HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, March 5, 1975

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (JUDGES' SALARIES) 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.

UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

The SPEAKER: In recent years members of this House have, on occasion, indulged in the regrettable use of some unparliamentary language in debate in which, mainly because the member against whom the imputation had been used did not see fit to object at the proper time, the Presiding Officer did not intervene. I have probably erred in not intervening by calling the member using such words to order and insisting that they be withdrawn, and, in the event of refusal, naming the member concerned. Erskine May states:

> Good temper and moderation are the characteristics of parliamentary language. Parliamentary language is never more desirable than when a member is canvassing the opinions and conduct of his opponents in debate.

The right to claim courteous treatment in debate is a right of all members, and the following examples of unparliamentary expressions that call for prompt intervention by the Chair may be useful as a guide to honourable members:

(1) The imputation of false or unavowed motives.

(2) The misrepresentation of the language of another and the accusation of misrepresentation.

(3) Abusive and insulting language of a nature likely to create disorder.

(4) Charges of uttering a deliberate falsehood.

In future I intend to rule out of order the expressions "lie", "liar", "lies", "lying", and any other unparliamentary expression, and to call for a withdrawal and, if that withdrawal is not made to my satisfaction, the Standing Orders will be implemented fully. Future proceedings of the House will be conducted in accordance with Standing Orders, and interjections will be kept to a minimum. Honourable members will be warned for infringements or for disregard of the authority of the Chair and, if any honourable member persists in his disregard, such honourable member will be named and, in accordance with Standing Orders, be permitted to explain his actions or to apologise to the satisfaction of the Chair.

I have made this statement because, as from today, this policy will be implemented and applied by the Chair to all honourable members. There will be no favours whatsoever from the Chair, and all honourable members will be treated in accordance with the statement that I have just made to the House.

QUESTIONS

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

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (February 25).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Australian Government has announced a policy of ensuring that all children of pre-school age will have access to one year of pre-school education by 1980. Based on this objective, the South Australian Government has sought, and been granted, capital funding by the Australian Government for new schools in the interim programme, and pre-school child-care facilities under the childhood services programme as set out below:

INTERIM PROGRAMME 1973-74

(much of the expenditure has carried over into the 1974-75 financial year)

Education Department:

School	Building	Use by children
Croydon	Complete	Occupied term I, 1975
Strathmont	Complete	Occupied term I, 1975
Ferryden Park	Complete	Occupied since term III, 1974
Port Adelaide	Incomplete	Not occupied. Play groups while waiting
Gilles Plains	Complete	Occupied term I, 1975
Mansfield Park	Complete	Occupied since term III, 1974
Kilkenny	Complete	Occupied term I, 1975
Elizabeth West Ridgehaven Goodwood Para Vista Nangwarry Trinity Gardens Salisbury North West Alberton Ingle Farm Elizabeth Downs	Contracts let; in course of construction	Play groups have started in schools with teachers as a preliminary

Kindergarten Union of S.A. (Incorporated):

Evanston	Incomplete	Some children attending Gawler, will transfer
Le Fevre (in temporary premises)	Incomplete	
Fairview Park	Complete	Children started term III, 1974
Flagstaff Hill	Complete	Children started February 17, 1975
Koolangarra (Whyalla)	Complete	Children started term I, 1975
Holden Hill (in temporary premises) . . .	Incomplete	
Ingle Farm	Incomplete	Play groups for some while waiting
Christie Downs	Incomplete	
Madison Park	Incomplete	Mobile unit
Manor Farm	Incomplete	Mobile unit

Kindergarten Union of S.A. (Incorporated):

	Building	Use by children
Morphett Vale East	Incomplete	*
Viscount Slim (Whyalla)	Complete	Children transferred term I, 1975
Thorndon Park	Incomplete	*
Seaford	Incomplete	*
O'Sullivans	Incomplete	*
Stanvac	Complete	Children started February 24, 1975
Hackham East	Incomplete	*
O'Halloran Hill	Complete	Children started on February 10, 1975
Hackham West	Incomplete	*
Cumberland (alterations)	Complete	No change in enrolments
Crystal Brook (extensions)	Complete	
Murray Bridge (replacement)	Complete	Children began in new building February, 1975
Pooraka	Complete	Children started term II, 1974

* Children enrolled operating in temporary premises pending completion of building.

CHILDHOOD SERVICES PROGRAMME, 1974-75
(together with carry-over from 1973-74 financial year)

Education Department (in conjunction with Community Welfare Department):

Integrated child-care pre-school projects:

Campbelltown	Design stage
Brompton	Design stage
Nangwarry (in conjunction with pre-school listed above)	Working drawings complete. Tenders to be called

Regional resource centres:

Mansfield Park	Planning under way, room being prepared
Ferryden Park	

Pre-school day care for intellectually retarded children:

Kent Town	60 children enrolled at present

Kindergarten Union of S.A. (Incorporated):

Child care pre-school:

Lavis/Grey ward	Land being sought
Norwood	

Pre-school child care:

Woodside	Tenders called
St. Marys	Contract ready to let

Rebuilding pre-schools:

Jamestown	Tenders called
Barmera	Tenders called
Pinnaroo	Tenders called
Bridgewater	Contract ready to let
Yankalilla	Tenders called

It will be noted that the Tea Tree Gully area has an increased provision by the new centre at Fairview Park, the nearly completed building at Holden Hill (to which children will transfer from a temporary building) and the play groups at Ridgehaven Primary School pending the completion of the pre-school building.

PORT AUGUSTA ROAD

In reply to Mr. VENNING (February 25).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is intended to upgrade the Port Pirie to Port Augusta highway, and the proposed work is as follows:

(1) A Highways Department gang, being established in a camp near Port Germein, will commence work on the Port Pirie to Mambray Creek section in May, 1975.

(2) A second gang, established in a camp at Winninowie, will commence work on the Mambray Creek to Port Augusta section about February, 1976.

HOUSING TRUST LAND

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say whether the Land Commission has purchased any land previously owned by the South Australian Housing Trust? If it has, how much of this land has been transferred and what percentage of the total land purchased by the commission does it represent? If Housing Trust land has been so transferred, how does such a transfer constitute an improvement in the bank of land available in South Australia for housing?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Some land that was surplus to Housing Trust requirements has been purchased.

Dr. Eastick: Surplus?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, surplus. I point out to the Leader that the Housing Trust had in fact an area of land for use under its existing policies that was equivalent to about 19 years supply. It was believed that some of that land should be put on the market at an earlier date than normally would have applied under the Housing Trust programme. Therefore, some of the Housing Trust land has been provided. The Leader is apparently not aware of the original provisions of the Land Commission, which, from public statements, contemplated the taking over of certain of the lands held by the State Government. This is being developed and put on the market in the way provided by the Land Commission. That constitutes a real improvement in the supply to the public of land serviced at cost. I will ascertain for the Leader exactly how much of the total land originally came from the Housing Trust.

Dr. Eastick: Tomorrow?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot guarantee that I will have it by tomorrow, but I will bring it down as soon as I can.

VIETNAMESE CHILDREN

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether any problems have arisen regarding the adoption, by South Australian families, of Vietnamese babies? I have received a letter from a constituent who contrasts the situation and circumstances surrounding the adoption of a child with Australian parents with those applying where the child has Vietnamese parents. The important part of this letter is as follows:

There are 40 Vietnamese babies waiting for adoption in this State. All of them have been here for the specified time, usually 12 months. All of them have their papers. However, the judge in the case is not accepting the papers, as often they do not have the mother's signature on them or for other varied reasons.

My constituent goes on to say that in some cases the mother of a Vietnamese baby may be dead or untraceable, so that problems obviously can arise concerning the papers referred to. Can the Minister say whether there are any overall problems in this area and whether he proposes any solutions?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The policy which I have adopted and which I have instructed the department to adopt is to facilitate in every way possible the adoption of Vietnamese

children by suitable adopting South Australian parents. Of course, the department has the responsibility to satisfy itself that the prospective adoptive parents are suitable for that purpose and that the child who comes into their care will receive enduring parental care and support from those parents. Subject to those considerations, the department does everything in its power to ensure that people who are willing to adopt Vietnamese children receive a favourable response to their applications for acceptance as adopting parents. Generally speaking, this procedure has worked satisfactorily. Indeed, there is a substantial list of parents in South Australia whose adopting of Vietnamese children has been approved but who have not yet received children, so in that regard there is no bottleneck.

The problem that has arisen (and, in view of the honourable member's question, I will have further inquiries made about it) is that when children come to South Australia and have been in the care of their prospective adopting parents for some time the parents are required to apply to a court for a formal adoption order. At that stage the court must, among other things, satisfy itself that the children are available for adoption. This involves examining the documents available from Vietnam, and problems have arisen regarding the adequacy of those documents. However, steps have been taken to solve problems in that regard, although I do not know to what extent those steps have been successful. It is a matter of arranging for adequate documentation to be obtained from Vietnam to enable the court to be satisfied that the children are available for adoption; that is to say, that any necessary consents have been obtained from the natural parents. In law, provisions exist to deal with the situation where a parent is unable to consent to the adoption because that parent is no longer living or cannot be contacted. Naturally, adoptions are more difficult to implement if parents reside in oversea countries than if parents reside in Australia, where the facts are more easily ascertainable. I will have further inquiries' made about the matter and let the honourable member have any further information that I can obtain.

TAXATION POWERS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Treasurer supply information regarding the suggested referral of taxation powers *vis-a-vis* the Commonwealth and the States following the recent Premiers' Conference? In addition, can he indicate the areas that are likely to be affected, to what extent they will be encompassed by such a referral, and what stage discussions have reached in this context?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only matter that I am aware of regarding the referral of taxation powers involves a referendum which was held last year arising out of a Premiers' Conference and which provided that powers could be referred by the States to the Commonwealth and that the Commonwealth could refer powers to the States. That provision for uniformity in the transfer of powers was not. carried. I have no knowledge of any other proposals, nor have any been discussed at a Premiers' Conference.

Mr. Coumbe: What about the Constitution Convention?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Many things have been considered regarding the Constitution Convention, but at the moment that organisation seems to be bogged down in a series of hard political stances taken by the people involved.

Mr. Millhouse: By whom?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: By all people involved in the Constitution Convention, and that includes those of all complexions from this Parliament. If the honourable member thinks there is some hope of getting agreement in the Constitution Convention he is more naive than I think he is.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Mr. WRIGHT: Is the Treasurer aware of the press report appearing on page 9 of today's *Advertiser* which is headed "$3 000 000 boost for meat exports"? If he is, does he see any similarity between the action of the Commonwealth Government in assisting the beef industry over a perilous period and the action taken by the South Australian Government in assisting the trade union movement by way of the Industrial Organisation (Building Loans) Bill? The article states:

> The Federal Government will lend up to $3 000 000 to the Australian Meat Board to help it make export sales. The Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt) said yesterday loan terms and conditions would be fixed by the Treasurer (Dr. Cairns). The loan would be repayable over a period to be determined by an increase in the livestock slaughter levy. The levy would not be increased until the beef market had fully recovered.

I do not want to condemn the. Commonwealth Government for this action, because I think that it is absolutely necessary and that it ought to receive full praise for assisting an industry that is in a difficult situation at present. However, Opposition members have expressed strong opposition to the Industrial Organisation (Building Loans) Bill during the debates on it in the past week. I believe there is similarity between the assistance being given to the beef industry by the Commonwealth Government and the assistance being offered under the Industrial Organisation (Building Loans) Bill that has just passed through this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can explain the question but not debate it.

Mr. WRIGHT: Does the Treasurer see any similarity in this regard?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Governments of all kinds in Australia have tried to assist those parts of the economy that have faced difficulty. In South Australia, signal assistance has been given freely by the Government to both the primary-producing and the secondary industry sections of the community and assistance has been given through both grants and loans to tertiary industry, especially where there has been any difficulty. Members representing rural districts in South Australia are assiduous in approaching the Government for assistance in those areas, and this assistance has been given in significant form within the State. The strange thing is that where some other sector of the community of which members opposite disapprove is in any difficulty, even though it is an essential part of our economy, they do not see the necessity for giving any kind of assistance; but, then, consistency in principle in these matters is not a thing we can always expect uniformly in political events in this State.

HOUSING LOANS

Mr. EVANS: As the limit for second mortgages on new houses is fixed at 85 per cent of valuation, less first mortgage advances, at interest rates of about 18 per cent, will the Premier take urgent action to have the lending ratio increased to 95 per cent of the total cost of a house, including all cost rises? In a recent report, Mr. Pethick made the point that the Government's recent loan increase from $15 000 to $18 000 would not necessarily help many people wishing to purchase a house, except those who were in the under $133 a week classification. He made one or two other points in the report, which states:

> Mr. Pethick said that despite the new loan ceiling (subject, of course, to valuation and income qualifications), the

big problem was the limit on second mortgage money to 85 per cent of valuation . . .

He also said:

If all mortgages on a house up to 95 per cent of its cost (subject to a limit of, say, $25 000) were insurable, it is probable that lending institutions would enter the field of second mortgage finance at much fairer rates of interest than are now available . . . This would bridge the deposit gap and make repayments by the house buyer less of a financial burden.

Because of the present high cost of houses, there is a need to increase that limit to 95 per cent. A 10 per cent increase a few years ago did not mean much in monetary terms but at present, because of inflation, it would be significant. In many cases it means $3 000 in capital, without interest. I take the matter up with the Premier to find out whether an increase to 95 per cent is possible for first and second mortgages inclusive.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: 1 understood that the honourable member was referring in his question to second mortgages, but in fact the concessional interest rate loan of the State Bank to the limit of $18 000 is a first mortgage. I am not certain that I have entirely followed the honourable member's question, so 1 will examine it, refer it to my advisers and bring him down a full reply.

FORD CAR DEALERSHIP

Mr. BURDON: My question, which is addressed to the Premier, concerns the Ford Motor Company and dealerships. Recently a dealership of that company in Mount Gambier became vacant and several people in my district who, before the closure, had purchased new Ford motor vehicles have expressed to me much concern about their warranties and the failure of the company to provide facilities for servicing their vehicles, as well as information about any alternative arrangements that have been made.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please ask his question?

Mr. BURDON: Will the Government consider holding discussions with the company to overcome the concern of Ford car owners in my district?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Certainly, we will examine the matter.

NARACOORTE CAVES

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Tourism tell the House what progress is being made with the development of the spectacular finds that have been made in the extensions of the Naracoorte caves? Much publicity has been given to the findings resulting from explorations in the extensions of the caves, and 1 understand that one area that has been found, known as the great hall, is spectacular in itself, having created much interest in this State and across the border. Indeed, many people have asked me when it is likely that these new caves will be opened to the public, and I should be pleased if the Minister could tell the House when this is likely to occur.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I cannot tell the honourable member the likely opening time for the additional areas. He would know that the area was highly rated, as it should be, by the Tourist Bureau, because the finds that have been made there are of tremendous scientific interest, having stimulated much interest not only in Australia but throughout the world. Because of this, it was pleasing that yesterday the Australian Department of Tourism made available a substantial amount that will assist not only the development of those caves but also the provision of adequate information and facilities for people who may visit the area. The work cannot be rushed, because we must be careful about how the caves are developed so that they will not be damaged. I will check with the people who are working on the project, get what information I can, and let the honourable member know.

MODBURY SOUTH SPECIAL SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on the progress being made on Modbury South Special School, which is now under construction, and will he find out when the building is expected to be in use?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: 1 shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Development and Mines say what changes the Government has made recently regarding the previously projected number of people expected to live at Monarto each year after 1978? Further, will he say what changes the Government has made regarding the amount of money previously expected to be spent in the next five years and also the number of public buildings and general developments expected to take place in phase 1? I should imagine, because of what I personally regard as something of a down-turn in industrial expansion and also because of the Borrie report regarding zero population growth, that the Government would recently have closely studied and reassessed the whole matter of Monarto.

The Hon. D. I. HOPGOOD: Modifications to the Monarto programme to take account of lower projected population trends were made over 12 months ago, and the present targets that we have been working towards have not altered since then. I remind the House that, since that review was made, we have always talked about a population of between 25 000 and 30 000 by 1983. At this stage I see no reason for changing that target, and, for the forthcoming meeting of Ministers with the Australian Government, we will be identifying the exact sources of these population numbers.

Mr. BOUNDY: Can the Premier say whether the Government will now abandon its plans to force public servants to live at the proposed new city of Monarto? State public servants are opposed to such a move and Senator Wriedt (Leader of the Government in the Senate) has said today that the Australian Government will not be a party to the conscripting of Commonwealth public servants to Monarto. A front page article in today's *Advertiser* refers to the public servants' rejection of the proposal to conscript them into service at Monarto. An article appears on page 2 of todays *News* under the heading "Canberra 'No'—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot exhibit newspapers.

Mr. BOUNDY: —to Monarto Moves by Force".

Although Senator Wriedt has said that he doubts whether the Minister for Regional Development (Mr. Uren) will be a party to any such move, this Government wishes to force its employees to go to Monarto. If it is necessary to force people to go to Monarto to establish the new city, does the Premier wish to see Monarto established contrary to the weight of public opinion mounting against it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has asked several questions and, in reply to his initial question, I point out that the hypothesis he uses is incorrect. The Government has no plans to force public servants to live in Monarto.

Mr. Millhouse: Ha, ha!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has asked whether the Government will abandon its plans to force public servants to live in Monarto, but I point out that there is no Government plan to force public servants to live in Monarto.

Mr. Millhouse: They will lose their jobs if they don't.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As is the case in the Commonwealth Public Service, which intends to establish some regional offices in Monarto, a certain number of jobs will be located in Monarto. Public servants will not be compelled to live in Monarto but, if their jobs are there, they will be required to attend Monarto to do their work. If, however, they choose to live somewhere else and travel to Monarto by helicopter, rickshaw or paddle steamer, they may do so.

Mr. Millhouse: Be realistic.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: By the time the jobs are located in Monarto there will be an excellent freeway provided by the Highways Department which will get public servants there in rather less time that I would imagine any of the honourable member's constituents would take to get to Adelaide.

ROYAL PARK SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Mr. OLSON: Will the Minister of Transport investigate the possibility of providing school buses from Semaphore Park to Royal Park High School? I have been told that, with the expansion of housing in the West Lakes scheme involving the Semaphore Park area, 250 children are required to travel four kilometres across the Port River causeway, which is without public transport. As the physical condition of some children does not enable them to ride bicycles, will the Minister arrange a suitable form of transport?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Transport Department is now undertaking an investigation on the overall question involving the whole of the peninsula, and I am sure that that investigation will embrace the point that the honourable member has raised. However, I will certainly bring the matter to the department's attention and make sure that the information he has sought is provided.

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Minister of Education satisfied that the policy of appointing class A principals (or "superheads", as they are popularly called) in departmental secondary schools has achieved, or will achieve, what it is intended to achieve? The newspaper report that alludes to the appointment of 20 superheads states that the appointment of such officers was a recommendation of the Karmel committee. I have checked that recommendation, finding that the reason for suggesting this appointment initially was that it was intended to place less weight on experience in the departmental system; it was hoped to attract people from outside the department to take these positions, people such as those who might otherwise take positions as senior lecturer at a university. Later, the Karmel report states that the scheme may help to encourage the interchange of inspectors and headmasters, and so on. The newspaper report states that the criteria for appointing these officers included educational experience, as well as the ability of the person involved to cope with problems caused by socio-economic conditions.

I understand that initially the appointment of a class A principal will be for five years. The list of schools at which these principals are being appointed looks like a fairly representative list of schools throughout the secondary system. I believe that problems of a special nature are likely to occur at any time at any of the large metropolitan schools. Obviously, the advertising of these positions has not attracted people who will be able to compete with secondary school headmasters. It would appear (and this has been suggested at least once or twice) that the new appointments could prove a divisive factor amongst headmasters of larger secondary schools. I note from the list that the headmasters of several of our larger metropolitan secondary schools have not been appointed class A principals at this stage. I ask the Minister whether in fact the appointment of these superheads has achieved what it was intended to achieve when the policy was first announced.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I believe it will be possible to make an effective judgment on the matter only after some time has elapsed. There were several applications for these positions from other States, New Zealand, and Papua and New Guinea. However, the selection committee judged that not one of these applicants was to be preferred to those who were recommended from within the South Australian Education Department. I think I can say that it was disappointing that the applicants from other States and overseas were not better than they were. Moreover, I have certainly always believed that the arrangements made in relation to class A principals should improve the flexibility possible for people considering whether or not they should apply for an administrative position. I have always thought it most unsatisfactory that, when a teacher or headmaster is appointed inspector, he cuts himself adrift from the school situation for all time.

Certainly, one of the reasons behind establishing the office of class A principal was to try to encourage the movement of officers between the department and the teaching service. No secondary inspector applied for a secondary class A principal position, although I am not sure what is the position regarding primary schools. Despite that, I think that, in the longer term, the new office will ensure that the position of secondary school inspector is more attractive, because a person can apply for that position knowing that he has not cut himself off for all time from the teaching service. If such a person, in his later judgment, wishes to go back to teaching, he will have an opportunity to do so. We will really not be able to make a judgment in this matter until such time as the type of person applying for an inspector's job in the future is also analysed to see whether or not people have applied for that job who previously would not have applied, because it would have meant their cutting themselves off entirely from the teaching service.

I hoped (and I expressed this view before the new classification was established) that we would have received some successful applications from other States or overseas, and that we would have had some interchange between the inspectorate and the schools. Although that has not taken place yet, I hope it still will occur. Regarding the employment of people from overseas or other States, some difficulties certainly arise because of a certain lack of portability in relation to long service leave and superannuation rights. Those arrangements tend to tie a person to his existing position once he has occupied it for some time. In this case, the proof of the pudding will ultimately be in the eating; we will have to wait longer to see whether the matters set out in the Karmel report and the additional matters to which I have referred do in fact come about.

BIRD SMUGGLING

Mr. DUNCAN: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say whether the problem of smuggling protected birds out of South Australia is increasing? Is

there any evidence to indicate that this smuggling is organised on an international basis? What steps is the Government taking to speed up its programme to control smuggling activities? My question arises out of a news report broadcast this morning concerning the apprehension of persons who were attempting to smuggle protected birds out of South Australia. As the number of birds referred to was over 200 (a large number), apparently an organised gang is involved. I am sure members of the House and the public, knowing the unique and valuable bird life that exists in South Australia, will be most anxious to know whether or not the smuggling activities are organised and, if they are, what steps the Government intends to take to break up such organised smuggling.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Bird smuggling has been a tremendously difficult problem over the past 10 years or so. It could have been referred to as a widespread activity until, in 1972, the National Parks and Wildlife Act was enacted, with the National Parks and Wildlife Service being established as a section of the Environment and Conservation Department and additional staff being provided for that service. Since then, particularly during the last two years, tremendous inroads have been made into organised smuggling of birds from this State. In fact, many people have been apprehended who have been suspected for some time of being involved virtually full time in smuggling birds to other States and overseas. The arrests made during the last couple of years have, I believe, virtually solved the problem. Therefore, 1 was a little surprised (but nevertheless pleased) at the apprehension of people who were obviously taking birds without permits and in an improper way.

The fact that, over the last two years, we have confiscated about 5 000 birds from people who had been dealing in them illegally indicates what a large and profitable business this was until we stopped the activities of these people. As 1 have said, I am a little surprised at this latest development, because reports from departmental officers who work closely with customs officials and local police have indicated that the problem has been virtually solved and that we have fairly well cut off the source of supply to those who have been dealing in these birds. I think it is fair to say that what was reported yesterday was a fairly isolated case. Nevertheless, considering the tremendous profits involved in engaging in this activity, I think it is necessary for us to watch the position closely, enforcing the sort of penalty that was included in the Act last year to provide an additional weapon for the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

HOUSING TRUST REGIONAL OFFICE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Development and Mines, in his capacity as Minister in charge of housing, consider establishing a Housing Trust regional office somewhere in the Riverland area? I understand that at present the trust operates through agents, who are largely rent collecting agents, and through the good offices of the local district council. However, because of increasing demands for houses in the Riverland and the need for inquirers to be given reasonable replies and for applicants to get application forms and information directly, I wonder whether, because of the real need that exists as a result of the growing demand in the area, such an office could be set up on a full-time or part-time basis so that local people might know that a representative of the trust would be present there to discuss problems with them at a certain time on a certain date. At present the matter rests with the district council which, although seemingly responsible for the service, is not obliged to provide it even though it is pleased to provide it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The honourable member's suggestion is in line with Government and trust policy on the decentralisation of departmental activities as much as possible. I will certainly take up the matter immediately. However, in the event of a favourable decision being made I could have problems with the member for Chaffey, the member for Murray, and the member for Frome, but that is a hurdle we can jump when we get to it. The suggestion is certainly in line with what we want to do but it is a matter of how soon the policy can be implemented.

FISHING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask the Minister of Fisheries whether he supports his colleague the Commonwealth Minister for Science (Mr. Morrison), when he says:

> Put simply, what the Food and Drug Administration is saying is that two fish fingers a day, where seafood has above 0.5 parts per million of mercury, can lead to mercury poisoning, which causes blindness, deafness, insanity, and death.

If the Minister does not agree with that statement, what action, if any, does this Government intend to take in the matter? I suppose all members are aware of the present controversy over the mercury content in fish. This matter has had much publicity, and it seems that the States are on one side and that the Commonwealth Government is on the other. The Commonwealth Government is seemingly intent on imposing its will through the Trade Practices Act by making a regulation thereunder. The statement to which I have referred in my question is the latest shot in the war, so far as I can ascertain, on the part of the "Feds", the Commonwealth Government. It is for that reason that I give the Minister an opportunity to say whether he accepts what has been said and, if he does not, what he intends to do about it.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I did see the article to which the honourable member refers. Not only can 1 not agree with the statement but I honestly cannot believe that statement was made by the Commonwealth Minister for Science, because it seems remarkable. This matter is causing much concern not only in South Australia but also in the other States. As a result of this, I visited Canberra last week to speak with the Commonwealth Minister for Health, the Minister for Science, and the Attorney-General. I should have expected that any announcement of this nature would be made by the Commonwealth Minister for Health. However, at this time I have not established whether he agrees with this morning's press report. The South Australian Government is taking this matter seriously when the generally expressed views of the Commonwealth Minister for Science are wrong, and evidence we have placed before that Minister suggests that we have strong reasons for adopting that view.

Two aspects are involved. The South Australian Government (including me as Minister) is primarily concerned with the effects that such a decision as that reported in this morning's press would have on the industry and members of the community, because the fish diet of the latter would be dramatically affected if it could be established, even with reasonable doubt, that the suggested standard was necessary for the health of the community, and we would have to accept the disadvantages. However, I point out that the evidence we have indicates that that is not so and that much further work must be done before such a dramatic step is taken. Later this week the Premier

will discuss this matter with the Prime Minister, drawing his attention to the point of view of this Government.

COMMERCIAL VEHICLE INSURANCE

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether the State Government Insurance Commission is refusing to write insurance policies on heavy commercial vehicles? I have been told that the commission is refusing to accept such proposals even though it is bound by its charter to undertake all forms of general insurance. The premiums on policies of this nature are usually high. In fact, the cost of comprehensive insurance is the highest operating cost incurred by the truck operator. It is of no help to truck operators if the commission refuses to honour its obligations, thus increasing the cost of insurance generally.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member directed his question to the Minister of Transport, whereas the State Government Insurance Commission is under the jurisdiction of the Treasurer, so the question is better directed to him. The honourable Treasurer.

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

DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends soon to appoint a new Director of Agriculture to replace Mr. Marshall Irving who has just retired, or does it intend to appoint only an Acting Director until the Corbett committee's report on the Public Service is tabled or until a new Director is appointed to administer the Environment and Conservation Department, the Lands Department, and the Agriculture Department? Although Mr. Irving, who was an excellent Director of Agriculture, recently retired, I understand that the Government has not yet made a move to appoint a new Director; rather it has made moves to appoint an Acting Director. An interesting article appears in Ronald Anderson's *Primary Industry Newsletter* of February 19 this year. The article, which is rather amusing and which is headed "Stronger on Acting than Actions?", refers to the South Australian Government and to the fact that we have an Acting Director of Fisheries, an Acting Director of Lands, and now an Acting Director of Agriculture. The article suggests, rightly, that we are in a period of flux because of the activities of the Callaghan committee and of the Corbett committee. The article also suggests (and this is why I ask the question) that one Director will administer the Environment and Conservation Department, the Lands Department, and the Agriculture Department, the three Government departments that are being conscripted to Monarto. It is for that reason 1 ask if and when a new Director will be appointed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen the article and the reply is "No".

Mr. Dean Brown: You don't intend to appoint a new Director?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not say that. The honourable member asked his question and I replied, "No".

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was asked and a reply has been given.

UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF

Mr. BECKER: Can the Attorney-General say whether there has been a change of Government policy in providing immediate financial assistance for unemployed persons and, if there has been, why? I understand that about one week elapses while unemployment benefits are being processed through the normal channels of the Commonwealth Employment Service. I have had drawn to my attention an unfortunate case in my district concerning a gentleman who is experiencing difficulty in obtaining unemployment benefits because his wife's assets and income have created a problem. My constituent has been married for almost 25 years, but for the past 14 years he and his wife have been separated and have lived in different boarding houses. Recently, he became ill and his wife took him back and has nursed him back to health. He lives in the same house as his wife although in a separate room, but cannot qualify for unemployment benefits. Within five months he will be aged 65 years, and has been told that he will not be entitled, to the age pension, for the same reason as that which prevents his obtaining unemployment benefits. My constituent's problem is that he lost his job some time ago, and has tried to get other work but cannot because of his age. His wife will not pay him pocket money. On applying to the Community Welfare Department for assistance he was told that there had been a change in policy and that financial assistance was not now available to people who should be receiving unemployment benefits.

The Hon. L. J. KING: There has been a change, but I assure the honourable member that it was never the policy of the Government or the Community Welfare Department to provide assistance for husbands .whose wealthy wives were not willing to sustain them in these circumstances. Formerly, the Australian Government required a person to be unemployed for two weeks before he was eligible for unemployment benefits, which meant in practice that, before the cheque arrived, a period of over 16 days might elapse from the cessation of his employment. The State Government provided relief on a scale that was identical with the Commonwealth Government's unemployment relief scale in order to cover that period. However, the Commonwealth Government has now reduced the period to seven days, and a person is now eligible for unemployment relief after seven days of unemployment. As the person normally receives at least a week's pay on the termination of his employment, generally this does not present a problem and, for that reason, the State Government has discontinued the scaled unemployment relief. Apart from that there exists now, as has existed in the past, provision for emergency situations, and every district officer of the Community Welfare Department is allocated a budget calculated according to the social indicators that indicate the likely needs in his district, and he can have recourse to that budget in any emergency situation in which people are without a means of livelihood while waiting for unemployment relief or for other reasons that apply. If a person applies and if the district officer is satisfied with his *bona fides,* he may receive relief in cash or in some other way that will tide him over. That is the only change in the position, and it has resulted from a change in the policy of the Australian Government in reducing the time for eligibility for unemployment relief. The case raised by the honourable member does not concern the time required for eligibility: it concerns the fact that the person is not eligible because he is living with his wife who has sufficient assets and income to enable the domestic unit to function. In these circumstances he is not eligible for Australian Government unemployment relief or for emergency relief from the State Government, because such relief is provided to enable people to obtain necessary food, clothing, and shelter in an emergency situation. The person concerned is not a welfare problem: rather is this a domestic problem, and I think his remedy lies other than through the Community Welfare Department.

PORT BROUGHTON SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education details of the present planning for a new area school at Port Broughton, the Victor Harbor of the North? It is rather significant that, before the last election, one candidate, a Nat Smith, told the Port Broughton High School Council that he had information and plans of the proposed new school for the area and offered to meet the council and talk to it about those details. I do not wish to comment on the value of such a dissertation, other than to say 1 should like to ask the Minister what are the present plans for the school.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am surprised at the honourable member's touching interest in his district and his concern for his friends.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: And for his colleague.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: His friend could not have been a prospective colleague in the circumstances, but I believe that his friend Mr. Smith made several statements that I would not have authorised, and I am sure that the member for Rocky River did not authorise them, either, although the honourable member did not indicate in his' question whether or riot that was so. Despite all that, although I understand that the Port Broughton Area School is not on the design list I will inquire about the present situation and obtain a reply for the honourable member so that he may tell the school and his constituent Mr. Smith.

COUNTRY ABATTOIRS

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government intends to license abattoirs in country areas? At the conference of the Eyre Peninsula local government group at Wudinna last Monday, concern was expressed at the suggestion that centralised abattoirs would create additional costs to the consumer. The specific point was that, if the Government Produce Department depot at Port Lincoln was the only Government-licensed abattoir on Eyre Peninsula, the increase in costs would be twofold: first, the increase in freights on livestock to the abattoir, which would be an additional cost to be met by the producer; and secondly, the increase in freights on processed meat to country markets, an additional cost to be met by the consumer. In many cases there could be a 300-km freight differential added to the already high costs. Naturally, any country abattoir would have to comply with the Health Act and, on the assumption that such requirements were met, it would be of advantage to producers and consumers to have stock slaughtered at the place of marketing.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although I will obtain a report on this matter from the Minister of Agriculture, I assure the honourable member that, up to now, no submission has been made to Cabinet on it. Discussions have taken place, but I cannot say whether legislation has been drafted or what are the intentions of the Minister. However, I am sure that the Government has not considered the matter at this stage.

PIG FEEDING

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government intends to introduce legislation to prohibit the feeding of swill to pigs, and to control its disposal? Butchers in my district have approached me about this matter, as suggestions have been circulating that controls will be introduced. They are greatly concerned, as such action would require major reorganisation and will cause hardship. Also, I understand that bakers would have problems in disposing of stale bread. Will the Minister ask his colleague to clarify the position?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I recall something being said about this but I do not know the exact details. I will ask my colleague to bring down a report.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Premier say whether the Government will consider offering a reward for information leading to the conviction of anyone who deliberately lights a bush fire in this State? To my knowledge no such reward is offered at present. I am prompted to ask this question by a report appearing in the *Advertiser* of February 11 this year, which states:

Melbourne—The Victorian Government will offer a $10 000 reward for information leading to the conviction of anyone who deliberately lights a bush fire.

This year we have had in this State many serious bush fires, some of which appear to have been lit deliberately. It is difficult to apprehend these people unless someone actually sees them light the fire. Two young men were seen recently lighting a grass fire at Seaview Downs. The person who saw them light the fire gave chase and took the number of their car, and this resulted in their being apprehended and in their case now being before the Supreme Court. The person who took the number of the car did so at great risk because he could have been assaulted for taking this action. I believe that anyone who takes this risk and gives the information to the authority should be rewarded.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will discuss the matter with my colleagues who are concerned with this and bring down a report.

FAIR CREDIT REPORTS BILL

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

That the Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference with the Legislative Council on the Fair Credit Reports Bill to be held during the adjournment of the House and the managers to report the result thereof forthwith at the next sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

ROAD MAINTENANCE (CONTRIBUTION) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963-1968. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

EXPLANATION OF BILL

It effects metric conversion amendments to the Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1963-1968. The exemption from contribution charges on vehicles of under eight tons load capacity, the rate of charges and various references in the form provided under the Act are expressed in metric terms. The provision relating to penalties is also amended.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act which provides that the Act shall not apply to vehicles with a load capacity of less than eight tons. As the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is to operate in units of 50 kg, the nearest appropriate metric figure is 8.15 tonnes. If eight tonnes had been specified the Act

would apply to about 250 registered vehicles that are at present exempt. Clause 4 amends section 10, which deals with offences and penalties. In line with Government policy, minimum and progressive penalties have been abolished and the maximum penalty has been increased from £200 ($400) to $500. There has been no increase in penalty since 1963. A new subsection is added, providing that persons concerned in the management of a corporation may be liable to conviction for offences committed by the corporation.

Clause 5 substitutes for the present second schedule a schedule which provides for a rate of .17c a tonne-kilometre in place of a rate of one-third of a penny a ton-mile (that is, five-eighteenths of a cent). The figure of .17 cents a tonne-kilometre has been agreed upon by the Australian Transport Advisory Council. Clause 6 makes consequential amendments to the form provided in the third schedule. It is not appropriate to amend the reference to 25 miles in section 14 *(b)* of the principal Act, which enacted a transitional provision inserted in the Road and Railway Transport Act.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

CORONERS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2448.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): 1 support the Bill; indeed, I believe it is long overdue. The Attorney-General said in his second reading explanation that the Bill would change the Act relating to coroners in this State. The office of coroner is an unusual one. It is not just a magistrate's position: it is rather unique in as much as a coroner's court can be constituted with rather less regard to the law.

Mr. Coumbe: Any justice can be a coroner.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes. Under the present Act justices can in fact act as coroners, and the current Justices Hand Book sets out clearly the procedures for people acting as coroners. I understand that my colleague the member for Glenelg will be dealing with that matter later in the debate. I believe that for some years the coroner of this State (or the City Coroner, as he was for many years) has been gravely overworked and I think this is an appropriate time to pay a tribute to those people who have held the office in the past. Mr. George Ziesing discharged those duties at one time, but I believe that no-one has been more renowned than the former City Coroner (Mr. Cleland), who was City Coroner for, I think, about 20 years. When he retired in 1972 he left a gap that I and many other members of the community think has been ably filled by the present City Coroner (Mr. Ahern).

The position of coroner is onerous, because it is his duty to decide whether inquiries shall be held into causes of sudden death, cases of misadventure, and the origin of some fires. More than 1 500 violent, unnatural, sudden, or unexplained deaths occur in the metropolitan area each year, and the number is increasing. More sudden deaths and other cases that have come under the coroner's jurisdiction are occurring in the whole State.

Post mortems are necessary in some cases and police reports often are necessary. In about 200 to 250 of the total number of cases, a coronial inquiry is necessary. In other words, a coroner has the big responsibility of deciding whether a formal inquest should be held in a specific case. I consider that in the past the arrangements for country areas have not been satisfactory. Indeed, I think that the experience most members have of coronial inquiries would have been gleaned from thrillers and Agatha Christie books, set in Britain. The circumstances set out in those novels, however, do not bear a true relationship to the state of affairs in a coroner's court in South Australia.

I consider that country areas have suffered and that the establishment of the causes of death and the facilities available to local coroners to establish causes of death in country areas have not been adequate. I welcome this move to appoint the City Coroner to the position of State Coroner, and I welcome the extension of his jurisdiction to the whole State.

When the office was first established, I understand in 1887 (the Coroners Act was passed in 1884) the coroner had jurisdiction only over any municipality to which the Lodging-house Act applied. The municipalities were Adelaide, Port Adelaide, Port Pirie, Palmerston, Woodville, and Petersburg. The jurisdiction was extended from a radius of about 16 kilometres from the General Post Office to a radius of about 32 km from the General Post Office as Adelaide grew, and now the jurisdiction is to extend over the entire State.

I also welcome the appointment of a Deputy State Coroner. Obviously, it will be necessary to appoint regional coroners, who will liaise with the State Coroner and be responsible to the State Coroner's Department. By this method, we can integrate the activities of the State Coroner's jurisdiction throughout the State. I am certain that justice will be served much more efficiently, that there will be less imposition on people who until now have been acting as coroners, and that it will be possible to obtain a much clearer picture of the causes of sudden deaths, accidents, and any other matter into which a coroner can inquire.

In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General commended clause 12, which deals with the circumstances in which inquests can be or should be held. I agree that that is a particularly important part of the Bill. One of the most interesting features is that an inquiry may be held by a coroner into the disappearance from, or within, the State of any person. That provision is contained in clause 12 (*e*). In other words, the inquiry can be held in the absence of a body. I think that until recently it has been the case here and elsewhere that a body must be available and that an inquest can be held only on a body.

In future a coroner may hold an inquiry in circumstances that would lead a reasonable person to suppose that the missing person had met his death. There is still a need for inquests into fires, particularly where arson is involved or suspected, and in other circumstances. Generally, I welcome the Bill. 1 think it improves the legislation greatly and furthers the cause of justice in South Australia.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I, too, support the Bill, but I wish to comment on only one aspect of it. The appointment of a State Coroner and a Deputy State Coroner will update the present position, and I consider it only right that the present occupants of the positions of City Coroner and Deputy City Coroner should be given the opportunity to hold the new positions. The principal effect of the legislation is that it provides for the State Coroner to hold an inquest, or to direct another coroner to do so, if he considers it necessary or desirable that an inquest be held or if the Attorney-General directs him to do so. Without going into detail (because the recounting of past experiences may embarrass some people), I am sure that it has been shown that this is a desirable provision, and I am pleased that it has been included.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I take a slightly different view of the Bill from that taken by the member for

Bragg in supporting it. Perhaps that is because I have had some experience of inquests and the working of coroners. I must say that I think the whole scheme of the Bill is good. Always, both in practice and when I was Attorney-General, I have found it irksome to have what seemed to be an artificial restriction on the jurisdiction of the officer known as the City Coroner by which the jurisdiction extended only to a radius of about 16 km from the General Post Office.

Dr. Tonkin: Then it was changed to about 32 km.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, thank you. When a coronial inquiry was left to local justices of the peace in country areas, the local justice of the peace was frequently, if not invariably, advised by the local police officer, and once he had deemed an inquest unnecessary, there was little, if anything, that could be done about the matter, even though the conclusion may have been reached on the flimsiest of evidence or on no evidence at all. That was that: the person concerned had made a decision and nothing could be done about it.

However, in the metropolitan area we had a City Coroner who was in private practice as a legal practitioner. The member for Bragg has mentioned the late Mr. Cleland. There was also the late Mr. Arthur Blackburn, V.C., and others who acted in the capacity of City Coroner. I cannot think of the names of all the persons concerned, but, doing the work on a part-time basis, they had the big advantages of having had legal training and having the help of some staff in the Attorney-General's Department. Therefore, they could make an informed and considered decision whether to hold an inquest. Now we have a State Coroner whose jurisdiction is to extend throughout the State; as I say, that is a good thing.

I will now deal with a matter in relation to which I will take action at the appropriate stage. Some years ago we took away from the coroner the right to commit for trial for an offence. Since I have been a practitioner of the Supreme Court of the State it has been possible, for a coroner to commit for trial for murder if he found this justified, and to commit for lesser offences. I have referred to the case of murder, because normally the coroner deals with death, but it could be a case of manslaughter. In the past, the committal by the coroner took the place of proceedings in the court of summary jurisdiction, or the Police Court, as it was then known. This committal was at least as effective for that purpose as committal proceedings in another court.

Dr. Tonkin: Why was it changed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I never understood why the change was made, but it was made about 20 years ago, certainly not by this Government or a predecessor of the same political complexion. A change was made in the days of the Playford Government, and I always thought it was a mistake. The present situation is that an inquest is frequently not held until after it has. been decided whether to take committal proceedings in a court of summary jurisdiction, so it becomes, as it were, just a formality. We have a City Coroner (Mr. Ahern) who will undoubtedly continue under this legislation. He is a legal practitioner who is paid four-fifths of the salary of a local court judge, so he is at least as competent (I hope the Attorney agrees with this) as a magistrate or a justice of the peace to make up his mind on committal proceedings, deciding whether or not to commit for trial. At present, justices and magistrates decide this.

I believe we should restore the power to the coroner to commit for trial, a power he had until it was taken away about 20 years ago. We can do this simply. We will have to oppose clause 5, which has been drawn anyway, having regard to the convenience of the Parliamentary Counsel. It will be one of these drafting tricks. These matters can be a headache to the profession forever afterwards, because lawyers are left seeking in every nook and cranny of legislation, instead of Parliamentary Counsel doing it in the first place. We will have to strike out clause 5, because it was at common law that the coroner previously had power to commit. In part, this clause provides:

> . . . and any rules of practice or procedure with respect to an inquest arising at common law or by Statute of the Imperial Parliament are hereby excluded.

In addition, we must simply strike out subclause (2) of clause 26, that subclause providing:

> A coroner holding an inquest shall not in the inquest make any finding, or suggestion, of criminal or civil liability.

Those amendments will effectively restore the power of a coroner to commit. I hope the Attorney will consider the arguments I have advanced in favour of restoring this power. That is the only point I make in relation to the Bill. I have always felt (and if I had had the opportunity while Attorney-General I would have taken action to remedy this) that it was a mistake to take away this power from the coroner. That applies now even more when we have a professional man as full-time coroner for the whole of the State.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): In supporting the Bill, which has much merit, I commend the Government for introducing it. I will refer to a few matters in Committee. The office of coroner is ancient, previously having been known as "coronator". In fact, such an office is referred to in the charter of King Athelstan in 905 A.D. I believe the coroner holds a high office in the land, having an important job to do. As the member for Bragg said, it is interesting that, under section 7 of the Coroners Act, every justice of the peace shall be a coroner. This provision relates to any situation 16 km from the General Post Office. A J.P. may be called on to hold an inquest into a death or a fire. In the event of difficult questions arising at country inquests, the City Coroner or a special magistrate usually attends.

In the case of road accidents, the coroner's job is to discover the truth. What caused the accident? Did the accident cause the death or did the death cause the accident? Only by a post-mortem can such facts be established. At page 110, the *Handbook for Justices,* discussing the duties of a coroner, states:

> It is impossible to enumerate the cases in which a post-mortem should be ordered, but, as a general guide, it is desirable to order one:
>
> *(a)* when the coroner is not convinced that death was due to natural causes:
>
> *(b)* in all cases in which it is suspected that death was caused unlawfully or by the fault of another, and in most cases in which it is suspected that it was wrongfully caused:
>
> (*c*) when a dead body is found, e.g. apparently drowned, or run over by a train—(because the body may have been thrown into the water or placed on the railway line to conceal a crime):
>
> (*d*) in cases of apparent suicide unless the circumstances are such as to leave no doubt of suicide—(because the appearance of suicide may conceal murder):
>
> (*e*) when death occurs in a factory or in the course of employment, even though the deceased's condition could have accounted for death naturally:
>
> (*f*) when death occurs under an anaesthetic:
>
> (*g*) in most cases in which it appears that an inquest will be necessary.

The other aspect of a coroner's duties is inquiring into and reporting on fires. At page 112, the *Handbook for Justices* states:

A fire having been reported, the coroner's ultimate duty is to decide what caused the fire. As in the case of an inquest into a death, the coroner must have jurisdiction to act. This is conferred by section 10 (2) of the Coroners Act, 1935-1952, which provides:

(2) Every coroner shall have jurisdiction to inquire into the cause and origin of any fire whereby the life of man or beast has been lost or endangered, or whereby any land or chattels or any other valuable effects have been endangered, destroyed, or damaged—

(a) if he is of opinion that the inquiry should be held; or

(b) if the Attorney-General directs him to hold an inquest;

Therefore, the *Handbook for Justices* sets out what is expected of a justice when acting as coroner. 1 should like to congratulate the City Coroner on the work done by him, as it is appreciated by members of the community. Relating to the Deputy State Coroner, clause 8 (2) (*b*) provides that he "shall be paid a salary determined by the Governor". When he replies, I hope the Attorney will say what will be the basis of this salary. Will the salary of the Deputy State Coroner be related to that of the State Coroner? Clause 10 provides:

(i) Where the State Coroner is for any reason unable to discharge the duties of his office, the Attorney-General may. direct a Deputy State Coroner to act in the office of State Coroner during the period of the inability.

Why has the Attorney-General deemed it necessary to provide that the Deputy State Coroner may (and not shall) be directed by him to discharge the duties of the office of State Coroner? I support the Bill, which changes the title of City Coroner to State Coroner and which, among other things, appoints a Deputy State Coroner.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): It is not intended to appoint a Deputy State Coroner with full-time duties. At present there is a Deputy City Coroner, and there will be a Deputy State Coroner; however, he will perform duties only as required and that, generally speaking, will be caused by the absence on leave or illness of the State Coroner. Consequently, the remuneration to be fixed for the Deputy State Coroner will be related to the time occupied by him on his duties. I do not know what the precise figure is now, but it is related to the amount the Government pays a part-time magistrate on a daily basis for his services as a magistrate.

As to the point on clause 10, it is not of great importance but it is possible that the State Coroner may be unable to discharge his duties, although it may be for such a short time that it is unnecessary to appoint the Deputy State Coroner to perform the duties of State Coroner. The power is there, so I think that is all that is necessary. The point raised by the member .for Mitcham as to whether the coroner should have power to commit for trial has been widely discussed. My recollection of the debates that went on 20 years ago is that the reason for discontinuing this authority in the coroner was that it was considered more convenient that, where a criminal charge had been laid, the matter should take its normal course in the courts of preliminary hearing before a magistrate, justices (or a justice) of the peace, followed in most cases by a committal for trial.

Generally speaking, the facts were fully ventilated during the course of a preliminary hearing, and the ground covered in an inquest became purely formal. I believe that system has worked satisfactorily. The system that preceded it was one in which, in almost all cases, where serious charges were laid as a result of death an inquest ran its normal course and the committal for trial was from the coroner. To restore that system would involve a substantial shift of work from the magistrates' courts to the coroner and may well involve increasing the number of coroners, because a substantial amount of time is spent in magistrates' courts in conducting preliminary hearings on charges of homicide or other charges arising out of death. I would hesitate long before doing that.

I believe that the coronial system in South Australia is now organised on a different basis, and we are not really equipped nowadays with sufficient courtrooms, staff or coroners to undertake preliminary hearings in cases in which charges arise out of death. Therefore, I would not favour restoring the old system, believing that the present system works well. If a charge is laid, the matter goes before a magistrate in the ordinary way, and the inquest is usually reduced to being a formality; however, the facts all come out, and there is no problem about that. 1 realise that there are advantages in some cases in the coroner's having power to commit for trial.

A situation can arise where the inquest virtually proceeds to a conclusion without any charge having been laid. The facts ultimately leading to the laying of a charge may emerge only during the course of the inquest. In such a case, if the coroner considers at the end of the inquest that there is a prima facie case against someone and that person has had the opportunity during the inquest of knowing he is under suspicion and cross-examining witnesses with that in mind, there may well be advantages in the coroner's having the power to commit for trial, thereby rendering a subsequent preliminary hearing unnecessary. However, the problem with which we were confronted when we looked at the matter in relation to preparing the Bill was how best to define the circumstances in which this should take place. It could not be done as proposed by the member for Mitcham, 1 believe, because clause 5 is designed to exclude all the practices and procedures that would arise at common law or under Statute of the Imperial Parliament.

Far from this being one of the principles that he suggests concern the legal profession, because it has to search for these rules, it is the reverse. This measure will save much of that problem, because it is saying, in effect, "This Bill is really a code; forget about the rules of common law and any ancient Statute of the Imperial Parliament, and look at the Act to see what are the powers of the coroner and what are the procedures," and so on. I should be loath, indeed, to take that out and throw it back again not only on this Act but on to the old rules. Therefore, I do not believe that is a satisfactory solution to the problem. If subclause (2) were deleted from clause 26, one would still be left with the provision contained in subclause (1), namely:

A coroner shall not proceed with an inquest where a person has been charged in criminal proceedings with causing the event that is, or is to be, the subject of an inquest, unless the Attorney-General directs him to do so.

One would be left in a situation in which the coroner would have to desist from proceeding with the inquest where criminal proceedings had arisen, unless the Attorney-General directed him to continue. If that is to be done at all, some method has to be devised of defining the circumstances in which the coroner may proceed and may commit for trial. Perhaps that is not beyond the ingenuity of the draftsman, but a solution was not devised and was not able to be devised at the time the Bill was prepared. I am therefore unable to accept the proposals that have been made and the way in which they have been made. However, I indicate my general view on them, namely, that if it is confined to a situation in which no criminal charge has been laid I think there is merit in the coroner's having the power to commit for trial,

thus rendering unnecessary a subsequent preliminary hearing. More thought will have to be given to that aspect and, because of the remarks made during the debate, I will further consider the matter and consult with those who have advised me in relation to the preparation of this Bill. If it is possible to devise a solution before the Bill is disposed of in another place, I shall do something about having amendments inserted there. At this stage, however, I believe the proposals that have been made are unsatisfactory.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Certain rules excluded."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Unless this clause is modified it will not allow a coroner to commit, because the power to commit is a common law power. I accept what the Attorney said, and hope that the Bill will be amended in another place in order to restore power to the coroner to commit for trial. I do not oppose the clause.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Attorney had representations made to him by practitioners, coroners, or the Law Society on this matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): No. We considered whether we should retain the present system, revert to the old system, or take a mid-way course. 1 discussed the matter with my officers and the City Coroner and decided to do nothing, but, as the matter has been raised again, it will be considered.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 25 passed.

Clause 26—"Inquests and other legal proceedings."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to proceed with my amendment, but I remind the Attorney that, when this power previously existed, Mr. T. E. Cleland (the then City Coroner) and his Deputy, Mr. Paul Teesdale-Smith, had no difficulty in coping with the work load in the metropolitan area at the Coroner's Court sittings on each Friday. Admittedly, the population has increased, but I do not think the administrative burden will be so heavy as to render the return of the power impractical.

Clause passed.

Clauses 27 and 28 passed.

Clause 29—"Order for removal of body for interstate inquest."

Dr. TONKIN: Will there be some reciprocity with coroners in other States in this regard?

The Hon. L. J. KING: That is what is intended, and I think that all other States have similar powers in their legislation.

Clause passed.

Clauses 30 to 34 passed.

Clause 35—"Rules."

Dr. TONKIN: Will the State Coroner make his own rules for the conduct of his courts?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2448.)

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): This Bill provides for the repeal of section 270 of the Crown Lands Act, as amended, and the repeal is consequential upon the enactment of section 79 of the Real Property Act. Section 270 of the Crown Lands Act empowers the Registrar-General, at the request of the Minister, to provide replacements for lost or destroyed copies of leases and/or agreements affecting the Lands Department. The Real Property Act provides clearly for this purpose, and it is in the interests of clarity and to save duplication that section 270 of the Crown Lands Act should be repealed and that section 79 of the Real Property Act should be observed. I support this Bill, but it seems to me rather a waste of time when I am sure the Attorney-General has been aware of the need for further amendments to the Act. This would have been an ideal opportunity to incorporate with this amendment an amendment to clarify the situation regarding Crown lands generally.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are dealing with a specific Bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, Sir, but as part and parcel of the exercise it would have been in our interests—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no part and parcel of an exercise in the Bill.

Mr. CHAPMAN: —to clarify the position in relation to the Crown Lands Act as it applies—

The SPEAKER: Order! We are dealing with a Bill that repeals a section of the Act, and it does not open up the whole of the Act for discussion by members.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am disappointed that I am unable to pursue the matter at least to put my views before the House regarding those sections of the Act that could have been dealt with by the Attorney-General on this occasion. However, I accept your ruling on the matter, and undoubtedly *I* will have an opportunity to raise the matter at another time that will be acceptable to the Chair. On that basis, I have no further remarks to make on this Bill. On behalf of the Opposition, I am pleased to support the Attorney-General in his limited but essential move concerning this measure.

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

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2449.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I support this Bill. I am pleased to see that the Lands Titles Office is now adopting some of the procedures that have been so effective in the Lands Department for a number of years. I have been impressed by the way the Lands Department has been able to streamline the procedures involved in obtaining the Minister's consent. After the Minister's consent has been received, the problem has been the time taken to obtain a new lease or title or to have a title registered with the Registrar-General, and in many cases it has taken up to three months to have a new title or lease issued by that department. It has always been explained that the delay has been caused by the details required in the processing of a document, in some cases many officers being obliged to initial a document as having been sighted while it is being processed.

One of the greatest problems has been the necessity for the Registrar-General's personal signature to be on all documents involving transfers of titles or leases. Many of these apparent bottlenecks will now be overcome. The Registrar-General can now delegate machinery functions to lesser persons, and deputies will not need to be appointed. This work can be done by officers below the position of either the Registrar-General or the Deputy Registrar-General. The seal, which will be sufficient authentication without the signature of the Registrar-General, will be impressed and documents will not have to be placed in the Registrar-General's in-file before they can be processed further.

The Registrar-General will be able to make corrections without the need for the documents to be returned to the person responsible for that part of the processing that is involved. As has been mentioned by the member for Alexandra, provision is made for a substitute certificate to be issued by the Registrar-General if he is satisfied that a title has been lost, and we no longer have to go through the procedure of obtaining a provisional certificate, involving the necessity of establishing whether it is an authenticated document. Those of us concerned with land transactions have been concerned about the attitude of banks and lending authorities towards title and lease security. Evidently, they wanted not merely a letter giving the Minister's consent, or a substitute title, or what we call a provisional title: they wanted the actual deed before they would accept it as security for a loan.

I believe that, by shortening the process as we ought to be able to do by these amendments, we will be able to reduce much hardship and frequent embarrassment that have been caused to people who have purchased property and want to settle for it but are unable to borrow money for the purchase because they have been unable to obtain a title. I support the amendments and believe that, when they have been put into effect, it will be apparent to those concerned that additional amendments can be made to streamline the transfer system further. I hope that this matter will be considered so that procedures in the Registrar-General's Department and the Lands Titles Office will be as effective as are the procedures in the Lands Department in connection with obtaining the Minister's consent regarding leases and other matters that require his approval. If this is done, it will be of real benefit to those who are concerned with the purchase of property or with real estate in general.

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

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2449.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support this short Bill, which merely provides that societies registered under the Friendly Societies Act will have power to establish child-minding centres. I have examined the list of societies registered under the principal Act and I consider that they are all good and responsible organisations. We on this side have no objection to the measure. The only operative clause is clause 2, which amends section 7 of the principal Act by inserting a new paragraph viiia, which deals with the establishment and maintenance of child-care centres.

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully): I, too, support the Bill. As the previous speaker has said, the Act limits the objects of friendly societies, and the extension of the powers of societies in the Bill will allow such a non-profit-making organisation to establish child-care centres. I understand that the society concerned has assets and that it has indicated a desire to put them to use in this way. As additional child-care centres are necessary and as the need will continue to grow, this action should be encouraged. The society has a good reputation and can be relied on to provide dependable and safe centres. This is of paramount importance to the mothers who need to leave their children in such centres.

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

AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2450.)

Mr. RUSSACK (Gouger): I support this short Bill, which remedies an apparent deficiency regarding the powers of a person who is appointed manager of the estate of a protected person. A protected person, under the Act, means a person who, or whose estate or part thereof, becomes the subject of a protection order, and a manager is a person appointed to be manager of an estate under the Act.

I understand that the Full Court, in a recent decision, found that the powers conferred by the Act on a manager did not entitle him to stand in law completely in the place of a protected person. I understand that, if the aged or infirm person, before becoming a protected person, negotiated certain contracts and was, by undue influence, persuaded to accept certain negotiations, the manager, when appointed, could not completely stand in in the place of the protected person.

Therefore, much damage was being done. The Bill corrects the deficiency, and the manager will be able to act entirely in the place of the protected person when a court order requires him to do so. Members on this side support the measure and consider it necessary to rectify the deficiency so that the manager will have full power to manage the business of a protected person and organise that person's affairs.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from February 18. Page 2436.)

Clauses 3 to 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Salary of Auditor-General."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

In new section 6 (1), after "salary", to insert "and allowances"; and in new section 6 (3), after "salary", to insert "and allowances".

We have discovered, much to our dismay, that the Auditor-General is the only recipient of these statutory salaries who has not been provided in the Bill with adjustment allowances. As all other provisions relate to salaries and allowances, it is necessary to correct this provision.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 15) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2448.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. I understand the concern of the Police Force in having a backlog of warrants that, in most cases, have not been able to be executed. I accept the random survey undertaken by the Attorney-General's officers that has shown that 80 per cent of the warrants relate only to fines that have been imposed, the rest relating to warrants of arrest, usually for relatively minor offences. I also accept the Attorney's assurance that the practice will not be to throw away warrants for more serious offences, where possibly a warrant can be executed in the future. Most members of the community would accept that, where a warrant has been lying idly for about 15 years, it is a hopeless case, with the system being cluttered up by many thousands of such warrants.

It is fair to comment on the difference between Victoria and South Australia regarding the executing of warrants. It is to South Australia's credit that, when a court hears a charge against a person who is not in court, he is notified, even if he lives in another State, of the fine or other verdict of the court. This applies in cases where people have entered a plea by way of letter. However, this was not the position, until recently, in Victoria. Some operators of heavy transport vehicles who were fined for traffic offences were not informed of the fines, and subsequently a police officer would knock on the door with a warrant for their arrest. I raised this matter with the Victorian Minister, who has promised to have the problem solved, so that people from this State who are fined in Victorian courts and who do not appear in court will be informed by letter.

The Hon. L. J. King: They're just a few years behind the times.

Mr. EVANS: In this respect that is true. However, that State has now set out to rectify the error. In this State, we are perhaps a little behind the times in relation to executing warrants and serving unsatisfied judgment summonses. The Police Force is overburdened with this work, even though many officers undertake it outside normal hours of duty, receiving a payment for this extra work. Many police officers would prefer not to perform the task, because it puts them into a higher income tax bracket. After all, they do not receive much benefit for the inconvenience it causes them when delivering warrants or summonses.

I suggest that the Government should consider creating another office to handle the delivery of warrants and summonses to take the load off the Police Force, members of which believe they are obliged to deliver documents of this nature after normal working hours. Although police officers are paid for this task, they do not believe the remuneration is worth the bother. This matter has been raised with me previously by two officers. I do not know whether it is the practice all over the State, but these two men said that they thought it was an unnecessary duty and that it was not very rewarding for them. The other minor change to the Act that will be brought about by this Bill I accept. I fully support the measure.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SIGNS)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 4. Page 2648.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I have no objection to this measure: it merely provides for a fine under the relevant section of the Act. The fine was omitted in the original drafting of the legislation, which was a most recent addition to the Statutes in relation to "stop" signs. It is a pity that Parliament, having drafted the measure and passed it through both Houses, did not observe that the penalty had not been included. The maximum fine is to be $100. I am disappointed that not even one member in either this House or in another place observed that the Bill did not include a penalty. I have no objection to the measure, which I support. However, I regret that such an omission occurred.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I find myself having to support, albeit reluctantly, the comments of the member for Fisher. It is. unfortunate that legislation is rushed through the House from time to time and is buried among other legislation so that Parliament overlooks including a penalty in relation to an offence. The offence to which this penalty relates is failing to yield right-of-way at an intersection or junction. That offence, which came into operation as recently as March 1, has already caused confusion. One wonders why, in respect of an offence of failing to yield right of way to vehicles on one's left or right that will carry a maximum penalty of $100, the points demerit scheme is not referred to. Because some people are confused by the new law I wonder whether a warning period should not be allowed. Some people have claimed already that they are not clear about this law.

In my district on Monday I saw a classic example of the confusion about which 1 speak. A young driver had pulled up at a "stop" sign and was obviously waiting for a break in the traffic before proceeding. He put his foot down and away he went but, unfortunately, he cut off a traffic policeman on a motor cycle and the policeman had to brake hard to avoid an accident. As far as road safety is concerned, the observance of the Road Traffic Act really comes down to courtesy. While it was unfortunate that a penalty was not included when the new law was considered, I am reluctant to accept any retrospectivity regarding the penalty. We on this side have been reluctant to agree to retrospectivity in the past. I believe this measure should commence from the date of proclamation, which would provide sufficient time for warning.

I believe that anyone who has been booked or who will be convicted of the offence of failing to give right of way should be given a chance. However, at the same time, anyone who breaks the law or forces his right of way should not be excused. It has always been my attitude that legislation should not be retrospective, so I believe clause 2 of the Bill should be amended so that the penalty is not retrospective but imposed from the date of proclamation.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): While agreeing with the remarks of the member for Hanson, I should like to take this opportunity to ventilate another problem in relation to this offence, the penalty for which is established by this Bill. That matter relates to the marking of "stop" signs and "give way" signs. Obviously, offences can be committed by people failing to give way because they do not realise that "stop" signs and "give way" signs govern one part of an intersection. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Transport to institute inquiries to make sure that "stop" signs and "give way" signs are easily visible from all parts of an intersection. With the present change in the legislation, a person driving along what seems to be a major road and seeing a car crossing an intersection, but not being able to see whether a "stop" sign faces that part of the intersection, is not to know that he may contravene the law. As this situation applies at many intersections, serious consideration should be given to marking the intersection, or to marking the reverse side of the "stop" sign, in a way that indicates to people coming into the intersection that a "stop" sign is in a position on one or other parts of the intersection.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

Mr. BECKER: I move:

To strike out "be deemed to have" and "the first day of March, 1975" and insert "a day to be proclaimed".

This amendment is consistent with the Opposition's attitude toward retrospectivity of legislation. There has been some confusion on interpretation, and an education programme is needed for the benefit of the public. Also, a few days of grace will not be amiss.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): It seems that the honourable member has not read the legislation. The new rule in respect of the "stop" sign applies from March 1, whether the member for Hanson or anyone else likes it or not. It is not a question of retrospectivity, because the legislation has applied since last Saturday. All that this Bill does is rectify the omission of not providing a penalty in the amending Bill. This amendment should not be accepted, because it will do nothing more than create utter chaos.

Dr. TONKIN: The Minister has failed in his duty by not having had this legislation ready and passed in time for the change in the rules relating to "stop" signs. A penalty should have been provided, and the Minister cannot blame the Opposition for this mistake. When there is a change in a long-established law, there should be a transitional period during which members of the Police Force can instruct and warn offenders. It is an unsatisfactory situation to expect drivers, especially those who have developed a pattern of driving, to remember exactly what has to be done, and they need reminding. I still believe that much help needs to be given to get people to obey this law. I commend the Government for the admirable education campaign directed to that end, but I believe the legislation should not be put into effect with a retrospective penalty that has been enacted four days after the change in law came about.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not think the Liberal Party can be serious about this amendment. It does not -have my support. While the omission of the penalty from the earlier Bill was an unfortunate mistake that has been acknowledged, it does not, I think, excuse the moving of such an amendment as this. If this amendment were passed it would be futile because the Government could proclaim it to come into effect tomorrow, so what is the point of it? If we prescribe an offence, it is only sensible that a penalty should be laid down and, as there is no general penalty in the Road Traffic Act, we must prescribe a penalty or there will be none except something at common law, and that would be a ludicrous situation.

The Liberal Party part of the Opposition is simply taking this action to make a point that confusion and upset has been caused by this change in the law. Liberal Party members are not alone there: I think it is difficult and I agree in part with what the member for Bragg said. I find it pretty hard to remember what to do when driving my car, but I do not hold myself out to be a good driver. My experience may not be up to normal standard and. I may be below that standard in driving.

I have also received complaints from people and I have received one message that will illustrate the problem. I am sure the Minister will listen to this. A man telephoned my office and said that he had a business on Goodwood Road and that he was concerned about the traffic' crossing the intersection of Grange Road and Goodwood Road where there is a "stop" sign.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member is getting wide of the amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. The intersection is not very wide, but the man asked that lights be put in at that spot. He went on to say that, since I voted for this rule, I should put it right. That was the last part of his message. He thought the problem was partly my responsibility as, indeed, it is and as it is the responsibility of those who voted for this in Parliament, so we ought to do something about it. He wants lights installed at the corner but, with great deference, this matter is wide of the amendment. I hope the Minister will take some action on it. I could not possibly support an amendment such as this. We have either to pass the Bill as it stands or to chuck it out, and I think we ought to pass it.

Mr. EVANS: I said earlier that I supported the Bill, but I do not support this amendment, which is not moved by the Liberal Party in total. I believe that, if this Parliament amended an Act to make it unlawful to do certain things, each and every member who supported the provision would believe that a penalty should be imposed when that Act became operative. I believe that such action is justifiable and necessary and I believe the amendment the member for Hanson has moved would only cause more confusion. As the members for Bragg and Mitcham have said, there is confusion already, so why increase it? I am against the amendment: it is unnecessary and should not be supported.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2450.)

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): Although I support this Bill, I have certain reservations. The Bill increases the limitation of the shareholding of a member of a society from the present statutory limit of $10 000 to an amount to be fixed by the society concerned. The management of a society could have a problem if at any annual general meeting it was moved from the floor that the maximum shareholding of a member be increased so as to increase substantially the figure from the sum that prevailed at that time. In the event of the retirement of a member from active participation in a co-operative, the co-operative has to pay out the share capital held by that member at the time. The need to do this could result in a considerable financial burden for that co-operative if the share capital held by that person was extremely large. While this may not occur, I can see that it could be a problem to the management of boards of co-operatives if the maximum share capital that could be held by individual members was increased substantially.

The Bill before the House also deals with voting rights. In 1974, a special Bill was passed to enable Kyabram Preserving Company Limited to take over Jon Preserving Company Limited, and that takeover eventually took place. The passing of that Bill created problems in equity and clause 5 of this Bill clarifies the situation by amending section 12 of the principal Act. A member of a society registered before the 1966 amendment had been enacted could have voting power commensurate with his shareholding in the company. Since then, the accepted practice has been for each shareholder to have only one vote. The legislation introduced last year did not clarify the position regarding voting rights and I trust that this measure will set out the position clearly so that further confusion will be avoided.

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

COLEBROOK HOME

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. L. J. King:

That this House resolve that pursuant to section 16 (1) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act, 1966-1973, a recommendation be made to the Governor that those pieces of land being sections 553 and 565, hundred of Adelaide, be vested in the Aboriginal Lands Trust; and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2446.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the motion, but some aspects that have led to this move being made now have disappointed me, and it would be wrong of me not to have recorded in *Hansard* reference to an action taken last year. The property known as Colebrook Home, comprising about 2.6 hectares, has served for about 30 years as a home for some of our indigenous people. It has given many young people the opportunity to attend the local primary schools and, particularly, the high schools. Many good and respectable students have been housed there and Colebrook Home has served as their home.

Last year I raised with the Community Welfare Department the matter of the future of the building. Some vandals and louts had started to partly demolish the building by breaking windows and stealing the lead that had been used as flashing around the chimneys and other parts of the roof structure. A report in the *News* of August 17, 1973, states that an independent group wished to operate a school . on the site. I do not support or promote the cause for that type of school as an alternative school, although I believe that there could be a need for that type of school in certain sections of the community. It is worth while to comment on the type of property. The newspaper report states that a spokesman said:

> The home would be renovated by artist John Dallwitz, who is now living in an old biscuit factory which he renovated at Coromandel Valley.

Mr. Dallwitz has renovated that building in such a way that it is of historic value and is aesthetically beautiful. The work that Mr. Dallwitz did is a credit to him. That this man was willing to renovate the building so as to provide a school proved that the building was still useful. The press report also states that Colebrook would be a perfect site for the alternative community school. I am making the point that the building was useful.

Further, a group from the Sturt College of Advanced Education asked me whether it could renovate and upgrade the building so that it could be used by students of that college who otherwise would have to travel long distances to the school. The property is about 2 km from the college, and that group also saw a use for the building: it was not a building that was in ruins.

I accept that the National Trust did not consider that the building had any national importance or any characteristic that suggested that it should be preserved for National Trust purposes. That was the opinion of some of the members of the National Trust branch. At a time when South Australia was so sadly short of suitable accommodation at a reasonable rent for many young people in the community, it was a crime to demolish that building. I realise that it needed painting and renovating, but that work could have been done, as the cost a square metre would have been no greater than is the cost of renovating many buildings that the Housing Trust is buying in the metropolitan area to use as low-cost rental accommodation. The Colebrook building covered 465 square metres, being of solid construction of mostly brick and stone. Although this building could have been useful, the Minister told me he supported its demolition before the site was given to the Aboriginal Lands Trust—even though both the Commonwealth Government and the State Government supported the acquisition of residential accommodation for Aborigines.

Regardless of their colour, people could have been accommodated in this building if it had been upgraded, yet it was demolished. Despite the shortage of building materials and skilled labour, this building was demolished and the rubble was carted to the rubbish dump. People who live near this site will not be disappointed that the building has been demolished, because they had the unfortunate experience of being inconvenienced by the building's being used as a haunt by some of the more irresponsible teenagers in our community.

This site of 6.5 hectares represents a possible fire hazard (as it did when the building still existed). The site is alongside the council rubbish dump and near a recreation area. Not far away are some nice houses whose occupants would like to be protected from fires. In previous years, I have had to write to the department about the need to minimise the fire risk created by this site. Last year, burning was done. This year, someone down the line asked the local Emergency Fire Service to attempt to burn it. Unfortunately, as the service would admit, it was not a good burning.

I believe that this land should be given to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, but we should put on record the fact that the trust has a responsibility to people near this site to keep the site clear of weeds and vermin, especially snakes. That responsibility must be accepted by the trust. As we have provided the land for the use of the trust, the trust must look after it in the normal circumstances applying in the community. I make this plea on behalf of people in the area. Undoubtedly, the trust will use the property as it thinks best for Aborigines. I hope that, in doing so, it will seek the full co-operation of the local council. The Mitcham council does excellent work in looking after community interests and making sure that everyone receives a fair go. It is important that the trust communicate with the council so that the trust will not take action that will result in a conflict with the community. The worst way to start operations on this site would be to have a conflict of interest with the local people or the council. 1 believe this site will be an excellent location in which recreation facilities can be provided for Aborigines who live in the inner city area or who live farther out and wish to move gradually towards the city.

I hope members will support this motion. I believe the decision to demolish the building on this site should have been left to the trust. The Minister told me originally that he wanted the trust to be able to do what it liked with the property. Therefore, I believe he should have left it to the trust to decide whether or not to demolish the building. He should have told the trust that he believed use could be made of the building but that he left it to the trust to decide whether or not to keep it. We cannot afford to waste resources, yet they were squandered at Colebrook last year. Let us see that a similar occurrence does not happen again, as people of all shades of colour in this State are short of accommodation.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Minister of Community Welfare): The member for Fisher has suggested that the decision to demolish the building that was Colebrook Home was a mistaken decision. In fact, that decision was taken on the best advice available; I believe it was the only decision that could have been made. The condition of the Colebrook Home and the cost of restoring it to habitable condition were problems not only for me but also for my predecessors, as the files show. When I was Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, I established a joint steering committee to examine the future of this home. This broadly based committee consisted of representatives of the then Aboriginal Affairs Board (a statutory board existing under the Act); the State Aboriginal Affairs Department, which was my own department at the time; the Education Department; and the Commonwealth Labour and National Service Department.

The Aboriginal community was strongly represented on the steering committee, which had access to the best technical and expert advice available.

It reported to me on May 21, 1971, that, because of their age and state of repair, the buildings were unsuitable for use for welfare or educational purposes and that the cost of alterations and renovations would be uneconomical. The recommendation was that the building should be demolished and the site made available to the Aboriginal community. That is the advice I followed; I believe it was a correct decision. The building could not have been left for long unless it was renovated and put to use.

It was uneconomic to renovate the building, and it would have been useless to leave it subsequently for the Aboriginal Lands Trust to decide what to do with it, because the building would have remained unrenovated and unoccupied, attracting vandals and having undesirable consequences for the neighbours until it was transferred to the trust. The trust would have been saddled with the financial responsibility for the building and would not have had the means to discharge that financial responsibility. No-one enjoys knocking down a building that can be put to any possible use. I assure the honourable member that I did not make the decision with any juvenile joy that I get out of knocking structures over. It was a carefully considered decision made on the recommendation of the steering committee, which had access to the best information available and which was quite clear about the course to be followed.

Motion carried.

LISTENING DEVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 18. Page 2436.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): The Liberal Opposition supports the Bill. Having examined the measure at some length, we can find nothing wrong with it whatever. It appears that the amendments are proper. If a person is so disposed to break the law in relation to listening devices, he should not be given a second chance to commit a similar offence. Therefore, it is only proper that he forfeit any equipment or device he has in his possession with which he could commit that offence. I believe it is only proper that the Minister responsible for this Bill should have the right to dispose of any information that a person might have collected when committing an offence. I believe Parliament should dispose of this matter as soon as possible, because people who commit offences of this nature are of low character and should be dealt with most severely. The existing law provides heavy penalties for people who contravene the Act. On behalf of my colleagues, I have pleasure in supporting the measure.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Repeal of section 7 of principal Act."

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I oppose the clause, which was inserted by the Legislative Council. This clause purports to repeal section 7 of the principal Act, that section providing:

(1) Section 4 of this Act does not apply to or in relation to the use of a listening device by a person (including a member of the Police Force) where that listening device is used—

(*a*) to overhear, record, monitor or listen to any private conversation to which that person is a party;

and

(*b*) in the course of duty of that person, in the public interest or for the protection of the lawful interests of that person.

(2) A person referred to in subsection (1) of this section shall not otherwise than in the course of his duty, in the public interest or for the protection of his lawful interests, communicate or publish any information or material derived from the use of a listening device under that subsection.

It would be mischievous of us to allow this clause to remain in the Bill. This matter was considered carefully when we debated the Bill that became the principal Act. It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that it would be dangerous to prohibit the use of listening devices where the person using such a device is a party to a conversation that is in the public interest or involves protecting the lawful interests of that person.

It is impossible to exclude the possibility that there may be occasions in the public interest when the use of a listening device is absolutely necessary to record a conversation without the knowledge of the other party. It is possible that a person may need to use, and should be able to use, such a device in protecting his legitimate interests. An obvious case would be where a person, during the course of or immediately before a conversation, suspected that in that conversation he could be offered a bribe. He may be a public official who has some reason to believe that a conversation and the way matters are developing are getting around to that situation. It is obvious that, in the public interest, he should be able to record that conversation without the knowledge of the other party.

I think it would be dangerous to make that action a criminal offence. Similarly, a person may need to record a conversation to protect his legitimate interests. There are obvious examples of the use of such equipment. A person who suspects he is about to be blackmailed should be able to use a device of this nature. Perhaps the only way he can satisfactorily protect himself is to make a surreptitious recording of the conversation. Examples can be multiplied. As a general practice, I am strongly of the opinion that the law should stamp out the use of listening devices used without the knowledge of the person whose voice is being recorded. However, we have to make exceptions in order to protect the legitimate occasions on which listening devices may be used.

I believe the other place overlooked the serious consequences that would follow if a person were rendered liable to criminal prosecution for using a listening device in legitimate circumstances to protect his own interests or the public interest. It would be absurd, if a person was privy to a conversation that indicated espionage by a hostile power, that he could not, by reason of the criminal law, make a recording of the relevant conversation. There are paramount public interests that must override that sort of provision. In addition, I believe a person is entitled to protect his legitimate private interests by the use of a recording device. That position was protected in the original Bill: it was a decision made consciously. In fact, it was discussed in this place during the passage of the original Bill. Nothing that has happened since has led me to reconsider the situation. I cannot really understand why the other place has seen fit to include this provision in the Bill.

Clause negatived.

Clause 3 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I welcome the provisions of new Standing Orders, and I am pleased to be able at this stage to speak about matters that concern my district. One matter grieves me to some degree, and I voice my grave concern about an article in the press reporting the definite deferment of the intended extensions to the Whyalla Technical College, which could easily be described as a trade school. I refer to a paragraph of a letter that I received from the council of this school that states:

> We were very pleased indeed when the Public Works Standing Committee gave approval for this project. We are well aware that since then staff of the Further Education Department have worked strenuously on the project to have it ready for tender. The project was sent out to tender last year, and tenders were due to close on September 27.

I believe it is true to say that the city of Whyalla has been fortunate in having education facilities provided for it, particularly by the present Government. Unlike the Opposition when it was in power, the present Government has provided the city of Whyalla with a new high school. I must apologise to my colleague the member for Stuart, because that high school is situated in his district, but I am sure he will not mind if I refer to it, because it is a good school with excellent facilities. The present Government has played an important part in providing education facilities in my district, and I refer particularly to the heavily subsidised kindergartens and the improvements to a special school for mentally retarded children, a school that has an important role to play in a large area of Eyre Peninsula and north of Whyalla. Also, there have been improvements undertaken at the Institute of Technology, and a special school at Whyalla South Primary School has been set up for partially deaf children, and is playing an important part in their education. Unfortunately, the present deferment of the project to which I originally referred has created a difficult situation for the training of apprentices, and the delay in constructing the proposed extensions will have important consequences for the city of Whyalla. It is true to say (it has been said before, and I am possibly repeating myself) that the city of Whyalla is largely heavily industrial and depends largely on employers of people working in heavy industry. These employers should have at their disposal adequately trained apprentices.

I will now say something good, for a change, about Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, which trains apprentices in the heavy industry field and which, probably is the prime employer in Australia of these apprentices. I point out how important this project is. For example, at the beginning of this year there was an intake of 258 first-year apprentices at the Whyalla Technical College, compared to 210 at the Port Augusta Technical College, as reported in a news item. The letter continues by saying that there is a vast difference between the cities of Whyalla, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier. As I have been involved in this venture, I can say that not only have many apprentices enrolled at the college this year: many of them are young boys who have just left school and who have come from areas outside of Whyalla.

This matter concerns me, and it is so important that we should leave no stone unturned in an effort to see whether finance can be made available to ensure that work on the proposed extensions is commenced. The proposed extensions comprise a complex containing a theatrette for training purposes, together with a cultural complex, which is also important to the training of apprentices. Even if we cannot agree to providing such extensions, we should be looking for immediate Commonwealth Government assistance to allow the work on at least part of the extensions, involving the proposed workshop and machinery, to proceed. I point out that it is not just a question of extending the workshop: adequate machinery is needed in an apprentice training workshop, and this costs many thousands of dollars.

The machinery is just as important as are the proposed extensions, because, without it, the apprentices could not be suitably trained. Conditions in the present workshop area at the college are under extreme pressure, and I do not think that one needs to be a mathematician to realise that, if 258 apprentices were admitted in the first year of a three-year course; a total of between 700 and 800 apprentices would be involved. This number is growing each year, and it is important to the city of Whyalla that this type of extension be examined soon by the Commonwealth Government. I hope that we will be able to find this extra finance soon to ensure that work proceeds on the proposed extensions.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I should like to canvass three matters and to have 10 minutes to deal with each one. However, in fairness to other members, and as I know that one's turn will not come around too often, I will try to talk about these three matters in the time at my disposal. First, I regret that Standing Orders have been changed. That this debate is occurring at this time of the day illustrates that the Government's programme for the remaining part of the session is far from satisfactory and, if the guillotine is to be applied during the closing stages of the session, many members will not be at all pleased.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: How do you sustain that argument?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I said, during the debate on the changes to Standing Orders, that I thought there could be a vast improvement in the Government's programme for the passage of its legislation through this House. Since I have been a member of this House, we have in past sessions been confronted with the Premier's talking on television about the Government's tremendous legislative programme and the late sitting hours that would be necessary. We then find that there is precious little legislation put before the House at the beginning of the session but that there is a rush of legislation later, necessitating late sittings. This happens merely because the Government has not put its house in order.

The Minister of Education, who has prompted my remarks, has been at least as much at fault as any other member in this respect. The rewritten Education Bill, introduced in the last weeks of the last session, is a classic example. This is ludicrous, and for the Attorney-General to try to justify the changes to Standing Orders by saying that they will obviate late sittings, when he really intends that the Opposition can at certain times be gagged, makes a farce of the Parliament. That this debate is taking place at this hour of the day illustrates that the Government does not have enough legislation before the House at present, and I will complain bitterly if the guillotine is used with any frequency during the remainder of this session. Perhaps the Government has sought to change Standing Orders now, when it knows that it has only a few minor Bills before the House, in order to soften the impact. Already, we have passed about six Bills this afternoon.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: More than that!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Government's time table is indeed poor. It had been arranged by the Opposition that I would handle a Bill that was not to be dealt with this week and, having arranged to lead a deputation to the Premier, I was not present in the Chamber when, unfortunately this afternoon, the Government decided to deal with the Bill in my absence. The second point to which I should like to refer—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you like to continue on that subject for a little longer?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Although I would, I have three subjects on which I should like to speak and only 10 minutes in which to do so. I have, therefore, only about three minutes to devote to each subject. The second matter to which I should like to refer relates to public examinations, with which the member for Davenport dealt yesterday. The Minister of Education seems to have adopted an indefinite stand on public examinations. A clear-cut decision was taken to abandon the Leaving examination (in my view, that was a wrong decision), and one wonders now what will happen with the Matriculation examination. I pointed out when I returned from my oversea study tour that, in every country where the education system is held in any sort of esteem at all, it has some sort of examination. The Minister was at great pains in this House to explain that Sweden did not have external examinations. However, an army of people is employed by the appropriate authority, with the sole function of devising tests, external to the school, to which all students will be subjected so that there will be some sort of uniformity and assessment throughout the whole secondary school system.

These tests may not be controlled in the same way as the university examinations are controlled, but they are arranged by the authority and, to all intents and purposes, serve the same function as the public examinations serve in this State. It seems to me that the Public Examinations Board in this State has been severely short of funds for the past year or two, especially last year, when there was controversy, as reported in the press, because of errors and omissions regarding examination papers, I think in Leaving English and Matriculation Biology. Requests have been made for the appointment of two professional officers to the Public Examinations Board so that they can do much of the work of checking and collating.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: The examiner in charge does that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There is a need to co-ordinate examinations in the various subjects, as well as a need for an overriding co-ordination, but this has been denied. I consider that the Minister is deliberately starving the board of funds, because I think he wants to see the Matriculation examination go. If a more satisfactory alternative can be devised, well and good, but I do not think it has been devised. I have served on the Adelaide University Council, and I know that complaints have been discussed. That university controls the Matriculation examination and I was impressed by the willingness to have alternatives considered, but all the alternatives tried have been found wanting.

I refer now to land subdivisions in the watersheds. The Engineering and Water Supply Department is quite inflexible in the rules that it has laid down for subdivision in the Adelaide Hills. The Government has not taken any notice of recommendations that the Ombudsman has made. The whole point in establishing the office of Ombudsman was so that the public would get a fair go. However, even when the Ombudsman was appointed a Royal Commissioner and made certain recommendations, the Minister did not recognise the strictures in those recommendations. The policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department regarding the watersheds leaves something to be desired. A resident of the Millbrook area, who is not a wealthy man, was forced out of pig production because the land was in the watershed. Although he lives near Millbrook, his property would drain not into that reservoir but into the proposed reservoir on the Little Para, about 25 kilometres away. As a result of having to relinquish pig farming, that person had to sell some land. His son lives in the area and has a family of about eight children. This man is a truck driver and is not in good financial circumstances, and an opportunity has been denied to cut off a block on which the son can build a house. However, nearby an entrepeneur was allowed to divide a perpetual lease into allotments of about 9 hectares and sell them at a big profit. Apparently, a non-resident applied for and was granted approval by the Land Board for subdivision. It seems to me that, if the Government is intent on keeping subdivision in the Hills area to a minimum, it should look at these matters on a fairer basis, making a closer scrutiny than it has in the past. The subdivision at Amaroo has been deeply resented by residents of the area. They ask how a person who does not live in the area is permitted to subdivide leasehold land over which the Government has control. How is he able to obtain permission to do so, thus being enabled to make a handsome profit, while other people who own land in the area and live there are precluded from doing so?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I wish to support the remarks made last evening by the member for Tea Tree Gully about the problem of noise pollution, a problem of increasing significance. I know of a case of this type in my district at present. Residents in a certain area are subject to noise disturbance caused by a rock group. I do not want to give the impression that I am against rock groups. The Minister of Development and Mines is something of a musician.

The Hon. D. I. Hopgood: Not rock.

Mr. SLATER: The group to which I refer practises, between engagements, on private premises, using modern electronic equipment. Consequently, the noise emitted is shattering, and I understand from residents that it continues for some time. Many people in neighbouring houses have young children; some have student children, and they are disturbed by the band for some time, as are the older residents. Stress is being caused to the whole neighbourhood by the group's playing for extended periods.

I understand that, last Sunday evening, they played from 5 p.m. to after 10 p.m. Great distress has thus been caused to people living near the premises at which the rock group practices. The residents have sought some redress, contacting the local council and the police. I understand the council is currently investigating what action it can take. I also understand that, at the request of one of the residents, police officers have come to the area once or twice and asked the group to contain the noise. However, the group complies with the request only temporarily. When the police have left, the volume goes up again and the same situation obtains. Apparently, the police officers have advised the group not only to reduce its size but also to cease playing after about 10 p.m. This plea has been ignored. The council is at a loss to know what action it can take to ensure that the neighbourhood is not disturbed by this playing of rock music.

I have referred to one type of noise pollution, other types being referred to last evening by the member for Tea Tree Gully. Although I do not wish to go over what she said, I heartily agree with her remarks. This is a problem which is of increasing significance in the community and to which some legislative attention should be given. The situation I have brought to the attention of the House is only one of many such situations referred to members and relating to disturbance caused by persons with no consideration for their neighbours.

I turn now to a different type of pollution. This occurs through the use of back-yard incinerators, and here, too, there is a lack of consideration by some people for their immediate neighbours. Most people use discretion in the burning of rubbish and the times at which they burn it, but some do not show consideration for others, burning offensive materials at any hour. I have had one or two complaints from people who have asked local councils to take action, but the councils find they have no jurisdiction over the use of household incinerators. As I understand it, the only legislation covering household incinerators is the Bush Fires Act, but even that Act has been changed recently with the introduction of the inner metropolitan fire area. We should consider amending the Local Government Act to give councils power to regulate hours of burning.

Mr. Venning: More restrictions!

Mr. SLATER: It is not a restriction. It relates only to people who do not consider their neighbours. I hope the matter will be considered when the relevant legislation is before the House. Another aspect of this matter concerns the location of the incinerator. Some people have put their incinerators close to the neighbouring house, sometimes only a few metres from bedroom or kitchen windows. Although this is most inconsiderate, it does happen. Councils have no jurisdiction over the placement of incinerators. When placed near neighbouring houses, they cause problems. We should consider giving councils power to direct people to put their incinerators at specified distances from neighbouring houses.

The last matter I wish to raise is an internal one within this Chamber. Over the past 18 months we have had alterations made to the Chamber, and my grievance really is an appeal against the light. We have had naked bulbs in this Chamber for some time. The covers have been removed, and I find the lighting rather trying. Although I am fortunate in not having to wear glasses, when we sit for long hours my eyes feel the effect of the light. I ask that the Public Buildings Department (or whoever is responsible) endeavour to provide better lighting for the benefit of members. So I hope that attention will be given to my appeal against the light. The member for Mitchell recently had to purchase spectacles at enormous expense. I wonder whether his purchase was made necessary by the bad lighting in this Chamber; if it was, he might have a claim for workmen's compensation. Further, I wonder whether, when my eyesight deteriorates, I will have a claim for workmen's compensation. I therefore ask you, Mr. Speaker, to give your attention to the lighting in this Chamber. I hope that the matters I have raised will eventually see the light.

The SPEAKER: The question before the House is "That the House do now adjourn."

Motion carried.

At 5.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, March 6, at 2 p.m.