident expectation that it will be wisely used. Clause 7 amends section 28 of the principal Act. by making the application of that section quite clear.

Mr. GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAIRY INDUSTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill he now read a second time.

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

Mr. Dean Brown: No.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Once again, we have made arrangements that have been broken. This Bill is the first of three measures intended to enable a new dairy product "dairy blend" to be lawfully marketed in this State. This new foodstuff, in broad terms, consists of an admixture of milk fat in the form of cream and vegetable oils. The product has the flavour and nutritious value of butter but because it is easier to spread it appears likely to have a wide public acceptance.

Members will be aware that for a number of years the legislation of this State and indeed of all the States of Australia has had the effect of prohibiting the addition of vegetable oils to butter. It is in the context of this legislative framework that appropriate amendments must be made to permit the marketing of this product which, incidentally, was developed in the Agriculture Department's Northfield laboratories. This Bill amends the principal Act, the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended, and the contents of this measure can be best considered by an examination of its clauses.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This clause is most important, as all the amending Bills giving effect to the scheme must necessarily come into operation on the same day. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act by providing for a definition of "dairy blend", and I would commend this definition to members' closest attention. So far as possible, the definition of "dairy blend" is to be uniform throughout the States of Australia. The manifest advantages of this approach are, I suggest, obvious. In addition, by an amendment to this section, dairy blend is included in the definition of "dairy produce", and by and large the provisions of the Act applicable to butter are extended to touch on dairy blend. In addition, two minor metric amendments are made to this section.

Clause 4 amends section 21 of the principal Act by extending the grading provisions relating to butter to include dairy blend. Clause 5 amends section 22 of the principal Act, by providing that the manufacture of dairy blend will be subject to the same limitations on its manufacture as are provided in relation to butter, and also makes a metric amendment which is self-explanatory. Clause 6 amends section 28 of the principal Act by extending the power to make regulations to cover dairy blend. Finally, I would indicate that once this product comes on the market it may not necessarily be marketed in the name "dairy blend". It is likely that the trade name "dairy spread" will be used.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAIRY PRODUCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill he now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is the second of three measures intended to facilitate the marketing of dairy blend. The principal Act, the Dairy Produce Act, is the vehicle by which the Dairy Produce Board of South Australia is established. One of the main functions of this board is to recommend and promulgate quotas for intrastate sales of butler and cheese within the framework of the Commonwealth Dairy Produce Equalisation Scheme. I am sure that all members who have an interest in this field will be aware of the application of this Act to butter and cheese. The effect of the amendments proposed by this Bill is to extend the application of the Dairy Produce Act to dairy blend.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 2 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of "dairy blend" in terms of the definition inserted in the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended. This clause also extends the definition of "dairy produce" to encompass the product dairy blend. Clause 4 amends section 3 of the principal Act by providing that in the constitution of the Dairy Produce Board manufacturers of dairy blend will be recognized.

Clause 5 amends section 15a of the principal Act by extending the powers of the board to reporting on the wholesale price of dairy blend in the same way as it reports on the wholesale price of butter, and the powers of the Governor under this clause are consequently amended. Clause 6 amends section 16 of the principal Act and gives the board power to determine quotas for dairy blend in the same manner as it determines quotas for butter and cheese. Clause 7 amends section 17 of the principal Act and is an amendment to the penalty sections consequential on the increased powers of the board. In addition, paragraphs (*b*), (*c*) and (*e*) of this clause effect metric amendments. Clause 8 is a consequential amendment.

Mr. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It is the last of the three measures that will facilitate the marketing of dairy blend. The effect of this short Bill is to take "dairy blend" as defined for the purposes of the Dairy Industry Act, 1928, as amended, out of the definition of "margarine". As a result, the Margarine Act will have no application in relation to dairy blend. In addition, opportunity has been taken to amend section 16 of the Margarine Act, which deals with the distance by which butter and margarine factories must be separated, to make this section consistent with section 22 of the Dairy Industry Act as that section is proposed to be amended.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRANSPLANTATION OF HUMAN TISSUE BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 11 (clause 4)—Leave out "sixteen" and insert "eighteen".

No. 2. Page 2, lines 10 to 12 (clause 4)—Leave out subclause (3) and insert new subclause (3) as follows:

(3) No part of a body shall be removed in pursuance of an authorization given under this section—

(*a*) unless two legally qualified medical practitioners, neither of whom is responsible for the removal, or the transplantation of the organ or tissue in question, have each satisfied themselves by a personal examination of the body that life is extinct and have each given a certificate in writing to that effect;

and

(*b*) unless the person proposing to remove the organ or tissue in question is a legally qualified medical practitioner who has also satisfied himself by a personal examination of the body that life is extinct.

No. 3. Page 2, line 37 (clause 4)—Leave out "deceased person" and insert "person (whether alive or dead)".

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to. The first of these three amendments raises from 16 to 18 years the age at which a person may consent to the removal of tissue from his body. The second amendment provides that, before removal of the tissue, death must be certified by two medical practitioners, neither of whom is the person removing the tissue. The effect of the third amendment escapes me, but apparently the Legislative Council thinks it will serve a good purpose: it deletes "deceased person" and inserts "person (whether alive or dead)".

The Legislative Council set up a Select Committee to consider this Bill, and that Select Committee believed it could improve to some extent on the conclusions of the Law Reform Committee, which had considered the matter and reported prior to the preparation of the Bill. The committee also thought it could improve on the Bill as it left this Chamber. I think it is doubtful whether, in fact, the Bill has been improved upon, but it is not a matter on which I think we should make an issue. I therefore recommend to the Committee that it should accept the amendments.

Dr. TONKIN: I support the motion and the Legislative Council's amendments, which undoubtedly follow the findings of the Select Committee. Paragraph 4 of the committee's report states:

Legislation dealing with transplantation of human tissue is not only the concern of medicine but also the concern of other branches of human science. Your committee was satisfied that the present medical practice in transplant operations in South Australia affords excellent control and adequate protection to the interests of the donor of tissue.

This simply illustrates that no-one wants rigorous controls more than do members of the medical profession. The standard of transplant surgery is high. It is good to include in the legislation provisions that remove from the minds of members of the public any doubt whether every possible care is taken. There cannot be too much protection. I have a reservation with regard to corneal grafting, which comes into a slightly different category, since corneal graft material is usually taken from people whose cause of death is fairly well known and expected. Organs such as hearts and kidneys are frequently taken from younger people who have died as a result of an accident and whose death is unexpected. For that reason, I believe that the amendment providing for two doctors to give a certificate of death is probably neither justified nor necessary. However, in the interests of uniformity, I am willing to support it simply because it makes sure that there can be no misunderstanding about the whole matter.

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 8. Page 381.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support most of the provisions in the Bill, which I would term a fluffed-up Bill. It has more padding than Mae West had in her hey-day.

Mr. Jennings: How do you know it was padding?

Mr. MATHWIN: A friend, who got as close to her as anyone else did, tells me that it was. I remember that, late on a Tuesday afternoon in March this year, the Minister introduced a Bill similar to this one, and on that occasion the ink in the printing was hardly dry. As the Minister has stated on both occasions, clause 7 is the main provision in the Bill. In his second reading explanation on this occasion, the Minister states:

It is substantially the same as the Bill that failed to pass in the last session of the Parliament, only a few minor technical amendments having been made to it. The Bill makes miscellaneous amendments to the Local Government Act .

That is precisely the position. The Bill is built around clause 7. In fact, most of the procedures for which it provides have been operating in local government over the years. Clause 3 amends the definition of "ratable property", and this is a step in the right direction. Probably most councils, particularly the Adelaide City Council, believe that the Bill does not go far enough. The definition of "ratable property" is amended by enacting new subsection (3) as follows:

(*a*) any land and buildings held by or on behalf of the Crown, or any part of any such land or buildings—

(i) occupied; or

(ii) unoccupied but intended for occupation within a period of 12 months,

as a dwellinghouse or for any other purpose not being a public or educational purpose; and

(*b*) any land held by or on behalf of the Crown by virtue of a lease.

By this means, local government will be able to obtain further rates. Of course, if many other properties owned by the State and Commonwealth Governments were ratable, vast finance would be payable to councils that would enable them to proceed with urgent work, particularly on roads. Local government now covers a wide area including care for the aged and infirm, and the more finance available to it the better it will be for local government generally. I hope that soon the Minister will persuade his Commonwealth and State colleagues to allow Government-owned properties to be ratable. Clause 4 enacts new section 49a as follows:

(1) 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.

Councils already appoint deputy mayors. I know of two or three cases where recently a sitting mayor has died and another person been appointed in his place. Last year, when the Mayor of Brighton (Mr. Hewish) died, Alderman Green was elected, and continued as mayor the following year. Clause 5, which is another padding clause, includes new section 70 (2) as follows:

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.

Again, that is already done. Section 49 of the Local Government Act refers to a deputy mayor not being entitled to any allowance, and I am pleased that the Minister has seen fit to delete that provision. Heaven forbid that there would be any argument about the matter, and an allowance should be given to people who step in. The Minister's action is a move in the right direction.

I wonder why the Minister has included clause 6, which amends section 83 of the principal Act by striking out "and local government". The Act at present refers to an audit by the Auditor-General and to an officer of the Highways and Local Government Department, and so on. Perhaps the Minister will explain this clause when he replies to the debate. Clause 7 gets down to the real nitty gritty of the whole affair and the whole crux of the Bill. In his explanation, the Minister states:

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.

He goes on to stale that many of these people are excluded. Obviously, the Minister is out to get the Adelaide City Council. If that is so, why does he not say so?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I would be out of order if I did.

Mr. MATHWIN: Surely the Minister realizes that metropolitan councils meet in the evening and that only country councils do not do that. Further, surely the Minister knows that it would be impossible to expect members of country councils, particularly those in the distant areas, to attend evening meetings. A council meeting would be held at, say, 7.30 p.m. and some members of the council would have to travel 130 or 160 kilometres to attend. Therefore, they would have to leave for the meeting as soon as they finished work or go home for a meal after work and then drive a long way to attend.

Councils now have up to about seven committees, such as the finance committee, the committee of the whole council, the works committee, and the by-laws committee and now, because of zoning regulations, councils have additional committees. Those committees must meet on the one evening, and they would be lucky if they finished their work by midnight or even 2 a.m. The poor workers, whom the Minister is trying to protect by saying that they cannot get to council meetings in the day-time, would have to drive home after the meeting, have two or three hours sleep, and then get up for work.

Is this the protection of the worker that the Minister wants? Surely the Minister knows that city councils and country councils must be considered separately. I support the Minister in his concern about having metropolitan council meetings held in the evening, but I could not support him regarding evening meetings for country councils. I do not understand how the Minister is protecting the workers. Because a similar measure was debated last session, the Minister would know the position in country areas and the problems of distance for mayors, aidermen and councillors. A council meeting on building and local zoning must take evidence from people who object to buildings being erected in certain areas, where consent-use is involved. These proceedings take a long time, and if the people are to be treated fairly they must have the opportunity to lodge an objection and put their case before the council.

Such meetings would take many hours, and the Minister knows it would be impossible to complete them in one evening. The time taken to travel many kilometres and then attend a meeting would make it virtually impossible for these people to carry on unless, of course, the Minister amended the Bill to give these people a day off on sick leave following a council meeting. Many workers are allowed time off to attend council meetings in the day-time, and—

Mr. Keneally: Did you read the local government report circulated to members?

Mr. MATHWIN: That comment relates to the Bill regarding local government boundaries to be introduced by the Minister later this session. That measure will be debated fiercely when it comes before the House. The Minister knows, as does the member for Stuart if he talks with people in his district, that it takes a long time for many people to get to council meetings. I support the Bill so far as it relates to the metropolitan area, but I cannot understand why the Minister has reintroduced this Bill in exactly the same form, when he realizes—

Mr. Keneally: Because councils want it.

Mr. MATHWIN: That is the funniest thing I have heard for a long time. I hope that when the Minister replies he will indicate how many councils really do want it.

Mr. Arnold: How many councils meet at night?

Mr. Venning: Town clerks are paid to work during the day.

Mr. MATHWIN: There are 14 district councils that meet in the evening; all the metropolitan councils except the Adelaide City Council meet at night. The 14 district councils that meet in the evening are Berri, Clare, Gladstone, Kapunda, Meadows, Munno Para, Stirling, Crystal Brook, East Murray, East Torrens, Laura, Morgan, Paringa, and Penola. Strathalbyn and Mount Pleasant councils hold committee meetings at night, too. Therefore, what is the Minister really after?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Keep going as you are and you'll completely destroy your own case.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister is out to get the Adelaide City Council, so why does he not get up and say that? I wonder why the Minister has not introduced this Bill in two parts (country and metropolitan), as was suggested when the matter was debated last session. He might get somewhere if he did that. Most of the provisions of the Bill are good; in fact, most of them are now in operation. The only fly in the ointment is clause 7, and that relates to the Adelaide City Council. I will leave it to country members to comment on the situation in outlying areas. Perhaps the member for Stuart will speak in this debate.

Mr. Keneally: Port Augusta council meets in the evening.

Mr. MATHWIN: I agree with the provisions of clause 8, and suggest to the Minister that several councils already apply its provisions; however, some councils do not. In a later clause the Minister provides for councils to obtain money to cover the matter concerning the continuous employment of council officers. Clauses 9 and 10 substitute

"ratepayers" for "owners of ratable property", and I entirely agree with those clauses. It can be seen, therefore, that I am against only a few of the clauses of the Bill. Clause 12 changes "wife" to "spouse", and ensures that "the spouse of the mayor or of any other member or officer of the council and anyone who may be performing the official functions of the spouse of the mayor or of any other member or officer of the council shall be insured against personal injury, whether fatal or not, arising out of or in the course of the performance by him or her of any official function, or in the course of any journey undertaken by him or her in connection therewith". The clause relates to either a male or a female mayor. When I was Mayor of Brighton, Mrs. Rennie was Mayor of Port Adelaide, and ladies in country areas have been mayors. Clause 15 provides:

Section 366 of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is enacted and inserted in its place:—

366. (1) Subject to any regulations, a council may—

(*a*) grant a licence for laying pipes under the surface of any public street or road under the care, control and management of the council for the purpose of conveying water;

and

(*b*) grant, with the consent of the Minister, a licence for installing pumps and equipment on or under any land under the care, control and management of the council.

(2) The council may revoke any licence granted under subsection (1) of this section.

I hope the Minister, when replying, will explain the necessity for this provision. Clause 16 relates to roadside cafes. I can see nothing wrong with that provision because, from time to time, the Premier has told us that, with our Mediterranean climate, we should have sidewalk cafes, and I agree with him. The Premier has had much to say about this matter over the years, particularly in connection with his oversea visits. The Government should be ashamed of the little it has done to promote tourism. Because of its inaction in this held, I am surprised that the Minister's second reading explanation even refers to tourism. Councils should have the right to grant a licence and to fix the requisite fee, because this will enable them to raise badly needed finances.

Clause 19 inserts, in section 449, new subsections that relate to loans and borrowings for certain purposes. New subsection (2) (*a*) provides for the purchase or construction by a council of dwellinghouses to be occupied by council employees. Many local councils have already purchased houses for their employees to live in. Indeed, I believe that the Brighton council has purchased two or three houses for such a purpose. New subsection (2) (*b*) empowers a council to borrow money in order to provide long service leave and superannuation for its employees or its former employees. New subsection (3) provides:

Any loan contracted by a council under paragraph (*b*) of subsection (2) of this section must be repaid within ten years of the date on which it was contracted.

I wonder why "ten years" is stipulated. Local councils borrow money in order to spread the burden of the expenditure. Instead of placing the complete load on the present ratepayers, councils borrow so that the loan may be spread over a period. Those who enjoy the privilege of any development carried out by the council should, in turn, pay for it.

Turning to clause 20, I believe that the intention of new subsection (2) is already being achieved, so I cannot understand the Minister's reasoning here. The Minister's second reading explanation states:

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.

If an area of land is dedicated or granted to a council by a person or by a body of people, or is left by will and dedicated for use as a local park by local residents, that shall be done at present only under conditions laid down by the Minister, so why has the Minister included new subsection (2) in clause 20? New subsection (2), inserted in section 457 by clause 21, provides:

No lease of any park lands shall comprise any land exceeding 6 hectares in area unless the Minister has approved in writing of a lease comprising a greater area of land.

Here the Minister is getting into the act again. Why must he approve the area? Control is exercised by the State Planning Office. If the area of land was on the coast, before the council could do anything it would have to seek the approval of the State Planner. From the State Planner the matter would go to the Coast Protection Board for its approval. How much more of this kind of procedure must we have? It would probably take months to obtain the required approval. This has already happened in the case of a council that had to obtain the approval of both the Town Planner and of the board. The double approval took about four months to obtain, with the result that to build a block of toilets cost an additional $3 000. Does the Minister have so little confidence in the Town Planner and in the Coast Protection Board to carry out their tasks? Clause 24 substitutes for the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act the Land and Valuation Court. I support this change. Clause 27 gives power to license a bazaar. I wonder how bazaars got into this legislation? The last time we debated this matter, I asked for a definition of "bazaar" and the Minister told me to go to the Parliamentary Library. On referring to a dictionary, I found that a bazaar was an oriental market. Why must we license an oriental market?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Coming from another country, you have trouble with Australianese.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am glad that the Minister can understand me.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I find it extremely difficult sometimes.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister should keep trying: he is doing well at present. Just how far should we take this matter? I know that the Premier returned from one of his oversea visits with a marvellous idea for sidewalk cafes. I support the provision of such cafes, bearing in mind our Mediterranean climate. I do not know whether the visit to the Middle East of the member for Elizabeth has resulted in a reference to bazaars, but I cannot understand why this aspect should be included in the Bill.

Clause 30, which amends section 667 of the principal Act, also covers bazaars and, as I see no reason for this alteration, perhaps the Minister will explain it later. Clause 34 refers to keeping records on microfilm: this is an excellent idea and will help councils reduce the amount of space in which they have had to store records. Clause 36, increasing the fee for information from 10c to $2, is an excellent amendment. Much information is sought from councils, particularly relating to various Acts, and it is right that councils will now be able to charge a fee of $2. However, it should be more in some cases, because the time required to provide this information is often worth more than $2. As I said at the beginning of my speech, generally I support the Bill, but I will move one amendment. Much of the content of the Bill is excellent, and I

was sorry to see the Minister sacrifice a similar Bill in the previous session for the sake of one clause.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I didn't sacrifice it.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister got himself into a tantrum, stamped his feet, and threw the Bill on to the seat, all for the sake of clause 7, which is the crux of the whole matter. Generally, I support the Bill, but I cannot support clause 7.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support 37 of the 38 clauses of the Bill. In the circumstances, Opposition members will support it to the second reading, but that is all the support we will give it. The member for Glenelg has covered all aspects more than adequately, but I comment on one or two points that seem to me to be significant. First, leasehold property held by the Crown will now become ratable. Many people consider that all property held by the Crown, including leasehold land, should be ratable. About one-third of the area of Gumeracha District Council is now held by the Government, resulting in a loss of rates to the council, and this has been a major problem for it. I do not quarrel with this provision of the Bill, but some people would want it to go further. I believe that the Government can compensate councils in some way for the loss of ratable property, as has happened in the Gumeracha District Council area. Opposition members believe that 37 of the clauses will not lead to controversy but clause 7 is utterly dictatorial and makes a mockery of the idea that councils should enjoy a reasonable measure of autonomy. I believe that councils should be given maximum autonomy, when one considers their considerable responsibilities. By clause 7 the Minister seeks to impose a completely dictatorial provision, in that councils will be compelled to meet after 6 p.m. unless there is a unanimous decision otherwise.

Mr. Millhouse: How can you justify the word "dictatorial"? It will be only if their members want it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Mitcham does not think the clause is dictatorial, that the Minister is not in effect dictating to the councils how they shall operate in respect of their time of meetings, I do not know what "dictatorial" means. The clause provides that councils shall meet at night unless there is a unanimous decision otherwise.

Mr. Millhouse: The effect of the present provision is to prevent people from going on the council at all.

Mr. Mathwin: All the city councils meet at night.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Mitcham listens he might learn something about conditions in country areas.

Mr. Millhouse: I doubt it.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I doubt it, because he seems to be singularly obtuse today. I will pursue my argument, and I hope he will listen so that he may be a little better informed than he seems to be now. The duties of a councillor in a country district are not simply those of attending evening meetings once a week or once a fortnight. They are considerably wider than that. A councillor has to look at many things which he cannot do during the evening, and it is necessary for him to carry out certain activities in daylight. If the meetings were held at night, councillors would probably have to carry out some of their duties at weekends. The duties of a councillor are somewhat wider than merely attending meetings, if he is doing the job properly. The ward system exists in many rural councils, and many councillors come from rural wards. It would be completely inconvenient, and indeed almost impossible, for some councillors to attend meetings if they were forced to attend at night. I suggest that the quality of the people likely to nominate—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Hello, we have another Bill Spencer! The riff raff!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me say, the quantity—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You switched from quality.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I believe it would be extremely difficult to get people to stand for rural wards; it would be far more difficult than it is now. At present most metropolitan corporations and councils hold their meetings at night. That is the area of which the member for Mitcham has the greatest knowledge. The Adelaide City Council is a notable exception.

Mr. Millhouse: Ha!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If this Bill is aimed at the Adelaide City Council (and no-one from the Government side has said anything to the contrary), the price being demanded from country rural areas is far too great.

Mr. Millhouse: Ha!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitcham can scoff and make funny little noises in the corner, but I believe it would be extremely difficult to get people in any occupation in rural wards to stand for election to a council if they were compelled to meet at night.

Mr. Millhouse: They can meet at night, the same as other people do.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know whether the member for Mitcham—

Mr. Mill house: There were well-attended meetings in the evening during the by-election campaign.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I refer to councils in my own district, and particularly to the ward encompassing Blanche-Lown, attached to the Truro council. I know how many kilometres must be covered from Blanchetown to attend meetings of the Truro council. Whether the councillor is a working man or whoever he is, we would be extremely hard put to get someone to stand knowing that he would have to travel this distance in all seasons to attend a meeting.

Mr. Millhouse: How will a working man get on in the Truro council?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: One of the employees at the local butcher shop was recently elected to the council by one vote. He seems to have made satisfactory arrangements with his employer to attend meetings.

Mr. Millhouse: He is lucky to be able to do that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Mitcham is as knowledgeable as he claims concerning such matters, I suggest that he speak later and canvass this situation from his wide experience with rural councils and provide us with statistics to back up his interjections. I invite him to speak and to pay particular reference to his vast knowledge of country councils. The member for Frome is far better qualified to speak in connection with councils in outlying areas than is the member for Mitcham. Nevertheless, I invite the member for Mitcham to enlighten us and show us the fallacy of our arguments.

As I have said, most metropolitan councils are catered for regarding their meeting times, so this clause obviously is aimed at either or both the Adelaide City Council and country councils. If it is aimed only at the Adelaide City Council, I wish the Minister would say so, because the price to be paid is far too high. I was at a local government meeting that the Minister opened on Friday. The Mid-North Local Government Association—

Mr. Mathwin: How did the Minister go?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister made a half-hearted defence of his Commonwealth colleagues, but he did quite well.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't you join the queue of that despicable crook.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't talk about the Commonwealth Minister like that.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Read Commonwealth *Hansard* and you'll know whom I'm talking about. I'm talking about one of your rotten mates.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister referred to a matter of mutual interest between the Commonwealth and South Australia with not much success. After the Minister left that meeting, the matter of meeting times was discussed. From my knowledge of people at the meeting, I can say that they were not all business men or farmers; there was a cross-section of people from surrounding areas, including some people whom I knew to be employees. This matter was discussed, the terms of clause 7 finding no favour whatever at that council meeting.

The effect of this clause will be greatly exacerbated if the proposed council boundary changes are instituted. I know that Opposition members have looked at the suggested boundaries for rural councils, but I doubt whether many Government back-bench members have perused them carefully. However, if they were adopted, the terms of this clause would make it extremely difficult for those concerned to get people to serve on councils in what would probably turn out to be outlying wards. It is difficult enough at present to get people to serve. If this clause were passed, it would be extremely difficult to recruit candidates, even with the present boundaries. The provisions of this clause give the complete lie to the professed endorsement of the Labor Party of the principle of one vote one value, as this provision is for one vote all value, with one member of a council being able to dictate to that council when it will meet. That seems completely to negate the principle of one vote one value, a catch cry that is so dear to the heart of the Labor Party. How the proposal in this clause can be justified by any sort of democratic argument, I do not know.

The other provisions of the Bill are not controversial. In view of what was said by the member for Glenelg in his comprehensive speech, I do not need to comment on these provisions which relate to the appointment of deputy mayors, the question of continuity of long service leave, the licensing of roadside cafes and restaurants, the leasing of park lands, the ability of councils to licence markets and sales, and the way councils keep records. These sensible amendments are desired by local government. Although I oppose clause 7, I support the Bill at the second reading stage.

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): Although I do not wish to deal with matters covered by previous speakers, as I have been involved in local government for several years I believe I am justified in speaking about one or two aspects of the Bill. In clause 4, provision is made for the appointment of deputy mayors. In the past, although it may not have been in conformity with the Act, many councils have carried out the procedure now included in clause 4. A councillor has been ready to accept the responsibility of the mayoral duties when the mayor has been away or unable to attend certain functions. This commendable provision has a second purpose apart from dealing with the immediate need. Many councils find it a problem to persuade someone to become mayor for an ensuing term because perhaps the councillors are ignorant of the duties involved and may be, to a degree, timid about accepting the responsibility. If a deputy mayor has been trained in this field of local government work, I believe the council is in an advantageous position, as there can be a continuity of people in this office. Whatever the office, I believe that a person can hold it too long.

Mr. Chapman: I thought you were going to say that the Minister had been there too long.

Mr. RUSSACK: No matter what the office, there should be a change, and perhaps that could be desirable in the case to which the honourable member refers. Even chairmen of district councils have remained in office for extended periods. I believe the reason for this is that other people have declined or been reticent about accepting the responsibility, having had no taste of the duties. Therefore, I support this provision to give power to councils to elect deputy mayors.

With the two previous speakers, I am greatly concerned about clause 7. Because of the inclusion of this clause, a Bill similar to this was not passed last session. I consider it objectionable and not in the interests of fair play and justice that one member of a council should determine when that council should meet. I am sure members on this side support a democratic means of determining when council meetings shall be held, but it is not acceptable to give one councillor authority to determine the time of a meeting. The member for Kavel referred to dictatorial attitudes. In the past, one of the main reasons for the success of local government (and it cannot be denied that it has been successful) has been its autonomy. I believe that the provisions of this clause will deprive councils of autonomy. There is more to be considered than the attendance by a councillor at ordinary meetings of the council. I have had experience in local government, and I will refer to this now.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The member for Mitcham should listen to this.

Mr. RUSSACK: I do not know whether he has had much experience in local government. With regard to being dictatorial, I wonder what dictates the member for Mitcham will give the member for Goyder when it comes to a vote on this clause. If the member for Goyder supports clause 7, I am sure that he will be voting against the wishes of councils in his area. In 1958, when I was a candidate for local government, I went to see the ratepayers of a ward that I wished to represent. I well remember a past mayor of the town saying to me, "When selecting a councillor, I consider whether the candidate will ultimately be capable of becoming a chairman or mayor; on that premise I make my decision." If a councillor wishes to become involved in council work and perhaps become a chairman of a committee or take the chair oh occasion, he will find that the time he spends at night meetings is minimal compared to the time he spends on other council work, not only at night but also during the day.

Many people have sacrificed much time and money to be a mayor or a councillor in the normal routine of a rural or city council or corporation. When I was a councillor and became chairman of a finance committee, I found it necessary to go to the council office in the afternoon of a council meeting and look through the financial statement to check the accounts and see that all was in order. Then, when I was on a works committee, I found it necessary to meet in the morning because it was not possible to examine and inspect works in that area at night, although I well recall that on one or two occasions the council adjourned while an inspection was made under the street lights. I recall two occasions when industry came to the area, and it was in the day time that the council was called together for special meetings. I appreciate that clause 7 refers to "ordinary meetings", but I am trying to point out that the meetings of councils occupy only a small percentage of the time and duties of a councillor, particularly if that councillor is ambitious to become more deeply involved in local government.

In the town in which I live I was in business, and I could not assess the time I had to spend or the money it cost me. I recall one citizen saying to me when I went into council: "There is one thing you must mind, and that is that you do not spend more time in council than you do in your business; otherwise, you will find you will have no business. I know a man who did that." Following me in office was a man who was an employee; he was the secretary of a local, privately owned firm in the town, and I give great credit to his employer, who said, "I cannot become involved in council work; therefore, I will give you the time to do so." He was allowed time off to carry out that work. He found he was absent from work for a considerable time—not in ordinary council meetings but in the execution of his duties as mayor.

Mr. Payne: You are doing a great job in supporting the argument that the Minister has advanced, that a great part of his work can be done other than at night, and the council meeting is only part of his duties. Therefore, why shouldn't it be at night?

Mr. RUSSACK: I am not saying that the council meeting should not be at night. I was in a council when the council meetings were at night, but why should one councillor determine when a meeting should be held? Let us have some common sense about this. I thought one of the principles of the honourable member's Party was a fair go for everyone, not just for one person; that it believed in one vote one value.

Mr. Payne: Isn't that person included in "everyone"?

Mr. RUSSACK: Everyone gets a fair go. In all meetings it is normal procedure that a simple majority decides what is to be done—in this case let us say an absolute majority: then it does not matter how many people are present. The clause provides:

> 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 dissents from that resolution.

The wording is "at a meeting at which all members are present", which means that, if they are not all present at the first or second meeting, the meetings must continue to be held at the same time until there is a "meeting at which all members are present". If there is one dissenting voice, that council must meet in the evening. A point that has been mentioned by the member for Kavel is that, if the boundaries are changed and many of these areas are amalgamated, there will be a far wider expanse of territory over which councillors will have to travel. I know the modern motor vehicle is fast and there is not now as much inconvenience as once applied, but in country areas night meetings are an inconvenience. Why should one councillor determine what the rest will do? It is reasonable that an absolute majority of the council should determine when the meeting should be held. If there is an amendment to that effect, I will support it. The other clauses of the Bill are mostly acceptable, but I strongly object to the lack of principle in clause 7. Whereas I will vote for the second reading, I hope that in the Committee stage something will be done to rectify this objectionable clause.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the Bill generally, but like other Opposition members I oppose clause 7.

Mr. Payne: Did you hear from people in your district, or just from councils?

Mr. RODDA: I am putting the view of the people in my district. The real argument centres on clause 7. I was interested in the interjections by the member for Mitcham, and I should hope that he was not espousing Liberal Movement policy when he castigated the member for Kavel.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He didn't hurt my feelings, though.

Mr. RODDA: I am sure he did not, but what will the member for Goyder do about the matter? Will he be dragged by the scruff of the neck by the member for Mitcham, against the wishes of the people of the Goyder District, to vote in support of clause 7? It is all very well for the member for Mitcham to speak about the number of people who attended evening meetings during the by-election campaign in Goyder. It is an inane and totally inadequate argument to talk about a political campaign meeting in this context, because I and other members know from experience in local government that council work does not stop when the council completes its meetings, as applies in the case of Parliament.

During the four years in which I was privileged to serve on the Naracoorte corporation, almost every week I would be asked to make an inspection or to examine a matter affecting the ward. Ward inspections were always carried out during the week and, although that was somewhat inconvenient in relation to my farming programme, it always had to be done. Either the member for Gouger or the member for Kavel said that he had experience of a working man or a man on a salary being elected to a council, with satisfactory arrangements being made (as indeed they should be) to make time for a person who had had enough public spiritedness to be elected.

Mr. Max Brown: That doesn't happen, though, does it?

Mr. RODDA: It has happened in the Naracoorte corporation, some members of which work for other people.

Mr. Max Brown: Don't make that as a general statement, because it is not correct.

Mr. RODDA: Will ward inspections be conducted in the evening? The Bill contains a provision that one person will settle the score about holding meetings in the evening, but what will happen about ward inspections? What will a councillor do if several ratepayers want to see him on the bendy road at the back of Woop Woop? He cannot carry out that inspection in the evening.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The Bill doesn't provide that.

Mr. RODDA: The Minister has made the point that the Bill does not provide that, but he was a member of, I think, the Marion council.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: One of the most progressive councils in South Australia.

Mr. RODDA: I think it was one of the most controversial, too, but I will not canvass that with the Minister. The Bill does not spell out when councillors will make their ward inspections, but that should be a necessary adjunct to the Bill. I am certain the Minister cannot comprehend what I am saying.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I don't understand why you people didn't read the Bill before you spoke on it.

Mr. RODDA: What works in theory and what works in practice are different matters, and that is what is wrong with those who occupy the Treasury benches in this place and in the Commonwealth Parliament. They are having difficulty about that matter. On the other hand, we see the member for Mitcham bracketing himself with the Minister's proposal, and that honourable member will drag with him little Sir Echo, the member for Goyder, who must toe the line, against the wishes of his electors. I am sure they will not look on him with as much favour as did the hot-blooded women who voted for him at the by-election.

Mr. Mathwin: Js that why he has a furrowed brow?

Mr. RODDA: That was the furrowed brow that looked down on the highways and byways of the District of Goyder, and it makes me cross to think about it. I would be failing in my duty if I did not bring to the Minister's notice my objection to clause 7. My colleague who has led for this side in the debate has said all that I would want to say about the other provisions. I notice that some amendments are made regarding markets, and perhaps in the Committee stage I will ask the Minister what is intended about that, because I am sure that the Minister, as Minister of Transport, must know that the operations at the saleyard conducted by the Naracoorte corporation have caused a welcome upsurge in railway freights. With the reservation I have mentioned, I support the second reading.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I hope to be mercifully brief and to the point. I support the Bill at the second reading stage, and hope that it will be improved in Committee. Members on this side who have preceded me, particularly the member for Glenelg, have canvassed the measure widely, and I want to speak only about clause 7. The main points were covered last session and, with one or two minor exceptions, the provisions of this Bill are identical to the provisions in the other measure. All members would agree with those provisions: local government desires them.

When the Bill was introduced last session, local government was asked about the other provisions to which I have referred, and it stated that it wanted them. However, at that time the provisions in clause 7 of the present Bill were not referred to local government, and it got a complete surprise when the provision was in the Bill when it was introduced. Many people have expressed to me and my colleagues complete dissatisfaction about the clause, which they thought was unnecessary.

I will not canvass the relative merits regarding city councils compared to country councils, because my colleagues have done that admirably. However, I call the controversial clause 7 the Virgo veto clause, because it places restrictions on certain councils. As the member for Kavel has pointed out, the position to which the Minister is moving could be aggravated if, later this session, a Bill to alter council boundaries was passed. We are faced with the restriction on councils regarding their changing the hours of council meetings.

My Party considers that a council should have the right, if it so desires, to change the time of its meetings. This is a fundamental, clear and democratic right, and there is no argument about that. However, we are faced with the overriding theme of Labor Party members of compulsion all the way. A council should have the right to change its hours of meeting, if it desires to do so, provided it is done democratically. The Opposition has no argument with that. If one examines clause 7, which deals with ordinary meetings, one can see that the Minister is laying down direct guidelines. This is contrary to the attitude he expressed last Wednesday regarding another Bill dealing with secret ballots. Clause 7 inserts after section 144 new subsections (2) and (3). New subsection (2) provides:

> Subject to subsection (3) of this section ordinary meetings of a council must commence on or after the hour of 6 p.m. on the days on which those meetings are appointed to be held.

New subsection (3) provides that the meeting hours can be varied if all council members are present and no member dissents. What would happen if a councillor was sick or was overseas? The meeting time could not be altered if the council wanted that to happen. Also, if any member dissents, the change cannot be made. If that is not compulsion, I will have to take a lesson from my friend from Florey, as that is compulsion of the worst type.

Mr. McAnaney: It's worse than compulsory unionism.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, if one could get anything worse than that. Surely the Minister is not serious in this regard. If he is concerned about the Bill and wants to preserve it (and I believe that with the exception of this clause this is an excellent Bill), this clause should be amended.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: How would you amend it?

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister has provided that there must be complete attendance at a council meeting before a meeting time can be changed, and no member can dissent. But what is the position regarding this Parliament, which could be termed the supreme court of legislation in South Australia, from which emanates all local government legislation? If Parliament is to amend the Stale's Constitution, its whole 47 members are not required to be present, nor is it provided that no member can dissent. All that is required is an absolute majority of the whole. Despite this, the Minister is suggesting that, if a council, be it a small or a large council, wants to amend its meeting hours, there must be 100 per cent attendance and no-one can dissent.

Mr. Mathwin: He must be joking.

Mr. COUMBE: Absolutely. This is an example of a dictator of local government. Local government derives its powers not from the Commonwealth Parliament but from the South Australian Parliament.

Mr. Mathwin: Members opposite would like it to be from the Commonwealth.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Local government is getting a nice lot of money from the Commonwealth.

Mr. Mathwin: So what?

Mr. Gunn: It's the taxpayers' money and the Minister knows it.

Mr. COUMBE: In his capacity as Minister of Local Government, the Minister has taken an oath, part of which is to uphold the law relating to local government and the

benefits that accrue to it, as well as to uphold the interests of ratepayers in this State. I suggest that he is going too far in this matter.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What's that got to do with it?

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister is imposing on local government a condition that is not observed even by this Parliament when it amends the Constitution Act.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You wait until I reply!

Mr. COUMBE: I cannot wait. The Opposition believes that if South Australian councils want to alter their hours of sitting they should have the right to do so on a democratic basis. However, it considers that the course the Minister is taking is far loo rigid and, indeed, could in some cases act to the disadvantage of a council that wanted to alter its hours of meeting. I therefore suggest that the Minister modify this clause and provide something along the lines of the procedure of this place. His Bill will then be saved, and it contains some excellent clauses that local government wants. Indeed, the remaining clauses have met with the approval of individual councils all of which favour them. However, those councils are not in favour of this clause. No council was consulted about this clause last year, although they were consulted about the others. Having registered that protest regarding the legal application of clause 7, I support the second reading in the hope that the Bill can subsequently be improved.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): The second reading of this Bill has been supported by most Opposition members, but I oppose it. I do so because the Minister said when a similar Bill was before the House previously that he did not intend to accept the proposed amendments.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That is completely untrue. You have not looked at *Hansard,* my friend!

Mr. BLACKER: If I recall correctly, when an amendment was moved in another place the Minister said he would accept the Bill only as it was or not at all.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You read *Hansard*!

Mr. BLACKER: It is obvious that the clause in question is clause 7, which deals with the times at which council meetings can be held. It will be compulsory for ordinary council meetings to commence on or after 6 p.m. if there is only one dissenting voice. There must be unanimity before a council can alter its meeting time. I object to this because of the difficulties that could be experienced in regional areas. The first report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas has just been presented to members, and the areas of many of the councils in my district have been considerably increased: for instance, from just over 259 000 hectares to about 466 000 ha. If this Bill is passed in its present form it will be almost impossible for councillors living in outlying areas to attend council meetings for the time required, and the Minister knows this.

A report compiled by John R. Robbins of the Adelaide University states the number of hours spent on local government work. About 75 per cent of the councillors involved in the report said that they were occupied on local government work for three or four hours or more each week, strictly in connection with council meetings. So, the time required by those individuals would be between 12 hours and 16 hours a month. It is humanly impossible for councillors to work at night for between 12 hours and 16 hours a month. I am not referring to any additional work involved, such as consulting with other councils or contacting the public on council matters: I am referring strictly to council meetings and preparations for them.

The former Chairman of the Lincoln District Council would live about 48 km from the place where council meetings are held, and the recently appointed Chairman would be more than 40 km away. Should the report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas be adopted, some councillors would be required to travel 80 km to council meetings. To expect councillors to travel that distance, to do about 12 hours work, and then return home is expecting the impossible. If we double the number of meetings, we must also double the travelling time. This would increase the expense involved, and it would present to prospective local government members a problem that would discourage them from taking part in local government affairs.

It has already been stated that local government people must make inspections, consult with other councils, and consult with the public on council matters. These duties increase the number of hours required and place an extra burden on any potential candidate for local government work. In the last two elections of a council whose activities I am familiar with, it has been necessary to apply the section of the legislation under which a council can direct that a ratepayer in a specific ward shall become a councillor; this has happened when councils can meet during the day, but such a person may not be able to commit himself to attending night meetings, quite apart from inspections of various kinds.

The member for Gouger said that a private employee can set an example by becoming a councillor. If it is all right for private enterprise to allow employees to become local government members, one may well ask why the Public Service cannot make equal opportunities available to its employees. The real crux of the matter has not been mentioned—politics. This whole Bill has been designed with political overtones.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Don't you mean "undertones"?

Mr. BLACKER: Maybe. Until I became a member of this House I was not aware of Party-political influence in local government as it apparently exists in some areas. In my own area I have never heard of Party politics being involved in local government, and Party politics would never be involved. However, it is quite evident that Parties sponsor local government members. An article in today's *News* states that the Labor Party expelled one of its members. It relates to another State, but it concerns the Labor Party's local government policy. The article, referring to Mr. Wally Dean, states:

> The official reason given for his expulsion from the Labor Party is he breached the Party's local government pledge. A spokesman for the A.L.P. said the New South Wales administrative committee of the Party had debarred Mr. Dean from membership. He said Mr. Dean had broken his pledge in that he had resigned from the South Sydney Municipal Council earlier this year without obtaining approval from the Party. Mr. Dean was, until he resigned, a member of the council, having been elected as an A.L.P. endorsed candidate in the last local government elections.

That is relevant to this Bill. Councils covering 14 existing local government areas meet at night and, where a council decides to meet at night, that is all right, but it should be the decision of the councillors actually involved.

Under clause 21, it is necessary for the Minister to give consent before local government permits the establishment of parks in excess of 6 ha. This matter probably shows an element of doubt and casts a reflection on the integrity of local government because, surely, if any local council was to establish a park or acquire land for this purpose, it would lose rate revenue. I cannot help but feel that most

of the clauses take power away from people who have been directed to administer others' affairs on local issues. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the remarks made by my colleagues regarding the Bill and support most of its clauses. The only clause I really oppose is clause 7, which amends section 144 of the principal Act. The Minister has decided that he will direct when local council meetings shall be held. The Minister, who has said in the House that people should have proper representation and who has referred to one vote one value, has proven himself to be nothing more than a hypocrite, because he wants to give one person the power of veto. The only conclusion one can draw from the legislation is that, as it does not suit one or two members to meet at a certain time, they should have the right of veto; that is the Minister's argument. If the problems existing in the Frome District and the district I represent were related to our position here, we could sabotage the sittings of the House.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And you'd do your level best to do that.

Mr. GUNN: I would expect such a remark from the Minister, knowing his actions here and elsewhere. That is the kind of situation the Minister is asking us to accept. ft is complete and utter nonsense. If the provisions of clause 7 are written into the Act, the problems associated with council meetings will be even more difficult in the future. The Minister has laid on the table the First Report of the Royal Commission into Local Government Areas, one of whose recommendations is to increase the size of certain councils. It is clear from reading the report that some council areas will be extended to take in areas not already served by local government. If this recommendation is implemented it will bring into local government people who live great distances from the place where their affairs will be administered. I know of some of these areas where, within the next two or three years, councillors will have to travel over 300 kilometres to attend council meetings. Yet one councillor could insist that council meetings be held at night. Surely, if the Minister is reasonable, he will allow a simple majority to rule on this matter. He should leave it to be decided by the members and the people of the State.

An interesting aspect of the Bill is that local government favours many of its clauses and I, too, support them. This is another case of the Minister's trying to mix the sweet with the sour. On a previous occasion when this legislation was before the House, the local government body represented by the member for Whyalla had the audacity to write to members of another place and severely criticize them for defeating the legislation. However, it was not another place that defeated the Bill: its defeat rested squarely on the shoulders of the Minister of Local Government, because he again proved that he was not willing to compromise. Had he wanted the Bill to pass, all he had to do was delete clause 7. He in no way tried to compromise. He talks nonsense, and we know that the type of democracy he would set up in the State would be a one-Party system, and the Minister of Education would support that principle, too. I support my colleagues' remarks.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I am sorry that the member for Eyre has walked out.

The SPEAKER: There is nothing in the Bill about the member for Eyre's walking out. The honourable member for Whyalla.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Whatever one may say about local government, I believe it is high time that some revolutionary things were done so that we could get on with protecting the people it represents. The whole history of local government is shot through with big business and people who sit on local government but who do not have at heart the interests of those they represent. These people represent themselves and ensure that they are financially rewarded. Clause 4 provides for the appointment of a deputy mayor, and this is something with which I think all councils have had trouble in the past. A person who holds a responsible office is not always available, particularly in local government. A mayor must, in addition to his mayoral duties, fulfil responsible duties in the community. Having had experience of the Whyalla council, I know that the strain put on the Mayor is beyond what one might term humane. I support the provision regarding the appointment of a deputy mayor, and consider it a good step forward. Regarding clause 8, dealing with the appointment, removal and salaries of officers, the Whyalla City Council on no fewer than two occasions ran foul of this situation, especially regarding superannuation payments to officers who had transferred from other councils.

Mr. Coumbe: You're talking about portability.

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes. Big councils probably run foul of this situation far more than do smaller councils. A well-trained officer is a vital adjunct to a large council. However, such an officer is difficult to obtain unless he is reasonably recompensed for what he might lose as a result of transferring from his old position to a new one. Fortunately, we have been successful at Whyalla in obtaining the services of two very worthwhile officers for our city council. Clause 10 provides for a vote being given to the ratepayer, and not to the owner of the property. One of the major problems in local government is that property owners have multiple votes.

Mr. Chapman: The greatest problem with local government is your Government's interference with it.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The member for Alexandra can say that, but he has much to answer for, in my humble opinion. Clause 10 gives a democratic right to the ordinary person. I turn now to the clause that members opposite do not seem to like; in my opinion, clause 7 is a simple one, setting out to give the ordinary person in the community the opportunity to stand for election to his local council. Previously, the ordinary man working for a living has been at a disadvantage in this regard. No ordinary person in the community, especially in the larger councils, can afford to be on the council. Anyone who says he can is just plain stupid.

Mr. Mathwin: That is a ridiculous statement.

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is not a ridiculous statement. The Local Government Act does not provide a reasonable opportunity for the ordinary citizen in the community to stand for local government. Any member of this House who says anything to the contrary is stupid and does not know the true position. One Opposition member in this debate said it was a question not merely of standing for election as a local government member but also of how much time had to be given up for inspections and other duties. I go along with that, but members opposite are saying that a person must also give up his pay for at least half a day a fortnight or half a day a month (according to the size of the council).

Mr. Chapman: You had better do your homework again.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I have done my homework on that. As long as members opposite are putting up arguments to deprive ordinary people of the right to be in local government they are satisfied. I am not. The member for Flinders talked of a survey I am about to mention, and quite rightly pointed out some facts. The only thing wrong with his remarks was that he opposed the Bill. A survey was carried out for the University of Adelaide by John R. Robbins. Members opposite will all be aware of the survey, which I find most interesting. I shall quote figures relating to ages, positions, numbers and percentages of councillors.

Mr. Keneally: How many were L.C.L. candidates and how many were—

Mr. MAX BROWN: I did not go into that, but the figures would be rather interesting. The survey showed that, in the age group from 21 to 30 years, there were 16 councillors, representing 3.3 per cent of the total number surveyed. The age group from 31 years to 40 years of age comprised 88 councillors, or 18.1 per cent of the total. Between 41 and 50 years there were 144 councillors, representing 29.6 per cent of the total. Those between 51 and 60 years totalled 148, representing 30.5 per cent, practically a third of the total. In the age group from 61 to 70 years there were 72 councillors, representing 14.8 per cent. Councillors aged 70 years and over numbered 18, or 3.7 per cent. I do not know whether those of 70 years and over were workers. Of those surveyed, 179, or 36.8 per cent, were self-employed.

Mr. Mathwin: Is that why the clause has been put in?

Mr. MAX BROWN: Yes, that is what the clause is all about. Of the total number surveyed, 154, or 31.7 per cent, were employers of from one to 10 men; 34.7 per cent employed from 11 to 100 men; and only four employed more than 100 men. About two-thirds of those surveyed were employers. An interesting fact revealed by the survey was that only 15 out of 486 were women, representing 3.1 per cent of the total. I consider that many of the people interested and always ready to take part in anything connected with local government are women.

Mr. Evans: That is better than the Parliamentary average.

Mr. MAX BROWN: I agree. A similar survey would reveal that women's participation in local government in the United Kingdom is far higher. I turn now to the figu res relating to classifications of employees. In my opinion, an employee is an ordinary man being paid by an employer. Of those surveyed, 72, or 14.8 per cent, were professional people, managerial people, or supervisors. I do not call those people workers. We find that 17, or 3.5 per cent, of the 486 were classified as skilled workers, while seven of the 486, or 1.4 per cent, were semi-skilled or not skilled at all.

Mr. Millhouse: How do you define a worker?

Mr. MAX BROWN: That is a good question. I can assure the member for Mitcham that I do not define it in the way he does. I draw these figures to the attention of the House, because this survey shows clearly what local government is all about. Every attempt should be made to remedy the existing anomalies, and this cannot be done until the ordinary person has a right to vote for what he believes in and a right to stand for council.

Mr. Chapman: And the right to strike, I suppose!

Mr. MAX BROWN: We have always got that. Do not have any illusions about that! The member for Alexandra will not take that away, either.

Mr. Goldsworthy: And the right to take unions to court, too!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Opposition members amuse me with their chatter about democratic rights. They will support the act of disfranchising all ordinary people in local government, but they speak about democracy. They must be joking! This clause gives the ordinary individual, who cannot afford the time to attend council meetings during day-time, the chance to be elected as a councillor. This legislation should be supported by everyone.

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Again, I address myself to clause 7, as I did when this Bill was introduced last session. The conduct and function of local government is under fire from the Minister, and I believe that he is grossly interfering in council functions and dictating to a group in the community who will not accept his action. Opposition members will not accept clause 7; country district councils are not willing to accept the dictatorial attitude of the Minister about when and how they will conduct their meetings; and ratepayers in those council areas do not accept it, either. The member for Whyalla referred to workers and employers. Even trade union officials are employers of office staff and, in fact, employ the Government to act on their behalf.

Mr. Evans: Unions pay their election fees, too.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Unions tell them what to do and how to do it after they are elected to Parliament.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Evans and Mr. Chapman are authorities on trade unions!

Mr. CHAPMAN: Clause 7 is directed against the function of either the Adelaide City Council in the metropolitan area or country councils throughout the State: perhaps it is directed against all of them. I will not identify the ulterior motives of the Minister in presenting a Bill with 38 clauses, most of which are accepted by the people and by councils. However, clause 7 is unacceptable to those people, councils, and Opposition members, because it provides for council meetings to be conducted in such a way as to assist politically his Government in future. The Minister has had almost a year to alter this Bill: a similar Bill was presented in the last session of this Parliament. On the Bill's return to this place, the Minister sought desperately to obtain a conference, because he believed that a conference could achieve much and that there was room for compromise.

Since then the Minister has had plenty of time to compromise with his Bill, but has chosen not to do so with the only important issue in it. Clause 7 is identical to the clause that was included in the previous Bill, about which the Minister agreed that there was room for compromise. Now, the Minister has the gall to present the same clause with the same wording in an attempt to destroy the concept of councils. The time and place for council meetings have been determined by locally elected councillors, and these details should be decided by them and not be dictated to them by the Minister. Either the Minister does not appreciate the practical function of councils or his colleagues do not appreciate them at all. Let us consider why council meetings are held in the day-time, in country areas in particular.

Members interjecting:

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister seems to be engaged in an argument with other members. I point out that not only the councillors themselves are involved in night meetings. What about staff members who must attend? What about inspectors who must report to meetings that could

last from 6 p.m. until 2 a.m. or 3 a.m.? Will they be paid overtime?

Mr. Wells: We know your policy in relation to staff.

Mr. CHAPMAN: And it will remain my policy for those who will not work. If the clause is passed, people will be forced to work outside reasonable hours. I had eight years experience in a council that met when it chose to meet, with the majority deciding when it should meet. 1 aim to support that principle, as I believe it is valuable to local government and must be preserved. Opposition members will fight any attempt by the Minister now or in the future to change that principle. While I was a member of that council, from time to time members chose to meet at irregular hours. However, in normal circumstances, like many other councils in South Australia that council met during the day, as a matter of convenience. When many councillors have to travel long distances to attend meetings, it is reasonable that the meetings be held in the day. It is unreasonable to expect councillors to work in their own job, business, or other form of employment during the day and then have to travel long distances to attend council meetings at night.

If they attended such meetings, they would be useless in their employment the next day. If a person is willing to take on this form of community interest, he must be willing to sacrifice some of his income in order to attend meetings. If a person is keen, he will give up his income on the days he is required to attend council meetings. It is wrong to think that it is fun and games to sit on a council or that it is just another interest; it is another job. If a person applies himself properly, he must decide whether or not he will sacrifice some of his income. The facts are as hard and cold as that.

Mr. Wells: It's a prestige situation.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I have not been involved with a metropolitan council, but that sort of prestige does not apply in a country area.

Mr. Millhouse: You should—

Mr. CHAPMAN: I want the honourable member to say whether the Liberal Movement supports the Government in dictatorially introducing night council meetings. In clause 7, the Government proposes a new system of decision making. The Minister, of all people, should be aware of the simple majority and absolute majority system of making decisions at local government level. However, he now puts forward another system. If a council chooses to hold meetings at a time other than that proposed in the Bill, the decision must be unanimous. I cannot see that such a system of decision making would be supported at local government or any other level.

Mr. Mathwin: How can you have a council inspection at night?

Mr. Keneally: How do councils that already meet at night handle that situation?

Mr. CHAPMAN: Council inspections take place before the regular meeting time of the council.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mr. CHAPMAN: The remarks of Opposition members on clause 7 reflect the feelings not merely of the individual members of this place but also of the whole community—at least, that part of the community interested in running its council affairs locally. If a metropolitan council chooses to meet of an evening, it should be allowed to; similarly, if in other places councillors decide to meet in the evening or in the day-time, they should be left alone to do so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Mr. Speaker—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Bad luck, Bill. I'd sooner listen to you than Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister is in good form this evening. It is a pity he said that, because I was going to support him. As I understand the drift of the argument, the only clause at issue in this Bill is clause 7: certainly, it is the only clause I have heard anyone speak to. I have heard childish nonsense spoken from both sides on it.

Mr. Chapman: It is a most offensive clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member thinks that, I must say I do not find it so. I was accused by the member for Kavel this afternoon of not having read it. I had read it previously and have read it again but do not find it an offensive clause. However, like many matters calling for debate in this place, all the arguments are not on one side; they are not all black or all white—there are conflicting considerations. It is a pity that on the Labor side everything good can be seen and no validity can be perceived in any of the objections to the clause. It is more of a pity that the L.C.L. members can see nothing good in the clause.

Mr. Rodda: Where does the Movement stand?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I speak for myself, and my colleague may speak and act for himself on this matter. I do not know what the member for Kavel thinks.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Like you, they have changed their name.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not know whether or not they have changed their name, and that is my difficulty. They are not all of the same mind about this change of name business. The member for Fisher obviously does not support the change of name, because this is what he puts in the paper week after week:

Stan Evans for stability and progress. Join the L.C.L. and defeat inflation and Socialism!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is what the honourable member puts in the local paper every week. I am quoting from an edition dated August 7, and last week he did the same, so he has not changed it. That is my difficulty.

The SPEAKER: Order! So far, the debate has been confined to the Bill. There is nothing in the Bill about the policies of the L.C.L. or the L.M. This is a local government measure, and it alone must be discussed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, as always, I defer to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on this matter, but I was sidetracked by an interjection from the member for Kavel and wanted to settle it. The member for Fisher put this in the paper week after week: "Join the L.C.L. and defeat inflation"—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows what Standing Orders provide. Tn accordance with Standing Order 169, I warn him for the first time that he is wilfully obstructing the authority of the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Of course, Mr. Speaker, I defer to your rulings, as I said previously. Nothing is farther from my mind than to do otherwise. However, I think I have made that point, and we will now get back to clause 7. I regret (and this is where I was diverted by the member for Kavel, anyway, although he did say some pleasant things about me the other night) that L.C.L. members see nothing good in this clause, because I believe, on

balance, that its good points outweigh its bad points. What is the situation here? We all know that a person who is employed, working for an employer, finds it extremely difficult to get off for any activity during working hours. That cannot be denied; it is something that members on this side have tried to ignore because they cannot deny it. There is no doubt about that. It may happen that an employed butcher at Kadina (or whatever the example given this afternoon may be) can get off to attend a council meeting, but that is exceptional. Only one person in a hundred could possibly serve on a council which met as a rule during the day-time. So at least, if members on this side were fair-minded about it and not so partisan, they would acknowledge that.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the clause as drawn does, or would if it became law, act as a curb on the discretion of councils to meet when they wanted to. The clause provides that a council shall meet after 6 p.m. unless there is a unanimous resolution to the contrary. So it is a curb on the absolute discretion of a council to meet when it likes. Why is that being done? The Government denies it is being done for a political motive, and I doubt (although I will give it the benefit of the doubt here) that it is close to that purpose. It is likely, from the nature of things, that if the clause is passed it will give a political advantage to the other side of the House: that is obvious, because the bulk of the supporters of the Australian Labor Party are employed persons, so it stands to reason it will give them an advantage.

Mr. Max Brown: How's that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Whyalla had extreme difficulty in avoiding my question by interjection this afternoon, which was, I acknowledge, an unanswerable question. He can throw about the term "worker", but 99.9 per cent of the people in the community are workers.

Mr. Max Brown: That's your opinion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is where we are in trouble. The honourable member had the opportunity to give his definition but he declined to do so, and now he is interjecting on me. The clause, if passed, will be of some advantage to Government members or their Party, but that is no reason why Opposition members should reject it out of hand. Why should it be? Whatever we do will give an advantage to one side or the other, but that is not a decisive factor. What we have in this matter is an attempt to give an opportunity to a large proportion of the community who at present, for all practical purposes, have no opportunity to serve in local government.

On the other hand, the method adopted to do that is a curb on the discretion of councils. I can think of no better way of doing it than this way, or of no more certain way of ensuring that people who are employed get that opportunity. However, I am open to suggestions on this matter. If we go past one man having the right of veto, he himself may find that he is practically disqualified from being on the council. If we make it two or three or so, it still could work an unfairness to one member of the council. I see no other way of doing it. I believe it is far more important to ensure that everyone in the community has an opportunity to serve on a council than to worry about the so-called matter of principle, namely, the curb on the discretion of local government bodies.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'd be denying someone else.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think so. This is the position and the Government knows it. There is the let-out given in new subsection (3), which provides:

> 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 dissents from that resolution.

So there is a let-out. If the whole council is of that mind there is no problem, but why should even one person be debarred from service on the council? I will not argue about what can never be proved or shown by anything but complete political bias. I say to Opposition members (and I hope that at least it will strike a responsive chord in some) that their Party faces the problem it faces today because it has insisted from the time I have been a member of it (and even before) on having its council meetings during the day. That, as we all know, cuts out many members who would like to serve on the council, because they are employed and cannot have the time off.

That was one of the reasons that caused a division in the ranks of the Liberals in this State. Can any member on this side deny it? All Opposition members know (and the member for Bragg knows it very well, because he took a leading part in this matter) that this was one of the matters at issue: whether the State Council of the L.C.L. should meet during the day (when people from the country could come along and have their say and self-employed persons, such as I, could attend) or whether it should meet in the evening, thereby giving people, such as public servants and others, a chance to take part in the councils of the Party. Opposition members know perfectly well the dilemma their Party was in, and the way it went and is still going. If they have not learnt from the experience in their own Party they will never learn the rights and wrongs of this matter, and they will never admit it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do they still meet during the day?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: So far as I know, they do.

Mr. Chapman: We meet when it's convenient to the majority, the same as for councils.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am glad the member for Alexandra has expressed self-satisfaction on that rule of his Party, because it suits me fine if he does. I do not think there is anything more to say about this clause than I have already said.

Mr. Chapman: You haven't said anything at all yet.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A balance must be struck between giving people in the community an opportunity to serve on local government (and I come down four square on that side) and between the theoretical objection to telling councils when they shall meet. I do not hesitate, in the absence of some compromise (and no member has suggested one that would be acceptable to me yet), to say that I support clause 7. There is nothing else objectionable in the Bill, so I support it as a whole.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): I support the Bill. Before going on to outline the reasons for my support (and particularly the contentious clause that has just been the subject of the effort by the member for Mitcham), as a member of the Government Party responsible for the Bill I will analyse what has been said by Opposition members, with the exception of the member for Mitcham. The member for Mitcham, as far as I could deduce from his argument, gave a reasonable explanation of clause 7 and a reasonable summation of the way the Opposition had tried to handle this matter. He outlined the dilemma facing the Opposition and showed clearly that

it had not handled the matter well. Opposition members, with the exception of the member for Mitcham, have made no real attempt to hide the fact that the present situation regarding council membership (particularly in the country) is such that it provides for a restriction on membership.

I do not think that any Opposition member would have sufficient hide to try to say other than what 1 have just said is the case. Predictably, Opposition members came down on the side of the *status quo* in this matter. In this respect they have even less chance than Buckley. It is like trying to hang on to a handful of treacle: it gets out through the inadequacies of the vessel used to contain the problem. These inadequacies can be easily outlined here because, as I have already shown, Opposition members (apart from the member for Mitcham) have made no attempt to do other than ignore that aspect of the problem.

When Opposition speakers realized that the condition to which I have referred existed, what did they offer as a solution? The member for Victoria suggested, as a panacea, that special arrangements could apply to a wage-earner. The member for Mitcham referred to the butcher's employee for whom special arrangements were apparently made. Let me examine the situation as to special arrangements a little more closely. A person elected as councillor is required to represent the views of the ratepayers in the ward for which he has been elected. Should he, as a member of the council, be beholden to anyone other than those in the ward? That question has not been explored by Opposition members, and I am sure this was deliberate because, when one examines this area on a matter of principle, it is clear that no special arrangements ought to apply regarding whether a person can or cannot remain a member of a council. A council member today is required to exercise much common sense and function in the interests of the community.

Would any Opposition member who has already spoken suggest that a council member whose employer had made special arrangements to enable him to attend council meetings might not be influenced by those special arrangements, which the Opposition has advocated? Is it not reasonable to assume that, perhaps, when a certain decision is being considered by the council, the councillor's views might be influenced because he is on the council only because of the special arrangement that has been made regarding him?

Mr. Harrison: It raises a serious doubt.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, and that is no position into which a self-respecting councillor should be forced, although that is what the Opposition suggests, even though some workers may have something to contribute. The Government, as well as the community at large, knows this is the case. This is the first recent sign that I can recall of the Opposition's suggesting this, so perhaps it is at last gaining some contact with members of the community. I suggest that the Opposition look more closely at this matter. Indeed, any sensible person would say that no special arrangements should apply in such a case.

Another alternative has been suggested by Opposition members: that of sacrifice. We should note that they are not talking about sacrifice but are advocating additional sacrifice. Every member would agree that persons serving on councils are at times called on to make sacrifices and that they do so. No Government member is criticizing councils from this point of view. However, we are being told that additional sacrifices by certain classes of person will solve the problem. Opposition members are saying not that the sacrifices should be spread among existing councillors who will be disadvantaged in a harsh and severe manner but that it should be an additional sacrifice to be assumed by a person who comes from a certain restricted area of society.

We are, however, considering not a small but a large section of the society. The Opposition is therefore willing to inflict an additional sacrifice on that large area of society so that a person may serve on local government. That is what we have been offered by the Opposition, which suggests that these people should assume additional sacrifices or that special arrangements should apply. I have already explored the unhealthy connotations of that kind of arrangement acting as a brake or fetter on any council member. Opposition members have not, when advancing their arguments, denied that almost all metropolitan councils already hold night meetings. The member for Gouger, for example, showed by his argument (although I believe he was unaware of this) that the Minister was perfectly correct in introducing this provision and that it was not unreasonable because many councils did much of their work during the day time anyway, and this provision would not interfere with them if it became law. It simply refers to ordinary council meetings and not to when council members are looking at lamp posts, seeing if they have enough grass growing, or anything else that requires daytime inspections. So, we were told, we do not have to consider that aspect.

Mr. Mathwin: They all meet at night, anyway.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, in the metropolitan area.

Mr. Chapman: Do they have a high proportion of the work force to which you refer?

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Alexandra earlier gave us the benefit of his experience in local government. I suggest that I was reasonably courteous to him and listened to him carefully. However, I did not learn anything from him, because he did not really say anything, and I put his interjection in the same category: it is not worth noting. I was about to bring to your attention, Sir, the views of others in the community on this matter. True, as members of Parliament we are here to debate these matters, and members on either side are entitled to express their views. However, other people have their views on this matter too, and, as has been stated previously, this is not the first time this provision has been debated. Indeed, all members know that this matter was debated previously in this House. In the edition of Thursday, March 28, 1974, the *Advertiser* referred to the matter in its editorial. What did it have to say in this regard? Members opposite might reasonably assume that they would not be convinced by anything that I might say because, as a Government member, I (and indeed other Government members) would be biased. However, I do not think we would get the same reaction from Opposition members if I were to refer to the *Advertiser* editorial to which I have referred.

Mr. Millhouse: The *Advertiser* is nearly always unbiased.

Mr. PAYNE: I was about to add (and I venture to say that the honourable member's attempt to steal my thunder has failed, because I am going to continue and say this) that I am not convinced that the *Advertiser* is unbiased. However, on this occasion, reading what it advocates, I found myself pleasantly agreeing that it had not shown bias but had exercised reason.

Mr. Dean Brown: So, if the *Advertiser* agrees with you, it is unbiased.

Mr. PAYNE: I would not put any credence on what the member for Davenport has said to the House, judging

by check results that have been applied to statistics and other matters he has tried to introduce, on a distorted basis, in the House. Let us get that matter perfectly clear!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitchell should return to the Bill.

Mr. PAYNE: I will return to that unbiased *Advertiser* editorial to which I have referred and part of which states:

There is considerable merit in the proposal in the Local Government Act Amendment Bill—

referring to the previous Bill that contained a provision identical to this one—

that all council meetings should be held in the evening unless members agree unanimously to meet earlier in the day.

There we see not an "if" or a "but", not a worry about how careful we should be, as one often finds in *Advertiser* editorials. There is no suggestion of a Socialist plot and no mention of the Canberra octopus or any of the red herrings often drawn across the trail, but simply and honestly the editorial declares that there is considerable merit in the proposal. I am sure members who looked reasonably at the question could only find themselves in agreement. The editorial continues:

It is a departure—

and I think this is what worries Opposition members. Any kind of change is regarded by them as suspicious and is always opposed on principle without, in many cases, any examination of the subject or any reason for the opposition.

Mr. Keneally: Their concern is the lack of power.

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Stuart is making a suggestion, but I wish to be somewhat more charitable in the matter. I suggest that is not the motive in this case. The editorial continues:

It is a departure from the notion that councils should themselves decide on their meeting time . . .

That is the point so dear to the heart of the member for Alexandra who said he did not want any interference in local government functioning in the local way with the local group making local decisions. I do not know what it all meant, but I suppose he thought it sounded good.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He made the best of a bad case.

Mr. PAYNE: I agree with the Minister; one could put that connotation on the remarks and make quite a good argument that that was so. The article reinforces the earlier opinion in the first paragraph by stating:

It nevertheless appears justified for the reasons put forward by the Minister of Local Government . . .

The Minister is supposed to be the villain in the piece, according to the first Opposition speaker. However, it seems that, on this occasion, the *Advertiser* editorial has a different view. It is a matter of democratic principle and common sense, and a matter of a large slice of our society, as the member for Mitcham pointed out, being almost totally restricted from serving on councils. This is not a desirable state of affairs, and no member opposite has tried to make out a case to prove that that is not so. The member for Mitcham pointed out that members should be honest in examining the question, and he showed that those members who were formerly his colleagues on the other side but who are no longer of the same team were dishonest in the matter because they did not weigh the pros and cons in an effort to come down on the side of reason. The *Advertiser* on this occasion has been exemplary in its judgment. I can prove that statement by quoting further from the editorial:

The Bill could produce some hardship for members of country councils who have to travel long distances to attend meetings, but their interests and convenience must be measured against the interests of other members and potential members who might only be able to attend at night.

This is a sensible statement, taking account of the only fact established by Opposition members: some hardship may result to existing members who have to travel long distances to attend meetings. I am not arguing against that. Members have made that point, but it is not the whole argument. They have overlooked that, either wilfully or because they did not have sufficient ability to examine the matter over a wider range. The whole matter is reviewed neatly by the *Advertiser,* and I thank the *Advertiser* for putting it so succinctly yet sensibly.

Dr. Tonkin: And you thank the *Advertiser* for your speech.

Mr. PAYNE: No, I am not thanking the *Advertiser* for my speech. I am simply pointing to an unbiased editorial putting capable and sensible arguments. The member for Mitcham would agree with my analysis of this editorial, because he approached the matter reasonably, although he does not always do that. I suppose members opposite could argue sensibly that I do not always approach questions reasonably but, in this case, the member for Mitcham has approached this matter sensibly and he has supported the Bill. The editorial makes one final point that is worth mentioning, when it states, after discussing the fact that in some cases council members might find it better to attend day-time meetings:

But here again the Bill will unquestionably make membership of the council a practical possibility for more people.

It is the aim of the Minister to remove the restrictions that presently apply and to make it possible for people who wish to serve on councils to do so, if elected. Let us not forget that they must be elected. Members opposite act as though it is a cut and dried proposition, opening the gate to let in everyone including (according to Aiderman Spencer) the riff-raff and the workers. That is not the case.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: There is no politics in councils!

Mr. PAYNE: We will not develop that theme at the moment. The *Advertiser* also states, as does the Minister in his second reading explanation, that it would be simpler for people who wish to attend as observers. I have not heard even one Opposition member try to prove that it is bad for council business to be conducted in the open. Let us hear from them now. I know they would be out of order, but normally that does not deter them.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They don't let the press in at L.C.L. council meetings.

Mr. PAYNE: I understand that is the situation; conversely, the press has always been able to come along to our Party meetings. I do not hear members opposite urging that business be conducted in camera. If meetings are held at night it will be easier for many people, who at present cannot do so, to attend as observers. It may benefit local government.

Mr. Mathwin: How many people go there now?

Mr. PAYNE: I do not know what is the situation in the Glenelg District. I do not poke into what is going on there, because I am busily engaged in looking after the people in my own district. I can assure the member for Glenelg that, at the Marion council meetings, the galleries are full on many occasions.

Mr. Mathwin: Very often there are only three or four present.

Mr. PAYNE: There are other occasions—

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: The interjections illustrate the obtuseness of some Opposition members. Because the member for Glenelg goes to a council meeting one night and sees only three or four people in the gallery, according to him there is no point in having the business of local government in the open, but one has nothing to do with the other. Perhaps at the next meeting there would be 48 people. I believe I have shown that there are opinions other than those of members of Parliament on these matters.

The member for Whyalla earlier referred to a survey conducted by Mr. J. R. Robbins of the University of Adelaide concerning membership of councils. Details of The survey under the heading "Representation of Specified Groups'' indicate that, in a sample of 678 persons taken at random from the electoral roll, 57 per cent thought that there was not enough representation on councils of young people; 45.5 per cent considered there was not enough representation by housewives; and 41.6 per cent believed there was not enough representation of what may be called the worker group in the community on councils. If we adopted the definition of worker used by the member for Mitcham, we would find that council membership consisted of about 1 per cent of the people.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you like to give your definition?

Mr. PAYNE: It seems that no-one is allowed to secure the minutest of points where the honourable member is concerned: the honourable member is like the maiden who must have the last word, but he will not get it in this Chamber. I need not make any additional points in relation to this matter, because the feeling in the community supports the Minister and the Government in their actions in introducing this Bill.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: Opposition members may laugh, but the member for Alexandra referred not to an individual ratepayer but only to a local council. On the other hand (and credit is due to him for it), the member for Victoria did not deny that it was his local council, and not the people of the area, that asked him to protest about clause 7. When the council in the honourable member's district pulled one end of the string, he was willing to respond, but he was frank about it. As the member for Alexandra is now quiet, this would be a good time to end my remarks, and I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): Initially, I refer to the first operative clause relating to ratable property. Although this clause refers to Crown land, another group of people in the community do not always receive a fair go: that is, holders of properties occupied by elderly citizens' cottages and institutions, nursing homes, and church nursing homes and hospitals. There seems to be a variation in the way in which these properties are rated. Some councils grant concessions to these organizations, but others charge the full ratable value and make donations to the organizations. That situation could be tidied up, and I think the member for Unley would agree with me, because many of these institutions are located in his district, as they are in mine and in the districts of other members.

Clause 7 is the major cause of this debate. I congratulate the member for Goyder: I am amazed, absolutely astounded, and flabbergasted at the degree of influence that the honourable member has been able to assert on the member for Mitcham during the dinner adjournment. Judging from the change in the attitude of the member for Mitcham since his barrage of interjections this afternoon, he seems to have changed his mind or, if that is not so, he has changed his tune and shifted ground.

Mr. Langley: Tell us how.

Dr. TONKIN: The member for Mitcham finds himself in difficulties, but only because he has not kept pace with recent developments and does not know that the Liberal Party State Council meets alternately in the evenings and afternoons. This is not a bad solution, and one that should appeal to such a strong defender of democratic principles as the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: What's the use of meeting at night?

Dr. TONKIN: The honourable member has suddenly realized that, if he supports the Government on this matter (as he was so vociferously doing this afternoon), he will offend many people in his colleague's district. It was interesting to see that the member for Mitcham did not pre-empt the member for Heysen, as he said he would, but he pre-empted the member for Goyder who was to speak earlier. A group representing a country district has many problems, because one cannot please all the people all the time, and one has to carefully steer a middle course with one leg on either side of the fence or one may offend one's country colleague's constituents on the one hand or, on the other hand, offend one's Australian Labor Parly supporters in the city. Apparently, all things considered, the honourable member did not do such a bad job.

I regret that the member for Mitcham finds nothing good in our arguments. I believe it is probably better to examine and, if necessary, resist a change rather than institute change for the sake of change. Undoubtedly people who are employed can attend council meetings if they make the right arrangements. In many country areas where councils largely meet in the day, workers attend day meetings, managing well. In the metropolitan area, most councils meet at night. It was interesting to see from the survey conducted that, although most metropolitan councils met at night, most of their members (and they may all have been workers) were self-employed workers.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Look at the franchise.

Dr. TONKIN: The situation can be dealt with in many ways. I am a little disappointed in the member for Mitcham. For a man who upholds the democratic principles as well as he does, self-determination as often as he does, and freedom as vociferously as he does, I am surprised that he should support a one-man veto. It is rather like the situation of one member of this House deciding that, because he had to go to an important engagement every Wednesday evening, this House should not sit on that night because he could not be here.

Mr. Gunn: Where is it?

Dr. TONKIN: I think it is at the parade ground. By our attitude, we are not attacking the workers. I do not believe the member for Mitcham is the only reasonable person in the House, as he has given the impression he is. I agree that some people would have a problem in attending day council meetings but there are ways in which the problem can be solved. I believe councils may wish to meet in the evening, the day, or at 5 p.m.; they may wish to alternate their times of meeting. I do not mind what compromise is worked out. As Liberals, we believe in the

wishes of the majority, while giving every consideration to the aspirations and desires of the minority. We must do all we can to take the wishes of everyone into account. We must not have the totalitarian situation of one man saying when a council shall meet. The rule of the majority is the important thing.

Mr. Langley: Do you believe in that?

Dr. TONKIN: Very strongly. I believe that councils should be able to determine their own affairs. What is being lost sight of completely is the fact that the answer lies in the ballot box; people can elect to councils workers or other people. Once elected, a council should decide when it should meet. There should not be a direction by the Government as to when a council should meet, as it would be totally wrong for the democratic right of an elected council to be taken away from it by any action of this House. All members must know this well. It is a pity that, in trying to make things easier for worker representation on councils (a concept with which I fully agree,), the Labor Party should have gone to extremes. It is a pity that the member for Mitcham did not have the courage to come down on one side or the other.

Mr. Millhouse: I did: I said I'd support the clause.

Dr. TONKIN: It seems fairly obvious that the Labor Party intends to enter more fully and directly into local government politics. We have been threatened that it will do so.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: By whom?

Dr. TONKIN: We have heard this spoken about, and it has been said more and more by Labor Party spokesmen.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Name them.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: The Labor Party is doing the best it can not to make it easier for the working man to get on to a council but in fact it is trying to make it as difficult as possible for people in the country to maintain their interest in council affairs.

Mr. Duncan: That's a lie.

Dr. TONKIN: The pendulum has swung from one side to the other. It does not do the Government any credit to introduce legislation that swings so far. It could have come to a middle-of-the-road solution (a compromise) that would have solved the problem.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Your Party wouldn't compromise.

Dr. TONKIN: I will not subscribe to a total ban on certain meetings caused by the vote of one man. However, I would agree with a two-thirds majority deciding when a council should meet. This will cover the objection of members opposite in relation to half the members of a council being elected at one time. If half the council members are elected at one election and a majority of two-thirds is necessary to change the time of meeting, after the next election it is possible that the necessary majority will be on the council. Ultimately, the matter must come to the ballot box—to the voters. The democratic process requires that members of councils shall be elected by ratepayers and shall sort out their own affairs. The Government should keep well out of the matter.

Mr. BOUNDY (Goyder): Members on both sides are probably waiting with bated breath to hear which way I will vote.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We couldn't care less. When you've been here a while you'll know it's a numbers game, sport.

Mr. BOUNDY: For the benefit of members, I can say that, with reservations, I support the second reading.

Mr. Gunn: What about clause 7?

Mr. BOUNDY: I will come to that. As the clauses of the Bill have been well canvassed, I will refer to only three clauses. Clause 5 deals with the appointment of deputy chairmen of councils. I applaud this provision, as it allows for understudies to be groomed to take over from the chairmen when they are ready to retire. More particularly, it will allow deputy chairmen to reduce the load on council chairmen. I am well aware of the heavy volume of work undertaken by council chairmen. This clause can only assist in that respect. Clause 8 refers to long service leave entitlement and its continuity. These provisions are just. Council employees have been seeking clarification of this matter for some time.

Mr. Venning: What did your Deputy Leader say about clause 7?

Mr. BOUNDY: For the benefit of the member for Rocky River, may I say that I am the Deputy Leader of my Party. I do not wish to interfere with the normal process of local government in making its own decisions, and I believe it is competent to do so. I also believe that every member of the community should have the opportunity to serve on local government. I think that clause 7 is a genuine attempt to achieve that, but it is unjust because it seeks to allow only one person to determine when a council shall meet. Those people who offer themselves for local government recognize that much more is required of them than the actual time they spend at meetings. That consideration in itself should attract only those people who are prepared to make sacrifices. Meetings in the evening are, perhaps, small compensation for the sacrifices that all councillors make.

I notice that the Minister of Local Government does not seek arbitrarily to alter the decisions of those councils that choose to meet in the evening now: he leaves them as they are. My attitude to this clause is that a council should be entitled to meet at a time suitable to its members. I would, therefore, support amendments that achieved that end. I was not a member of this House when this matter was debated earlier, but I believe that then and today the Minister has indicated that he is prepared to compromise. I now ask him what compromise he is prepared to offer. Do two members vote for night meetings, or three members, or 30 per cent of the council, or what? I should like to know the Minister's attitude. He says, "Numbers is the name of the game"; I think also compromise is effective government, and Opposition members should consider that much more stringent effects on local government will come from measures other than this one. Therefore, I suggest we have much more to fear in the future than this evening. There is some basis for the Minister's argument on this clause and I hope that compromise is possible. I hope, too, I have not confused the issue further. My Leader is happy, and so am I.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): Of course, I support the Bill and I, too, will confine my remarks to clause 7. I have been prompted to make my small contribution to this debate by the comments of some members opposite, more by way of interjection than in speeches. The member for Alexandra has asked (perhaps in his speech—I am not sure—but certainly by way of interjection): why give the wage-earner greater opportunity to be on a council because, even if he had that opportunity, he would not be interested in contesting a council election? I think the honourable member stands strongly behind

that statement, because he has spoken across the Chamber to one or two members to find out whether or not in their electoral districts councils sit at night and whether there are any wage-earners on them. I say to the member for Alexandra that the Port Augusta council sits at night and, of the 11 members of the council, two are self-employed and nine are wage-earners. None of those nine would be able to stand for the council if the meetings were in the afternoon.

Mr. Chapman: They would be able to.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They aren't all wealthy farmers like you.

Mr. Chapman: I wasn't a farmer—I was a shearer.

Mr. KENEALLY: If the member for Alexandra will be patient, I will go on to point out to him that it will not be as easy for these people to be on the councils as he believes the case to be. Also, at Whyalla there are eight members on the council (for the four wards) and the Mayor. Four members are wage-earners, making five, together with the member for Whyalla, who is a notable councillor in Whyalla, as the member for Heysen would be able to tell members after his recent visit there. Here again is a council that sits at night, where the wage-earners are prepared to participate in council matters and become councillors, and no-one would suggest that the council at Whyalla or at Port Augusta was not efficient and progressive. Both councils are.

The honourable member has suggested that such wage-earners would not be interested in standing for the council. That is complete and absolute arrogance; it is the sort of arrogance that comes from the background that the honourable member had—local government being the selected area in which self-employed or business people are entitled to the greatest say, and the average person in the community having no part to play in decisions made by local government. The whole history of the L.C.L. in South Australia has been to resist any widening of the franchise for the average person in the community to have a greater say not only in local government but also in Parliament. This is clearly illustrated by its efforts regarding the expansion of the Legislative Council franchise.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart must return to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: I will certainly do so, Sir. The same principle applies in this debate: wherever there is an opportunity to prevent the average person from participating in local government, the Opposition supports such a restriction. This is all clause 7 does: it enables wage earners, who would not be able to become members of a council if it sat in the afternoon, to become members. The proof of this can be seen in a recent incident at Port Augusta. Everyone knows that the Redcliff petro-chemical plant is proposed to be constructed in my district.

Mr. Dean Brown: Was proposed!

Mr. KENEALLY: It is proposed. Everyone would be aware of the repercussions that such a project would have for the Port Augusta council and would realize the importance of a visit to Port Augusta of the Minister of Development and Mines, who wanted to speak to the council. As he could attend the town only during the afternoon, it was my job to arrange a meeting between the Minister and the council. I had to ring certain councillors' employers to arrange for them to attend the meeting. A major employer in Port Augusta told me that, because of the importance of the meeting to Port Augusta's future, it would on this occasion allow the employees who were councillors to attend the meeting. However, it was said that this was to be an isolated privilege and was not to be taken as a precedent. That meeting was well attended because I was able to get the leave passes, as it were, for the council members.

Mr. Dean Brown: Who was the employer?

Mr. KENEALLY: I can serve no useful purpose by mentioning the employer's name. However, the only major employers in Port Augusta are the Commonwealth Railways and the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is completely irrelevant to the Bill. The honourable member for Stuart must return to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: They are the only major employers in the city and most councillors work for them. If anyone can tell me that there would ever be a meeting of that council that would be of greater importance to the welfare of the community than was this one, I should be surprised. Despite this, there was a reluctance to allow councillors to leave their work in order to attend the meeting. Opposition members have asked the Government to say whether, if councils met at night, the average wage earner would want to be a member of a council. I have clearly shown that this is the case in my district. They also asked me to furnish some proof that there would be an objection to wage earners becoming council members if the council meetings were held during the afternoons. I have done that, and in the simplest terms—so simple that even the member for Alexandra would have been able to understand it.

The member for Bragg said he would support some members of council being able effectively to determine the hours of council meetings if two-thirds of the total number of members wanted to do so, but in this respect we would be right back to square one: there is an entrenched situation in local government that self-preservation and self-interest are the first priority. These entrenched interests will not have an average worker becoming a council member. If two-thirds of the members of a council were required to vote before the time of council meetings could be changed, the system would never be changed, because the average member of the community would not be able to stand for election. Unless such a person was convinced that eight or nine of his colleagues would also vote for a changed time and he was therefore confident of winning, the system would not be changed. In opposing clause 7, the Opposition is saying that it wants the *status quo* to be maintained.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They're looking after their mates.

Mr. KENEALLY: Of course they are. They do not want the average person to participate in local government. Opposition members make pretty speeches about local government being the form of government closest to the people.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They are always the right people with the right associations and who make the right arrangements.

Mr. KENEALLY: That is so, and this has certainly been stated, although quietly, by Opposition members. I support the Bill for a variety of reasons, and I support clause 7 for all the reasons enumerated by Government members, as well as the member for Mitcham. I considered it essential to make these observations from my own experience, for the benefit of members opposite.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill. I see that the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Liberal

Movement have left the Chamber. No, I am sorry, the Deputy Leader of that Party is in the gallery.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Mitcham was not sufficiently interested to vote on this provision the last time it was debated, so I do not know whether he will return and cast a vote this time. Perhaps he claims he is self-employed, which means that he works for himself but is also employed by this Government and the Commonwealth Government and leaves one employment to go to the other. His argument would be that anyone who was working could go where he wanted at any time. I therefore think he advanced a weak argument. The member for Whyalla kept talking about the workers and the ordinary people, but what is an ordinary person? Surely we are getting past that class-conscious stage where one refers to ordinary people and extraordinary people. Since I have been a member of Parliament, I have known many extraordinary people. However, the average person is an ordinary person.

The member for Stuart has claimed that we will not get any changes regarding councils' meeting times, but 20 years ago most council meetings were held during the day. However, a change has occurred as employees have gradually become council members. When it has suited the council, night meetings have been held. Indeed, this has happened in relation to the Strathalbyn corporation, but in relation to the district council, all the members of which are self-employed, at any time a change could occur. Nearly all persons who serve on country councils, school committees or oval committees are self-employed. Others have an equal opportunity to participate in community affairs, but they do not take advantage of that opportunity. However, there is no class distinction, as such people could join, say, a bowling club and play alongside their employers on the bowling green. There are more self-employed people in local government affairs because this is the type of person who takes an interest in such matters. How many people have been self-employed all their lives? Such people do not like working for wages, so they start a little business. The Chairman of the Meadows council, which is one of our biggest councils, was a shearer until not long ago, but he bought a small property. Some people prefer to be employees, and most are good workers. At one stage I had two young people working for me, one after the other, on a bonus and under good conditions. The first one made good use of his money and now has a 2 000 hectare property in Queensland, is a member of the local council, and is interested in politics. The other one had a far better chance. I had to guarantee his account at the bank to pay his income tax. He is now working for the Government. He was a good worker, but he did not possess the character necessary to be self-employed or to take an interest in local government. What I have said is the basic reason why there are more self-employed people in local government.

It has nothing to do with bigotry or discrimination, as some Government members think. Anyone who really wants to do so can become a member of a local council. I have just had a new house built, and the plasterer worked on it three days a week. He would have had two days in which to attend council meetings. I ask members to consider the absenteeism that occurs now. The time is now well past when a man must keep his nose to the grindstone. I worked in the National Bank 40 years ago and, if I stayed away, I was in trouble. At one time, I stood on the bank's front steps without a hat, and was put on the mat for doing this. A worker is now far more independent and has far more leisure time than his employer has and, in many cases, he receives a better income. Members opposite are making a mountain out of a molehill. As more employees want to become councillors (and this is happening all the time), more and more councils will sit at night. Why, when in most councils it is a serious liability for some to attend night meetings, should one councillor be able to say this cannot be done?

If a good case were put by a councillor to show that it would be detrimental to him to attend day meetings, his fellow councillors would no doubt be good enough fellows to make a concession to him. I know that a different attitude exists in the city, where it is dog eat dog and where one section of workers will strike because they receive less in wages than does another section. Then another section strikes to catch up. It is a constant fight to see who can get the best return one week, but the end result is that most other workers will receive an equal return the following week.

People in local government in the country are willing to compromise. Night meetings are now held in the city and in country towns, and we should leave country areas to solve their own problems. The Minister is not entirely happy at being told from Canberra what to do, and I am sure that country people will not be altogether happy if he tells them what they should or should not do. One group of society is trying to push the others around. If we want to have any influence in the world we must show that something can be done in a different way, and not tell people what they must do. If we set a good example, people will follow and do something reasonable. If members opposite think someone should be able to push others around in this matter, that must be their usual attitude. I have more faith in human nature than they have.

Most people are decent, provided that they are not pushed around. I see no merit in trying to direct people to do something, when change is already taking place. Better results are gained from evolution than from revolution. If things go wrong, people take an interest and try to straighten matters out. I strongly oppose clause 7 because the majority should be able to decide what should be done. I have sufficient faith in the people amongst whom I have worked to know that they will give every council member a decent and fair go.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government): At the outset, I will deal with a matter that arose when I interjected in the debate. I refer to March 28, when I was asked a question relating to a statement allegedly made by Alderman Spencer and reported in the *Advertiser*.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Here we go again! You wouldn't have a case without that, would you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Kavel will keep quiet, I think that his Deputy Leader will be more than satisfied with what I am saying. That is an indication of the divisions that exist among the Opposition.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You'll have to do better than that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the member for Kavel does not want to listen, I will not press the matter. However, I think the Deputy Leader wants to hear it, and, out of deference to him, the member for Kavel might show some respect. When replying to the question, I said, in effect, that it was my view that Mr. Spencer had been a member of the Adelaide City Council for

about 18 years and for well over half that time he had been the Liberal and Country League endorsed candidate, and I assumed that he was expressing L.C.L. views. There were interjections, and I said that the Leader of the Opposition might like to repudiate my statement. Later the same day the Leader repudiated the statement (at page 2847 of *Hansard*) not only as Leader of the Party but including all Opposition members in his repudiation. I am grateful that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition drew my attention to this matter.

Clearly, the debate has virtually centred around clause 7. References were made to other factors, but I should imagine that they were only passing references, and I heard no serious opposition to other clauses. I regret that the member for Flinders is not present, but I hope someone will draw his attention to my remarks; I refer to page 2863 of *Hansard* on March 28, 1974. In his opening remarks, the member for Flinders said I had made the very forthright statement when this matter was previously before the House that it was a matter of take it or leave it, that there was no area for compromise. I attempted to tell this House (and it is recorded at page 2863 of *Hansard)* that that was not the case. In fact, I said:

I thank the Leader for his indication of support in giving the names.

At that stage I moved a motion that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that a conference be granted. I included in that motion the names of managers, as is the normal procedure. I said:

I believe that, contrary to views that have been expressed in another place, a conference should be granted, because there is ample room to find a compromise.

Then we had a series of points of order, with interjections from the member for Davenport and the Leader of the Opposition, and I was not able to develop that point. However, I had said sufficient to indicate quite clearly that I was looking for compromise in the interests of local government. Finally, it was the Legislative Council that refused a conference.

Mr. Jennings: Shame on them!

Mr. Goldsworthy: It was made clear in the debate, if you had read *Hansard.*

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not concerned with reading *Hansard;* I am concerned with the messages that come to this House from another place, and the messages sent to that place from this House. I made quite clear that I believed the matter could be resolved by conference. It was the Legislative Council that refused a conference and threw out the Bill. For those people, and L think the member for Kavel was one of them (I hope I am not doing him a disservice)—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You would not accept the Council's amendment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I certainly would not accept it, because it was little more than maintaining the *status quo.* I indicated that there was ample room for compromise, but the Legislative Council was not prepared even to meet managers from this House.

Mr. Jennings: Not even to talk about it.

Mr. Dean Brown: That is because earlier in the day you had said there was no room for compromise.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is completely untrue, and the member for Davenport knows it is untrue. That was the first time the Legislative Council had refused a conference since 1918.

Mr. Venning: It looks as though you slipped.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No; local government suffered because of the pig-headed nature of the Legislative Council. I hope we are not going to have a repeat performance, because within the terms of this Bill are many features anxiously sought and eagerly awaited by local government. It has been suggested that clause 7 is undesirable because, as the member for Heysen has said, the present position maintains the people who are able to go to local government meetings. It is shocking, in this day and age, to have as many references, oblique though they may be, to class distinction as we have heard in this House today. To say that the self-employed person is the desirable person for local government is just so much hogwash that it is unbelievable in this year of 1974, yet Opposition members say the self-employed people are the ones to be encouraged into local government.

Mr. Mathwin: I don't think we've said that.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Glenelg might say he doesn't think that is so, but if he reads *Hansard* he will find that is exactly what has been said.

Mr. Mathwin: You are reading something into it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am reading that into it because, as the member for Glenelg knows, the average working man raising a family cannot afford to lose the time and the wages that go with taking a day off to attend council meetings. Several questions were thrown at the member for Stuart, asking what employer in Port Augusta he had had to approach, and obviously attempting to drag from him the fact that it was the State Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ruled at the time that that matter was irrelevant to the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Thank you, Sir. Tn the time I was a member of a council, the State Government never permitted its employees to have time off with pay. The member for Alexandra spoke about his council activities, but I should like to know how many of his employees he encouraged to go on local government bodies and, if there were any, whether he paid them for their Joss of time while they were at those meetings.

Mr. Venning: You are talking utter rubbish now. Get on with the Bill.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is rubbish to the member for Rocky River, because he is in the happy position of having an establishment that continues to earn a living for him whether he is there or not. Of course, the man working for the member for Rocky River would have his wages deducted if he were attending a council meeting.

Mr. Venning: No.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I challenge the member for Rocky River to give in this House the name of the person he employs and pays when he goes to council meetings.

Mr. Venning: He doesn't want to be on the council for a start.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Goyder was having 20c each way, and I reminded him that these things were finally determined by the numbers. I am conscious that that will apply on this occasion; I am equally conscious that it will apply when the Bill reaches the Legislative Council. I am most anxious to have it presented to the Legislative Council in a manner that will be acceptable on this occasion so that no longer will members of the Legislative Council continue to deprive local government of the benefits involved. Accordingly, I intend to support the amendment to be moved by the member for Glenelg.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Local government auditors' certificates."

Mr. MATHWIN: Why are the words "and Local Government" being struck out from section 83?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) : It was the Highways and Local Government Department as we knew it, but now it is the Highways Department.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—"Ordinary meetings."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

In new subsection (3) to strike out all words after "council" second occurring and insert "decides by a resolution supported by an absolute majority of the total number of the members of the council that the meetings should so commence."

The amendment will mean that decisions about council meetings will be determined by an absolute majority of the council, and this would be a democratic method that should commend itself to the Government. If the Minister does not have confidence in council members, it would be a poor reflection on his judgment. During the debate in the previous session on a similar Bill, the Minister said that he believed councils were controlled by vested interests. He was casting aspersions on those who give the State voluntary and honorary services.

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the amendment. I was a member of a council that met at night, and for 16 years the members who received a wage by working for an employer would not have constituted more than 15 per cent of the number of members of the council. Having the decision by an absolute majority is fair and reasonable, as only one more than half the number of councillors, irrespective of the number present at the meeting, would have to vote for a change. That is provided for by this amendment, but the Bill provides that everyone must be present and voting. If one person dissents, the motion is lost and the meeting must be held in the afternoon.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MATHWIN: I move:

In new subsection (3) to strike out all words after "council" second occurring and insert "decides by a resolution supported by at least two-thirds of the total number of the members of the council that the meetings should so commence."

The reasons for the amendment are plain and have been canvassed in the second reading debate. I am pleased that the Minister will accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 8 to 14 passed.

Clause 15—"Installation of pipes and equipment."

Mr. MATHWIN: Why is the consent of the Minister necessary in the granting of a licence for installing pumps and equipment?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This provision simplifies the procedure in the existing section.

Clause passed.

Clause 16—"Roadside restaurants and cafes, etc."

Mr. COUMBE: I understand that this provision is designed mainly to legalize drinking at roadside cafes in the city and other areas. Will this help to clear up the position regarding fruit vendors who operate from trailers at roadsides and whose operations cause a problem to some councils?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I readily acknowledge the problem to which the honourable member refers. However, this clause is designed simply to clear up the legal doubt currently existing in relation to drinking at roadside cafes, such as at the Strathmont Hotel, in Hindmarsh Square, and in two or three other places. As there has been a conflicting legal opinion whether these operations are in accordance with the Act, this clause puts the matter beyond doubt.

Clause passed.

Clauses 17 and 18 passed.

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

Mr. MATHWIN: Why is the period of 10 years stipulated in new section 449c (3) as the time in which a loan must be repaid? The principle adopted by councils in repaying loans is to spread the repayment over a period of years so that present ratepayers will not have to pay entirely for benefits to be reaped by subsequent ratepayers.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This provision deals with different borrowing from that normally undertaken by councils. Normally, councils borrow money for carrying out substantial works, such as roadworks, kerbing, sporting and park facilities, and so on, that will provide benefits in perpetuity. In this case, we are dealing with a once-only problem. The introduction of common superannuation has caused considerable financial commitments for some councils. In the financial climate in which many councils presently operate, it is impracticable for them suddenly to produce these funds from the revenue of one, two, or three years. Therefore, we have extended the period beyond the normal period, the time of 10 years being chosen as reasonable. It is desirable that these repayments be made fairly quickly.

Clause passed.

Clauses 20 to 28 passed.

Clause 29—"Unsightly condition of land."

Mr. COUMBE: I think this is the infamous "unsightly goods and chattels" provision that has exercised the minds of members of this Parliament for a considerable time. I am delighted that this amendment by the Minister is in the clause. It has been sought by local government for some time, and probably the case that most readily comes to mind concerns a property on the Main North Road, where the council was frustrated in its efforts to gain entry and had difficulty in recouping the cost. The gentleman concerned owed the Government and the council a considerable amount of money. Will this amendment clarify the position and enable the councils concerned to recoup costs?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is correct.

Mr. RODDA: Will this clause be concerned with unsightly used car lots? What action will be required of those people whose properties are unsightly?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Section 666b of the principal Act gives a council power to deal with unsightliness. That power has always been there but, like so many of these powers, it was not complete because, although a council could exercise that power, it could finish up financially worse off. This amendment is to ensure that the expenses incurred are recoverable from the owner.

Clause passed.

Clauses 30 to 35 passed.

Clause 36—"Particulars of charges upon property."

Mr. RUSSACK: Is this really a search fee that is to rise from 10 cents to $2, which must be paid before a search can be made?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (37 and 38) and schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, August 28, at 2 p.m.